the bill. It seems to be the best measure we can get.

I voted against recommitting the farm bill because the only provisions that would increase the farm income for 1956 would have been stricken from the bill had it been recommitted.

The President, in his message to Conress on January 9, 1956, set up a 9-point program and urged prompt action in order to increase the farmer's income this year. The soil bank would have placed about $1.2 billion in the pocket of the farmer. It is too late for the soil bank to take effect in 1956. It seemed to me that the only way to carry out the President's wishes to raise the income of the farmer this year would be by keeping parity prices up for 1 more year. Without this provision there would have been a reduction in the parity prices as well as in the acreage. You cannot help the farmer by taking land out of production, and at the same time reducing the prices he receives.

I feel there is more good in the bill than bad. The soil bank, which will go into effect next year, is designed to pay the farmer for taking land out of production. The present bill contains a domestic parity plan for wheat. This must be voted on in 1957 and carry, by two-thirds vote of the wheat farmers, in order to become effective. The bill carries a dual, modern price system for 1 year. This is designed to raise farm income until the soil bank can become effective. It contains a provision for $500 million to process surplus crops and get them into channels of relief both in this country and in foreign countries. It contains a provision for a commission to study the proposition of converting surplus crops into industrial alcohol. It contains a provision to prohibit production of supported commodities on Government-owned land.

I am convinced that the buying power of the farmer is essential to the men and women in labor, industry, and business in all communities. Farmers find themselves in a price-squeeze situation which in many towns has severely affected all business.

Farm income was estimated in 1955 to be about $10.8 billion. That is down 9 percent from 1954. In 1954 farm income was less than it was in 1953. The 1953 income was less than in 1952. The President said in his January 9 message, "Farm prices and incomes are depressing; unless corrected, these economic reverses are a direct threat to all of our people." I believe this bill as enacted, with the dual modern parity system, will bring income to the farmer this year. Dual parity and 90-percent parity will be the only means for a year to assure the farmer additional income. This is the only way you can carry out the President's desire to raise the income of the farmer, because the soil bank, which would have cost $1.2 billion, cannot become effective this year. The 90-percent parity will cost less than the soil bank.

If the farmer approves the domestic parity plan for wheat by his vote in 1957, it will not cost the Government one thin dime. I think it is a good provision. There are some consumers who claim it will increase the cost of bread and flour, but the evidence shows that from 1948 to 1955 wheat prices declined 31 percent, while the price of bread went up 28 percent.

Under the present farm bill, wool and sugar are supported at about 100 percent parity; cotton, tobacco, and peanuts at about 90 percent parity. The only crops not being supported at near 90 percent parity would be corn and wheat.

When the soil-bank provisions become effective, there ought to be a reevaluation and a restudy of the parity situation.

I repeat, you cannot help the farmer by taking land out of production or by reducing the parity price he receives. I trust the President will consider this when he decides the question of signing or vetoing the bill. I trust his advisers will point out that the soil bank cannot become effective this year, and that if he really wishes to keep the income of the farmer in balance, then the dual-parity and the 90-percent-parity provisions in the bill will be in existence this year. They are only for 1 year's duration.

There are some provisions in the bill that I do not particularly like; but when you consider that 10 earnest, sincere men worked many days on the compromise, you must conclude that there is more good in the bill than harm. It cannot please everyone. Each Member of Congress has a duty to perform to his district, State, and Nation. I have followed the dictates of my conscience. I hope the advisers to the President will weigh carefully the pros and cons of the bill, particularly in the light of the President's message of January 9 this year.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 16, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, April 9, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Charles Duell Kean, D. D., rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and most merciful God, who art the Sovereign Lord of men and nations, in whose hand the rise and fall of empires are but as grains of sand, yet who carest in infinite love for all Thy children;

We pray Thee for the Senate of these United States assembled in Thy presence, that Thou wilt bless its Members in the performance of their duties, and that Thou wilt prosper their undertakings as these can be related to Thy divine providence.

Give to the several Members of the Senate, we pray Thee, O Lord, wisdom, courage, and consecration; overcome their fears, support them when they are tormented by anxiety; enlighten them when they are perplexed and uncertain; strengthen them when they are under pressure; and comfort them when they face misunderstanding.

Relate their deliberations and counsels, O Lord, to the welfare of this Nation and the physical, moral, and spiritual health of all its people; use their endeavors to bring peace and harmony in all the length and breadth of this land; and make their achievements serve Thy sovereign purpose through contributing to the wider peace of the world.

All this we pray in the name and for the sake of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BARKLEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 12, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Kibbe, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GEORGE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until a week from today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

to the consideration of executive business and take action on the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George Cochran Doub, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Warren E. Burger, resigning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maurice E. Stans, of Illinois, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, with a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of February 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of two appropriation allotments; to the Committee on Appropriations.

CANDIDATES SELECTED FOR 1956 NROTC PROGRAM

A letter from the Chief of Naval Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of principal and alternate candidates selected for the 1956 regular NROTC program (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1953

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of operations under the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, dated April 13, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that bank, for the period July–December 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation, for the year ended December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT ON UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR EGYPT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the United States assistance program for Egypt, International Cooperation Administration, Department of State, dated June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CROOKED RIVER PROJECT, OREGON

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the Crooked River project, Oregon (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN FEDERALLY OWNED LAND TO LASSEN VOLCANIC NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to add certain federally owned land to the Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO CONFINEMENT IN CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE GRANT OF PROBATION

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18, United States Code, section 3651, so as to permit confinement in jail-type institutions or treatment institutions for a period not exceeding 6 months in connection with the grant of probation on a 1-count indictment (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Karl Yu from a report transmitted to the Senate on July 18, 1955, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to Armed Forces bombing and artillery ranges

"Whereas extensive areas of land and water within the State of California have been designated as bombing and artillery ranges and training areas for the Armed Forces; and

"Whereas use of land as a bombing area and artillery range precludes its use for other purposes; and

"Whereas many citizens believe that the Armed Forces do not have a program of maximum integrated land use in effect relating to areas which have been, or may be, designated as bombing and artillery ranges; and

"Whereas in order to insure the continued growth of California and prosperity of its residents it is mandatory that, in view of the limited areas of land within the State and the needs of future land development, further military use of such land be kept at a minimum: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to require that all Armed Forces requests for additional bombing and artillery ranges be accompanied by proof that all areas presently under their control suitable for use as bombing and artillery ranges are being utilized to their fullest extent; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from

California in the Congress of the United States."

Four joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution relative to providing increased benefits for survivors of military personnel

"Whereas action is now pending in the United States Senate on H. R. 7089, the Hardy bill, which provides for substantially increased benefits for survivors of military personnel; and

"Whereas in view of the reduced purchasing power of the dollar it is imperative that the benefits payable to survivors of military personnel be increased so that these people will not become a burden upon the communities in which they live; and

"Whereas although the cost of living has greatly increased in the past few years and, in line with such increase, most employees have received substantial raises in pay, nothing yet has been done to increase the meager benefits now payable to survivors of military personnel: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 7089; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to continuance of increased grants-in-aid for old-age security and aid-to-the-blind benefits

"Whereas the California Legislature at the 1952 second extraordinary session increased the old-age security and aid-to-the-blind benefits to California recipients by the maximum amount of $5 per month by passing on to them the increase in Federal grants-in-aid; and

"Whereas this increase was made contingent upon the continuation of the increased grants-in-aid by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the increase in the Federal grants-in-aid will expire unless Congress enacts legislation at the current session continuing the increase; and

"Whereas the Governor of California, the Honorable Goodwin Knight, has requested the Senators and Representatives in Congress from California to support Federal legislation continuing the increased grants-in-aid; and

"Whereas at the 1955 session of the legislature senate bill No. 398 was enacted and signed by the Governor providing that if an additional $5 per month increase in grants-in-aid for old-age security and blind aid is provided by Congress such increase would be immediately passed on to old-age security and blind-aid recipients in this State; and

"Whereas high living costs and the maintenance of a reasonably adequate and fair old-age security and aid-to-the-blind program in California warrant the continuation of the present $5 increase as well as the authorization of an additional $5 increase; and

"Whereas legislation is pending in the Congress of the United States which would accomplish these two objectives for the recipients of old-age security and aid to the blind: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the legislature respectfully requests that the Congress of the United States enact legislation at this session continuing the increased grants-in-aid passed in 1952 and give careful consideration to an additional $5 increase, and that support be given such legislation by the Senators and Representatives in Congress from California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 7

"Joint resolution relative to permitting recipients of aid to the aged to earn $50 per month in addition to such aid

"Whereas in 1950 the Congress of the United States amended the social-security law to provide that the first $50 per month of income earned by a blind person shall be disregarded in computing aid to such person, thereby allowing a blind person to earn this amount in addition to his aid; and

"Whereas legislation is presently before the Congress of the United States which would extend this same benefit to recipients of aid to the aged; and

"Whereas it is the belief of the Legislature of the State of California that there is an abundance of odd jobs and temporary employment in this State that could be capably filled by aged persons; and

"Whereas the present public-assistance program discourages these aged persons from seeking such employment by requiring that any and all earnings be deducted from their aid: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as is necessary to permit recipients of aid to the aged to earn $50 a month, which amount shall not be taken into consideration in computing aid to such recipients; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 13

"Joint resolution relative to Federal disability payments for aged and needy veterans

"Whereas there are in this country today thousands of aged and disabled needy war veterans who are unemployable and who have little or no income on which to live; and

"Whereas the laws enacted by Congress to assist such veterans are being defeated by arbitrary and unjust interpretations given them by the Veterans' Administration; and

"Whereas it is particularly deplorable and discriminatory that the Veterans' Administration has ruled that a 65-year-old veteran, suffering from the disabilities and ailments that come with old age, remains employable if he can eke out a few dollars here and there by part-time work to supplement an otherwise inadequate income, and on that ground denies disability payments to such veterans; and

"Whereas the rise in the cost of living that has occurred since the scale for veterans' payments was established some years ago has also resulted in hardships on those who are aged and disabled; and

"Whereas the American Legion is solidly behind a program to correct these inequities by raising the monthly benefits for disabled veterans to bring them more in line with today's increased living costs, by raising the limitation on the annual income which a veteran may receive and still remain eligible for disability benefits, and by amending the present law to include the automatic presumption that a veteran at the age of 65 becomes unemployable due to advancing years and physical infirmities and thus entitled to security benefits provided he can meet the income limitation and other requirements; and

"Whereas there is now pending in Congress the War Veterans Security bill, H. R. 7886, which embodies these provisions and will give some much needed help to these veterans who are now old and infirm, but who in their younger days answered their country's call: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact into law H. R. 7886; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to the proposed Washoe project

"Whereas there is presently pending before the Congress legislation to authorize the construction of the Washoe project, which project involves the waters of the Truckee and Carson Rivers, and which project originates in California, with some of its principal features located in California; and

"Whereas most of the benefits of this project, as planned by the United States Bureau of Reclamation, accrue to the State of Nevada, and the legislation before Congress contains no provisions to protect the State of California with respect to the potential future development of the areas in this State which may possibly necessitate the use of waters involved in this project; and

"Whereas the State Engineer of California has recommended at hearings before congressional committees (1) that storage and water supply for the Washoe project be based on stream runoff in the Truckee and Carson River basins as impaired by present and future use of water in the areas of origin in California, (2) that the amount of water to be available to the Washoe project be defined in an interstate compact and the project operated in conformance therewith, and (3) that the Washoe project provide a dependable water supply to lands in the Carson Valley in California as well as to lands in the same valley in Nevada, but such recommendations have not been adopted in pending legislation; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California believes that the storage and distribution of waters which affect the interests of two or more States should be accomplished in conformity with the desires of the States involved and in pursuance of this policy has created a commission to cooperate with a similar commission from the State of Nevada in formulating an interstate compact relative to the distribution and use of the waters of, among others, the Truckee and Carson Rivers; and

"Whereas the interstate compact now under negotiation between the commissions of the State of California and the State of Nevada will determine the amount of water that can reasonably be made available for future development in the areas of origin in California; and

"Whereas it is not contemplated or believed that the provisions of such compact will have a detrimental effect upon the operation of the proposed Washoe project or that the negotiation of such compact should be cause for delay of authorization of the

project by the Congress if appropriate safeguards are included therein; and

"Whereas amendments have been proposed to S. 497, 84th Congress, first session, one of the congressional bills to authorize the construction of the Washoe project, to provide protection for the future development in the areas of origin in California and to provide that the operation of the Washoe project shall be in conformance with any interstate compact formulated and approved, covering the distribution and use of the waters of the Truckee and Carson Rivers; and

"Whereas there is precedent for the inclusion in statutes authorizing Federal reclamation projects of a provision subjecting project operation to requirements of State law, as exemplified by the statute authorizing the Santa Maria project (68 Stat. 1190); and

"Whereas it is not the intention of the Legislature of the State of California in adopting this resolution to voice opposition to the authorization of the proposed Washoe project, which project the legislature firmly believes is a desirable and necessary development, but rather only to urge that provision be made in the legislation authorizing such project to protect the future development of the areas in California involved in this project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing the construction of the Washoe project with appropriate statutory provisions to (a) afford water users in Alpine County, Calif., the opportunity to contract for project water made available by the Watasheamu Reservoir before that water is made available for the development of any new land in Nevada, with the right of such Alpine County water users to exchange the water so secured for existing rights to the natural flow or stored water of the West Carson River; (b) provide that the use of the waters of the Little Truckee River solely for the generation of electric power by the Washoe project shall be subject to appropriation in the future for beneficial consumptive uses within the Little Truckee River watershed in California to the same extent that such waters may be presently available for appropriation in the State of California, unless and until an interstate compact is formulated and approved, covering the distribution and use of the waters of the Truckee and Carson Rivers; and (c) provide that the dam at the Stampede site shall be so constructed as to permit its ultimate enlargement to a height at which the reservoir behind it will have a capacity of approximately 175,000 acre-feet; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution relative to compliance with State water laws

"Whereas under the California State water resources law of 1945, as amended, the State water resources board was authorized and directed to prepare a comprehensive and coordinated plan for the full development of California water resources, for which purpose said board has expended nearly $4 million to date; and

"Whereas such comprehensive plan, known as the California water plan, pursuant to the direction of said board, is under formulation by the division of water resources and is approaching completion, and a preview thereof has been published; and

"Whereas in recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States construing the Federal Power Act, it has been held that licenses of the Federal Power Commission may construct and operate hydroelectric projects without compliance with State laws relating to the development and use of water; and

"Whereas application and extension of the precedents established in said cases might result in Federal domination of the use and development of the water resources of the States; and

"Whereas such precedents constitute an impediment to the continued exercise of the traditional rights of the States to control and develop their water resources in the public interest; and

"Whereas it appears that remedial legislation by the Congress is necessary in order to protect and preserve such traditional rights of the States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to promptly enact Federal legislation to require all Federal agencies and their licensees to comply with State laws relating to the development and use of water.

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution relative to national minerals policy

"Whereas the Western Governors Mineral Policies Conference was called by Gov. Goodwin J. Knight, of California, in Sacramento, Calif., on November 7 and 8 1955, after consultation by Governor Knight with Gov. Charles H. Russell, of Nevada, who is chairman of the Western Governors Advisory Council; and

"Whereas this conference and the subsequent meetings of the Western Governors Mining Advisory Council produced the following recommendations for the development of a national minerals policy:

"'MINERAL ECONOMICS—RECOMMENDATIONS ON MINERAL COMMODITIES

"'1. Gold

"'The council calls attention to the following conditions in regard to gold:

"'1. The absolute and arbitrary control exercised by the United States Treasury over the production, disposition, and holding of domestic gold is in direct violation of the rights of personal liberty, personal security, and personal ownership of private property.

"'2. The Government has usurped the right of individuals to sell newly mined gold to industry and to the arts, and has denied individuals the right to own, buy, or sell this commodity in a free market.

"'3. The sale of gold from our Federal gold reserve for other than monetary use annually exceeds the total domestic gold production and is dissipating the United States monetary reserves.

"'4. By making itself the sole buyer of newly mined gold in processed form and by fixing its arbitrary and low price, the United States Government imposes such hardships on the domestic gold producer that 95 percent of the primary gold mines have been forced to close operations.

"'The council recommends that:

"'1. Congress be urged to enact legislation to discontinue the sale of Government-owned gold from the monetary reserve to private industry and to restore to the people of the United States the right freely to buy, possess, sell, and otherwise treat gold. Such legislation is now pending in the Congress, but references to gold therein should be amended so as to not limit the measure to newly mined gold.

"'2. The respective State legislatures be requested to urge the Congress to support such legislation.

"'2. Silver

"'The council recommends that:

"'1. The existing policy, whereby newly mined domestic silver may be tendered to the Treasury Department for coinage purposes, be continued.

"'2. Senate bill 1427, "A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver and for other purposes," be rejected by the Congress.

"'3. As longer range objectives, the council further recommends that:

"'(a) The sale of Government-owned silver by the Treasury Department at less than its coinage value of $1.2929 per troy ounce be prohibited; and

"'(b) The seigniorage retained by the Treasury Department be progressively reduced in recognition of the steadily mounting cost of producing silver.

"'(4) The council highly commends the governors and the legislators of the Western States for the vigorous support which they have given to the silver mining industry, and we respectfully call to their attention the fact that their continued support is urgently needed.

"'3. Lead and zinc

"'The council recommends that:

"'1. An excise tax of 2 cents per pound be established on imports of zinc and lead to take effect whenever the price of zinc falls below 14 cents, East St. Louis, and the price of lead to 16 cents, New York.

"'2. The present stockpiling of lead and zinc should be continued until such an excise tax is put into effect.

"'4. Copper

"'The council recommends that:

"'The present excise tax on imported copper be maintained.

"'5. Molybdenum

"'The council recommends that:

"'The national stockpile program on molybdenum concentrates be continued until maximum emergency defense requirements are met.

"'6. Fluorspar

"'The council recommends that:

"'The fluorspare industry be afforded tariff protection and/or restriction of fluorspar imports sufficient to permit its survival.

"'7. Uranium—Vanadium

"'The council strongly urges that:

"'The Atomic Energy Commission make a prompt public declaration regarding the continuation and extension of its uranium-purchase program. Upon the announcement of its proposed program the domestic industry at large should be provided an opportunity to appraise and evaluate said proposed program and to submit further recommendations before its final adoption. Meantime, so long as the Government retains control of the purchase and use of uranium, the council looks to the Atomic Energy Commission to maintain an adequate purchase program and to prepare plans for an orderly transition from the current monopolies to the period when industrial requirements predominate.

"'The council strongly urges that more access and mine-to-market roads be planned and completed with all possible speed.

"'The council favors the continued curtailment by the Atomic Energy Commission of its exploration drilling program and urges that funds hitherto allocated for that purpose be made available to the Defense Mineral Exploration Administration.

"'The council further recommends that:

"'The security program be reexamined in order that maximum information be made available to the industry for effective future planning.

"'The Atomic Energy Commission should arrange to facilitate and plan continuity of studies of problems of the industry related to the marketing of uranium ores, in particular: (a) penalties now being imposed for high lime content; (b) the disposition of other metals produced in association with uranium including vanadium, copper, et cetera, and (c) the feasibility of establishing fixed uniform prices for uranium concentrates. These studies should enlist the personnel and experience of the Atomic Energy Commission, appropriate State and Federal agencies as well as private research organizations and the producing industry.

"'The council urges that:

"'In all future raw material purchase programs that the domestic uranium industry be given paramount consideration.

"'8. Rare earths and thorium

"'The council recommends that:

"'1. The Atomic Energy Commission should establish a price and buying schedule for thorium similar to that for uranium, since it has complete control of both these fissionable materials.

"'2. A tariff be placed on foreign monazite, bastnasite, and rare earth compounds which is sufficiently high to permit domestic producers to survive. A tariff of 10 cents per pound on contained rare earths metals is suggested.

"'3. Until Nos. 1 and 2 above are effective the Federal Government should make new contracts to purchase monazite and bastnasite concentrates in sufficient quantities and at a price which will maintain an adequate mobilization base for the industry.

"'9. Quicksilver

"'The council calls attention to the fact the market for mercury is assured by GSA purchases until December 31, 1957, but it has no knowledge of any definite demand which could assure the continuation of the domestic industry much beyond that date.

"'The council recommends:

"'1. The establishment of a tariff equivalent in protection and at the same percentage of the selling price as at the time the present tariff was established (1922).

"'2. If this is not possible, there should be established a plan of distributing the tariff paid by foreign producers to domestic producers in accordance with their production with the tariff adjusted from 25 cents per pound to 35 cents per pound.

"'3. In the absence of 1 or 2 above then the General Services Administration purchase program should be continued until the present appropriation is expended.

"'10. Tungsten

"'The council recommends that:

"'1. An adequate tariff be established to enable the domestic tungsten mining industry to stand on its own feet and compete with the low-cost foreign producers.

"'2. If it is impossible to obtain such a tariff, then an adequate tariff on imported tungsten ore should be established, the proceeds of which must be distributed to the producers of domestic tungsten produced and sold within the United States, in proportion to their production.

"'3. A purchase program for a reasonable period be established providing for reduced Government purchases at lower than current floor prices, based on the grade and impurities of the concentrates purchased, and with gradually reducing amounts and prices to enable complete withdrawal of the United States Government from the program by the end of that period.

"'4. Until 1, or 2, and 3 above are put into effect, the principles and purpose, as expressed in H. R. 6373 (84th Cong.), be reaffirmed as desirable objectives to provide a continuing and prosperous tungsten mining industry in order that an adequate mobilization base might be maintained.

"'The council suggests:

"'That the Department of Defense be advised that it is no longer necessary to "design around" tungsten. It should be used wherever and whenever it is best suited to the defense problem in hand.

"'11. Chrome

"'The council recommends that:

"'In order to prevent the domestic chrome industry from being shut down in the fall of 1956 and in order that the industry might continue as a mobilization base for possible emergency, that:

"'1. A tariff be established of 5 cents per pound on contained chromium metal in imported chromite ore;

"'2. If it is impossible to obtain such a tariff, then a tariff equal to five-eighths cent per pound on contained chromium metal in imported chromite ore should be established. The proceeds of this tariff must be distributed to the producers of chromite produced and sold within the United States in proportion to their production. Then the chrome industry could continue into the foreseeable future as a strong, healthy industry, capable of expansion and able to act as a mobilization base in time of national emergency;

"'3. Until such a long term program as outlined under 1 or 2, is adopted and put into effect, the General Services Administration purchase program should be continued on its present basis.

"'12. Manganese

"'The council recommends that:

"'1. A tariff be established of 5 cents per pound of contained manganese in imported foreign ores;

"'2. If the stipulation in paragraph 1 is impossible, then a tariff equivalent to one-half cent per pound of contained manganese be imposed, the proceeds being distributed to domestic producers on the basis of each domestic producer's unit production produced and sold;

"'3. The limitation of 10,000 tons on the carlot program be eliminated until the provisions of either paragraph 1 or 2 are adopted;

"'4. If the recommendations in paragraphs 1 and 2 are impossible, then a program similar to the present carlot program should be put into effect over a long term of years.

"'The council suggests that;

"'Every effort be made to obtain a treatment plant at either the Deming, N. Mex., or the Wenden, Ariz., depot to beneficiate stockpile ores to usable grade.

"'13. Antimony

"'In order to reactivate domestic antimony production the council recommends that:

"'1. Minimum tariff rates be established.

"'(a) On antimony ore and concentrates at not less than 15 cents per pound of contained antimony; and

"'(b) On antimony smelter products at not less than 30 cents per pound of contained antimony.

"'2. If it is not possible to obtain such tariffs then a tariff of 6 cents per pound on contained antimony metal in imported antimony metal, ores or concentrates should be established. The proceeds of this tariff must be distributed to the producers of primary antimony, produced and sold within the United States, in proportion to their production.

"'14. Asbestos

"'The council recommends that:

"'1. Unused funds now earmarked for the purchase of No. 3 fiber be made available to purchase additional No. 1 and No. 2 high grade fiber, thereby making usable all of the funds allocated to the G. S. A. Globe warehouse. The purchase of No. 3 should be continued on the present ratio of 3 tons of No. 3 purchased to each ton of No. 1 or No. 2 (approximately $1 million remains in the No. 3 fund to supply funds for the above change in the program).

"'2. Fiber of national stockpile quality now in the Globe warehouse be transferred to the national stockpile and the Globe warehouse be credited accordingly;

"'3. The life of the asbestos program be extended. This can be done by making available to Arizona asbestos producers part of the funds allocated to the national stockpile and changing the present Globe warehouse program as in No. 1 above;

"'4. The inspection of fiber for transfer to the national stockpile be done by G. S. A. classifiers now inspecting Globe warehouse fiber;

"'5. Fiber of national stockpile quality and sold to the national stockpile to be checked in at the Globe warehouse and paid for as now being done through San Francisco office of G. S. A.;

"'6. The present standards of quality be retained.

"'15. Coal

"'The council recommends that:

"'The governors give equal consideration to all of the available energy resources—uranium, coal, oil, gas, oil shale and water—before deciding which is to be used as the source of generating power in any given area.

"'16. Aggregates—Clay—Talc

"'The council recommends that:

"'The congressional committees on interstate and foreign commerce be urged to investigate the encroachment by the I. C. C. regulations on many minerals and mineral aggregate in intrastate commerce.

"'Lands and Water

"'The council considers the objective of the general mining laws to be the discovery and development of the mineral resources of the public domain by private enterprise. To effect this objective the laws invite citizens to prospect for minerals and upon discovery to locate valid mining claims. The mining laws also provide for protection of valid claims and the possessory rights thereunder prior to patent, and for transfer of legal title to private ownership by patent. History has proven the soundness of this system, and the council reaffirms its confidence in it.

"'The council holds that public lands are not the property of the Government of the United States or of any of its agencies but instead are lands held in trust for the people of the United States, and are destined for their eventual use under the principles of free enterprise. Vast areas of the West have in prospect many present and future uses, but they are most likely to find best use as a source of the national mineral wealth.

"'The continued inroads upon the use of this land which are made by Federal withdrawal of the land from mineral entry, or by acquisition by various agencies of the Federal Government, have long been adverse to the economy of the West. Such inroads have been tremendously augmented in recent years by military acquisition of huge areas in the Western States. This has served to curtail seriously the productivity of private enterprise within the State, and to reduce State and Federal income, as well as the supply of materials for the defense of the country. Under present laws, no Federal-land State has the power effectively to resist such inroads.

"'For those cogent reasons the council recommends that:

"'1. As to Federal land withdrawals:

"'(a) The western governors urge an immediate congressional investigation of Federal lands now withdrawn from mineral entry and other beneficial uses, whether withdrawn for military or other purposes, and

of western lands otherwise acquired by the various agencies of the Federal Government; that among other things such investigation determine the necessity for and the authenticity of the withdrawal, whether the land is still serving the purpose for which it was withdrawn or acquired and whether portions of it or the whole of it may be returned to the public domain or to private owners (with priority right for repurchase given to original owners); and that such investigation determine whether the various agencies and military units cannot combine their activities as to the use of such lands rather than making separate use thereof, in order to give such land the highest possible usefulness.

"'(b) Congress be urged by the governors to explore the possibility of Federal legislation requiring the cooperation and approval of any State for any Federal withdrawal or acquisition within its boundaries.

"'(c) The western governors request Congress to enact legislation to provide that in all further Federal-land withdrawals, for military use or otherwise:

"'(1) Public hearings be held on the proposed withdrawals.

"'(2) These hearings be held in at least one community within or near the area proposed for withdrawal.

"'(3) Notice of these hearings be published in the Federal Register and in a newspaper having maximum circulation in affected areas, at least 90 days in advance of the hearings.

"'(4) These hearings shall seek to determine the relative beneficial use of the land involved, and whether excessive acreages are being proposed for withdrawal.

"'2. As to the Oil and Gas Leasing Act:

"'The western governors opposed any further amendment of the Oil and Gas Leasing Act, approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 30 U. S. C. A. 181, et seq.), or any other legislative proposals which would add any further classes of lessees or any minerals or mineral deposits to those now named in said act.

"'3. As to Mineral Leasing Act:

"'The western governors urge the Department of Interior to reappraise the maximum acreage limitations presently existing on the leasing of Federal mineral lands withdrawn from location and increase the acreage to meet the requirements of modern mining and refining needs. Illustrative of such need is phosphate.

"'It is the considered opinion of the council that no further restriction should be placed upon the noncompetitive lease rules and regulations and that such regulations should be so administered as to encourage the investment of venture capital.

"'4. As to restrictive Federal legislation:

"'(a) The western governors oppose any and all legislation in the Congress that promotes further control and withdrawal of Federal lands from the public domain.

"'(b) The governors urge the Congress of the United States to return to the first principles laid down by our Founding Fathers, that the Federal lands of the United States are for the benefit of the citizens and should be sold and disposed of to the citizens as rapidly as is practically possible, so that those lands may be made the subject of private ownership by our citizenry and the subject of taxation for the support of local and State governments.

"'(c) The western governors advocate the annulment of the rules and regulations promulgated by the many departments of Government withdrawing and otherwise prohibiting possession of public lands by the citizens of this Nation, so that the citizens may again be free to take up the land under the original laws relating to mining or agricultural classification and carry that land through to patent without interference by a multitude of governmental agencies.

"'5. As to geophysical exploration:

"'The governors urge Congress to give prompt consideration of constructive changes in the discovery provisions of the General Mining Laws so as to afford a reasonable period of protection to those who in good faith seek a mineral discovery where the object of exploration is a deep or hidden deposit and discovery can only be made following prolonged use of expensive equipment and modern scientific methods of prospecting.

"'6. As to "in lieu" lands:

"'The western governors recommend to Congress a thorough study of the need for legislation serving to permit the public land States to make "in lieu" selection from mineral lands, for the mineral lands lost to the State because of the preemption of numbered school sections before the State's right to such sections was determined by survey.

"'7. As to State mining laws:

"'The western governors investigate the desirability of making more uniform the laws of the various States governing location and annual assessment work, and other mineral land matters within their jurisdiction.

"'Taxes

"'The council holds that the continuance of a healthy and prosperous mining industry and the contributions it can and should make to the public revenue, to employment, to national security, and to the general welfare, depends upon continuing production from now operating mines and the continuing discovery and development of new deposits. Essential to this is the hope for profits commensurate with the difficulties, the effort, and the risks of losses involved. The inherent risks in mining cannot be avoided, and taxes should not be imposed in nature or amounts as will kill incentives for incurring these risks and will result in loss of Government revenues and harm to the domestic economy.

"'The council recommends:

"'1. As to depletion:

"'(a) Full and adequate allowance for percentage as well as cost depletion should be provided for all minerals on a fair and equitable basis, not less favorable than present rates. We particularly note the necessity of such allowances in the development of so-called oil shales in the Western States.

"'(b) Depletion should be recognized as an allowance to stockholders in determining the taxability of dividends they receive as well as being allowed to the corporation in determining its taxable income.

"'2. As to exploration costs:

"'Cost of exploration, as well as development, should be allowed as a deduction without the limitations imposed by present law.

"'3. As to depreciation:

"'The provisions for more reasonable depreciation contained in present law should be retained without fundamental changes. No amount should be considered as recovered by depreciation deductions which has not effectively reduced the taxpayer's income subject to tax.

"'4. As to operating loss:

"'The more equitable allowance of net operating losses provided by present law should be maintained.

"'5. As to research expenditures:

"'The allowance under present law as a deduction of expenditures on research and experimentation should be preserved.

"'6. As to double taxation of corporate earnings:

"'The small step recently taken to minimize double taxation of corporate earnings should be enlarged.

"'7. As to new mines:

"'New mines should be exempted from income taxes for 3 years after commercial production begins.

"'8. As to capital gains:

"'A further reduction of the rate on net long-term capital gains would be economically beneficial to the mining industry and, on the basis of past experience, would increase net revenue collected.

"'9. As to severance taxes:

"'In State taxation, no particular tax nor the combined Federal, State and local taxes should be such as to discourage the exploration and development or production of minerals. Severance taxes or taxes based on or measured by gross output should be avoided.

"'Research

"'The council recommends to the governors serious consideration of the following discussed facts and conditions affecting industry research.

"'Research is the very foundation upon which growth of the mineral industries must depend. For the future health of the mineral industries and of the entire national economy, there should be vigorous research activity supported directly by private industry as well as by State and Federal agencies, each working in the sphere for which it is best fitted; and

"'With respect to privately supported industrial research, economic factors should be such as to give maximum encouragement to industrial expenditures for research. This viewpoint is embodied in a recommendation on taxes, shared in by the research committee; and

"'Since many research projects involve financial commitments over a long period of years, the lack of a clearly stated national mineral policy, has limited industry's willingness to undertake such long-term projects. It follows that the adoption of such a national policy, to which all these recommendations are devoted, will do much to encourage industrial research.

"'With respect to State and Federal research, the council recommends the following:

"'1. Establish at Federal level, and at State level where desirable, permanent minerals research advisory boards. These boards should consider and recommend initiation of research programs which, in their opinion, are particularly needed.

"'2. Encourage Federal and State mineral research programs at appropriate State agencies, universities, and nonprofit research foundations.

"'3. Expand or establish in each of the mining States a clearinghouse or library of pertinent technical information and records dealing with all phases of the mineral industries.

"'The mineral industries of many of the Western States, particularly the small-mine operators, need some form of central clearinghouse for pertinent technical information which would be readily available in suitable form.

"'4. Continue support of existing long-range research in Federal and State agencies.

"'Geological and topographic mapping should be accelerated as an essential part of this long-range program.

"'Public Information

"'When and if the governors approve the recommendations the council recommends that the western governors authorize the Western Governors Mining Advisory Council to undertake the following public relations activities to attain the widest possible public understanding of the policies adopted by them as a result of the Western Governors Mineral Policies Conference:

"'1. Distribute to all related and interested organizations the recommendations on national mineral policy affecting the mining industry as adopted by the governors as a result of this conference.

"'2. Distribute basic information related to the recommendations necessary to promote the broadest possible public reception and understanding.

"'3. Continue to distribute such additional information as should subsequently develop relating to those recommendations.

"'4. Obtain the full cooperation of all organizations and agencies, private and public, whose interests are related directly or indirectly to the mining industry.'

"Whereas these recommendations constitute a basic national minerals policy designed to strengthen the mining industry and the national security: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the legislature recommend to the executive and legislative branches of the United States the consideration of the national minerals policy formulated by the Western Governors Mineral Policies Conference and the effectuation of such recommendations; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relative to petitioning the Federal Maritime Board for allocation of shipbuilding and ship repair

"Whereas the maintenance of a nucleus of skilled workers and shipbuilding facilities on the west coast is considered by national military leaders to be vital to national defense; and

"Whereas in recognition of the importance of maintaining the ability of west coast shipyards to respond immediately to a national emergency, west coast shipyards receive a 6-percent differential in bidding against eastern yards on Government merchant-ship construction, with the thought that thereby at least a minimum of experienced workers would be available immediately in a crisis; and

"Whereas the importance of maintaining the west coast shipbuilding industry, at least at a minimal level, is not merely a matter of regional interest but it is in the interest of national security; and

"Whereas bids on proposal OSC–11 T4 and T5 tankers have recently been opened and Pacific coast companies have submitted a bid on the T4's only $5,000 higher than the Ingalls' bid (and $203,900 higher on the T5's); and

"Whereas although this construction does not fall under the 6-percent limitation, it does involve public funds and consideration should be given to the desperate need for shipyard work on this Pacific coast; and

"Whereas whatever the efforts have been of our congressional delegation in Washington, the fact remains that we have not seen shipbuilding or ship repair work brought to this Pacific coast and the entire industry is imperiled by this dangerous situation we now face: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the members of this legislature do hereby respectfully petition the Federal Maritime Board to allocate some portion of this tanker work to the Pacific coast; and be it further

"Resolved, That each Senator and Representative from California in Congress is requested to vigorously campaign for the assignment of a substantial portion of shipbuilding and ship repair to the San Francisco Bay area and to other shipyards in California, wherever located; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to each member of the Federal Maritime Commission, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 9

"Joint resolution relative to Federal legislation respecting the tunafish industry

"Whereas the fishing industry, which constitutes an important element of the economy of the United States, is in dire need of legislation to establish a national program for the stabilization of the industry; and

"Whereas there have been a number of measures introduced at the present session of Congress, among them being S. 3339, H. R. 9552, H. R. 9607, House Resolution 377, House Resolution 378, and Senate Resolution 186; and

"Whereas these measures contain various provisions to assist the fishing industry by establishing a top-level policymaking United States Fisheries Commission, creating a Fisheries Stabilization Corporation empowered to make loans to fishermen and fixing quotas on the importation of fish, shellfish, and their products; and

"Whereas the legislature has been informed that representatives of the fishing industry in California, New England and the Gulf States are in agreement that such remedial legislation is greatly needed; and

"Whereas it is particularly urgent that a quota formula for imports be enacted to prevent the threatened ruin of the southern California tuna industry by the American market being taken over by cheaper Japanese imports: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation protecting the country's fishing industry by establishing a policymaking United States Fisheries Commission, creating a Fisheries Stabilization Corporation empowered to make loans to fishermen, and fixing quotas on imports of fish, shellfish, and the products thereof; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution relative to prohibiting minors, unaccompanied by a parent or guardian, from crossing the United States-Mexico border without a permit for such purposes

"Whereas there is pending in Congress action on two particular bills concerning the crossing of the United States-Mexico border by unescorted minors; and

"Whereas either H. R. 5108, introduced by Representative WILSON of California, or House Joint Resolution 168, introduced by Representative HOSMER of California, would require that a minor be accompanied by a parent of guardian before he could cross the border into Mexico; also H. R. 5108 would allow unescorted minors to cross the border if they had a proper permit issued by the United States Attorney General, and House Joint Resolution 168 would allow such minors to cross the border if it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the appropriate immigration officers that the purpose of crossing the border is legitimate and not for the purpose of obtaining narcotic drugs; and

"Whereas under existing laws there is no restriction on minors who cross the border and many of such minors are entering Mexico for one paramount reason, to get free access to narcotic drugs; and

"Whereas the alarming increase in the use of narcotics by the youth of our country seriously threatens to undermine the foundation of our citizenry, the youngster of today—the voter of tomorrow; and

"Whereas many of our youths who could otherwise lead a constructive life are being consigned by the use of narcotics to a living death; and

"Whereas these bills, which would ban border crossings by unescorted minors, are deserving of full congressional support, and passage of either of them would be a tremendous stride in correcting this evil: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact either H. R. 5108 or H. J. Res. 168 or in the alternative to enact such legislation as is necessary to close the border between the United States and the Republic of Mexico until corrective action is taken by the citizens of Mexico to prevent the simple and easy acquisition of narcotics and their derivatives; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution commending the Boy Scouts of America and supporting the 1957 Boy Scout Jamboree at Valley Forge

"Whereas the Boy Scouts of America, one of the greatest character-building institutions in the world, is holding its Fourth National Jamboree, at Valley Forge Park, Pennsylvania, July 12 to 18, 1957; and

"Whereas based upon the experience of the three prior national jamborees held under the auspices of the Boy Scouts of America it has been proven that there are innumerable benefits to the boyhood of America through such national jamborees, such as:

"1. An unforgettable scouting experience for approximately 50,000 American boys;

"2. An opportunity to see some of the wonderful country in which we live, and visit historic shrines located at Valley Forge and at Washington, D. C., and in places en route and returning from the jamboree;

"3. A practical method of teaching Americanism, good citizenship, and leadership training;

"4. A realistic opportunity to teach Boy Scouts the value of the Scout Law—A Scout is Thrifty, and encourage him to earn his own way to the jamboree; and

"5. For an unrivaled opportunity to accelerate the whole character-building program of the Boy Scouts of America: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California, in full recognition of the success of the Boy Scouts of America, earnestly requests the Congress of the United States, State legislatures, State executive officers, boards of supervisors, city councils, and other governmental bodies and officers to give the fullest support and endorsement to the Boy Scouts of America and the Fourth National Jamboree to be held at Valley Forge Park, Pennsylvania, July 12 to 18, 1957; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to each Senator and Representatives from California in the Congress of the

United States, to the County Supervisors Association of California, to the League of California Cities."

Five joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to flood control on the Mad and Eel Rivers, South Fork of Eel River, Redwood Creek, Klamath, Mattole, Russian, Smith, and Van Duzen Rivers

"Whereas the most devastating floods on record struck the lands of the northern coastal area of this State which lie along the Mad and Eel Rivers, South Fork of Eel River, Redwood Creek, Klamath, Mattole, Russian, Smith, and Van Duzen Rivers during December of 1955; and

"Whereas many communities were completely demolished by these flood waters which caused immense property damage and indescribable human suffering that is difficult to comprehend even after visual inspection; and

"Whereas adequate flood-control measures could have completely saved this area from these losses; and

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army has been authorized to make a comprehensive survey for flood control on the Eel River and a preliminary examination and survey with respect to Redwood Creek but no money has been appropriated therefor; and

"Whereas there is a like need for appropriate authorization and appropriation for flood-control examination and survey on the Mad, the South Fork of the Eel River, the Klamath, Mattole, Russian, Smith, and Van Duzen Rivers: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps to provide adequate safeguards against any recurrence of the devastating floods along the Mad and Eel Rivers, South Fork of Eel River, Redwood Creek, Klamath, Mattole, Russian, Smith, and Van Duzen Rivers, including the appropriation of funds for the already authorized surveys and examinations on the Eel River and Redwood Creek and authorization of surveys on the Mad River, South Fork of Eel River, the Klamath, Mattole, Russian, Smith, and Van Duzen Rivers and necessary appropriation therefor; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to the prevention of flood conditions in the Napa Valley

"Whereas during the year 1955 extensive loss of life and property occurred as the result of flood waters in California; and

"Whereas if proper measures are not taken to control streams and rivers floods may be expected at any time in the future with resultant losses; and

"Whereas it is in the mutual interest of this State and Nation to prevent the depredations of flood waters as they affect the people and property of this country; and

"Whereas in order to prevent recurring flood conditions extensive planning and construction is called for both to prevent floods and control and utilize the vast power that is unleashed upon such occasions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the United States Army Engineers and Department of Public Works, State of California, are hereby requested to take the necessary measures to prevent future floods in the Napa Valley and city of Napa area; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, the United States Army Engineers, the governor of California, and to the Department of Public Works, State of California."

"Senate Joint Resolution 7

"Joint resolution relating to the construction of a dam on the San Luis Rey River

"Whereas the city of Carlsbad and the surrounding territory depends upon water from the San Luis Rey River, in the area known as Mission Basin, which is located between Bonsall Narrows and the Pacific Ocean; and

"Whereas the water supply for the city of Oceanside is also located in this same area; and

"Whereas the experience of this area has been that following prolonged periods of drought periods of extreme floods may be expected, and since a severe drought has existed in this area for approximately the last 10 years, it appears almost certain that a period of destructive floods can be expected which will cause extensive damage to persons and property located in this basin, and will also endanger the water supply of both the cities of Carlsbad and Oceanside; and

"Whereas studies by the Carlsbad Mutual Water Co. and the Division of Water Resources of the State of California indicate that a favorable site exists at Bonsall Narrows, on the San Luis Rey River, for a dam which would control these destructive flood waters, and would also permit these waters to be conserved for future use by way of controlled release into the Mission Basin: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States, the Army Corps of Engineers, the State water resources board, and the State of California Department of Public Works are hereby respectfully requested to consider and take all necessary steps to provide for the necessary studies for a dam on the San Luis Rey River, and immediate construction of the dam if it is found to be feasible; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, the Army Corps of Engineers, to the Honorable Goodwin J. Knight, Governor of California, the State water resources board, and to the Honorable Frank B. Durkee, director of the Department of Public Works of the State of California."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution relative to the prevention of floods in the Napa Valley area

"Whereas the people of the Napa Valley area were recently subjected to one of the worst floods in the history of California; and

"Whereas unless proper measures are taken to control and direct the heavy rains which may occur during any year losses of private and public property will again result; and

"Whereas flood-control dams and other measures taken for the protection of residents of this area in addition to alleviating the flood problem would also become a source of water or power if a scarcity of one or both should occur; and

"Whereas there is a need for immediate action in order that comprehensive studies may be made in order to ascertain the most favorable method and means of flood control so that, in turn, construction may be initiated at the earliest possible time: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the United States Army Engineers and Department of Public Works, State of California, are hereby requested to consider and take action regarding flood-control measures in Napa Valley and the city of Napa; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Governor of California and to the Department of Public Works, State of California."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 11

"Joint resolution relative to flood-control project authorization by the United States Congress

"Whereas the recent disastrous floods made even more imperative than ever the immediate construction of flood-control works in the area between Chico Landing and Red Bluff; and

"Whereas House Document 272, 84th Congress, 2d session, sets forth the protection necessary for this area; and

"Whereas immediate authorization by the Congress of the United States for the Chico Landing to Red Bluff project has been recommended by the Division of Water Resources in its publication Floods of December 1955 in California; and

"Whereas State water resources board has recommended that this project be authorized; and

"Whereas bill No. H. R. 9595, introduced in the 2d session of the 84th Congress, would authorize the construction of these necessary flood-control works: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to take immediate steps for the authorization of the Chico Landing to Red Bluff project by favorable consideration of H. R. 9595; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Assembly Concurrent Resolution 42

"Concurrent resolution relative to the observance of Pan-American Week

"Whereas on April 14, 1890, the First International Conference of American States met in Washington, D. C., and adopted a resolution which resulted in the creation of the organization known as the Pan American Union; and

"Whereas the aims of the Pan American Union, known today as the Organization of American States, have been and continue to be the defense and mutual benefit of the 21 American Republics comprising the members of this organization; and

"Whereas the need for confidence and strength resulting from the affiliation of peoples with common ideals continues to be of the greatest importance in this age in which we live; and

"Whereas the Organization of American States has ably shown for 66 years that friendship and understanding together with a mutual desire for peace can forge a powerful unit of defense and in addition can lead to amicable and just settlements in all areas of dispute; and

"Whereas Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, has proclaimed Saturday, April 14, 1956, as Pan American Day and urges the people of this Nation on that day and throughout the period of April 8 through April 14, 1956, to give expression to their cordial good will toward the peoples of the other American Republics and of their intention to maintain the principles of freedom and equality fundamental to all: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California (the Senate thereof concurring), That the people of California are hereby requested to observe Pan American Day and Pan American Week in the spirit outlined by the President of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States."

A report of the Joint House and Senate Committee on Insurance Investigation of the General Assembly of the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce, Honolulu, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act so as to provide for reapportionment of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Republican Club of Castro Valley, Calif., favoring the enactment of the Dirksen amendment, in the nature of a substitute, for the Bricker amendment to the Constitution, relating to the treatymaking power; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, various individuals in Montana have written to me relative to a certain legislative proposal in which they are interested, namely, the Langer bill (S. 923) to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes. At their request I ask unanimous consent that their petition, and the names signed thereto, may be appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the petitions were received, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, with the signatures attached, as follows:

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages. At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increasing the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

Mary Downs, Iola M. Dunn, Mrs. Frank Ravnik, Mrs. Frank Lamb, John W. Fredrick, Vera M. Fredrick, Mrs. A. P. Lundbacg, Mrs. I. W. Martinson, Mrs. Merritt F. Maddux, Mrs. John Romell, Mrs. Arnold Iverson, William R. Schneider, Arnold L. Iverson, Dorothy J. Kindrick, Frances E. Baker, all of Helena, Mont.

E. H. Tucker, Bozeman, Mont.; Helen J. Roemer, Harold Kenison, Alma Kenison, W. J. Harper, Beulah Rood, Jerry Rood, Doris Altimus, Helen Potts, Cora Busby, Livingston, Mont.; Jeannette Busby, Bozeman, Mont.; Carl W. Rose, Virginia Rose, Rebecca Watt, P. A. Watt, Helen D. Ferris, J. J. Case, Mrs. J. F. Johnson, Livingston, Mont.; C. W. Rose, Clyde Park, Mont.; Howard E. Harper, Mary Belle Harper, Hilda Harper, Elva Skillman, C. T. Skillman, Livingston, Mont.; Harold A. Rose, Clyde Park, Mont.; Mrs. Mabel Raab, Mrs. Carrie Bray, Mrs. Fanny E. Niles, Livingston, Mont.

Lauretta King, Majorie Nielsen, J. W. Griffin, Olive Powell, Mrs. Earl Wyman, Earl Wyman, C. V. Henderson, Mrs. J. C. Neely, Mrs. A. T. Ault, R. Blarnsworth, M. D., Melvin F. Kurtz, C. W. Eybert, C. O. Nystrom, Mrs. C. W. Egbert, Mrs. G. E. Surface, G E. Surface, Mrs. Emmett Carter, Joseph Jomseson, W. O. Kurtz, Mrs. D. A. Julson, Mrs. Dewey Brown, Mrs. Lucile Fry, Lydia Ehman, Dewey Brown, Eileen Allaway, Genvie McHenry, Lorna Kellison, David A. Julson, Mrs. M. E. Smith, Frank D. King, Mrs. W. O. Kurtz, Robert Alloway, Mr. W. L. Parker, L. W. Taft, E. Ehman, Mrs. W. L. Parker, William J. McHenry, Homer L. Morrison, Mrs. L. W. Taft, all of Bozeman, Mont.

Ernest P. Schaak, Mrs. Ernest Schaak, Elva M. Spes, Mrs. Bessie Surdal, Mrs. G. W. Lutes; Mr. K. Boucher, Thomas M. Sipes, Howard C. Lund, Mrs. Elmer Hadland, Elmer Hadland, Mrs. Dorris Taggart, Ferna Allen, Alfred Surdahl, Andrew Roedel, Paul E. Limerick, Mrs. Charles J. Hoffman, C. J. Hoffman, Mrs. Andrew Roedel, Mrs. Grace Adkin, Miss Beth Thomas, Mrs. Della M. Butts, all of Bozeman, Mont.; Mrs. Bill Black, Gateway, Mont.

Mrs. E. H. Tucker, Bozeman, Mont.; Mrs. Carrie Groom, Mrs. Josie Hanson, Carolina Albertson, Mrs. Jessie M. Peterson, Mrs. Gladys Fallang, Gale S. Wick, Mrs. Gale Wick, Evelyn Schereshy, Mrs. Onie Davis, Mr. Onie Davis, Mrs. Palmer Lomeland, Mrs. Harry McComb, Rudolph Fallang, Palmer Lomeland, Big Timber, Mont.

Mrs. H. G. Handford, Mildred H. Grawe, Mabel Felix, Rosetta M. Voelker, Bessie Chrisinger, Clara E. Olson, Mrs. Bessie Eichelberger, Mrs. Anna Marie Ziss, Carolyn C. Patterson, Vesta A. Perry, Rudah C. Enger, Mildred H. Carpenter, Alma Larson, Mrs. W. H. Rieman, Mabel O'Neil, Bertha W. Schnaidt, Caroline Walchli, Margaret F. Clifford, Gwladys E. Kramer, Mrs. Dean King, Mrs. E. B. Noble, Mrs. Amelia Withrow, Mrs. Frieda E. O'Neil, Mrs. C. W. Short, Mrs. Richard C. Mattson, Kalispell, Mont.

Rev. C. F. Crowe, Bernie Heare, Mrs. Bernie Heare, Mrs. Collene Pedersen, Mrs. Peter Backema, Mrs. George Rawl, Mr. and Mrs. N. G. Hudson, Mrs. Al Eidet, T. B. Foreman, Mrs. Gertrude Wahl, Mrs. Andrew Pressman, Mrs. F. Kampschior, Marion L. Cox, R. M. Mart, Glendive, Mont.; Marjorie Hoffmeyer, Billings, Mont.; G. B. Cox, Glendive, Mont.; Floyd Uglow, Savage, Mont.; Don Arnhart, Mrs. Roy Glasscock, Roy Glasscock, Mrs. E. C. Andrews, E. C. Andrews, Hugh R. Atwood, Mrs. Floyd Ewing, F. T. Ewing, Mrs. Tom Henderson, S. J. Daniel, Mrs. S. J. Daniel, Mrs. Ray Lowe, all of Glendive, Mont.

Mrs. Eva Sahn, Miss Jeanette Leland, Mrs. Einar Dahl, Miss Marion Leland, Glendive, Mont.; Mrs. Charles Barnaby, Wibaux, Mont.; Mr. and Mrs. George Finkbein, Mr. and Mrs. O. F. Roberts, Mrs. David Wold, Mrs. Pearl G. Eckes, Mr. and Mrs. Bill Bacon, Mrs. Grace Lanktree, Pete Tady, Lorene I. Tady, Mrs. R. H. Johnson, Mrs. Ada Wilson, Mrs. E. H. Rigley, Arthur Kitchen, Glendive, Mont.; Mr. and Mrs. Leon Anderson, Lindsay, Mont.; Mr. and Mrs. Leo Finkbiner, Albert L. Aker, Glendive, Mont.; Mr. and Mrs. Charles Green, Mildred, Mont.; Stella A. Eckes, Claude Robinson, Luella Robinson, Mrs. S. D. Blackwell, Glendive, Mont.

O. D. Harris, Mary Ridenour, Mrs. B. E. Horstman, Shelby F. Snell, Bessie M. Snell, Louise M. Storey, Alvena, Lyford, C. Wayne Mahugh, Dora W. Mahugh, Kalispell, Mont.; Allon R. Clark, Phyllis L. Clark, Creston, Mont.; Leslie A. Gunderson, Audrey V. Gunderson, Mrs. L. E. Fry, Iola M. Ruegsegger, Mrs. Caleb Jackson, Mrs. Ora Miller, Mrs. E. H. Beller, Kalispell, Mont.; Miss Florence Green, Mrs. Chas. De Voe, Somers, Mont.; Mrs. Ida Davis, Mrs. R. W. Carr, Irma P. Wagener, Mrs. A. Lyford, Augusta M. Rhodes, Mrs. L. E. Fry, Chester M. Mahugh, Clyde Williams, Eunice Chapin, Elizabeth Wilson, Mr. and Mrs. Pete Hoffman, Don Pack, Milo W. Naylor, Kalispell, Mont.; Marjory Pack, Marion, Mont.; Mrs. Eva Dygert, Mr. and Mrs. L. E. Clayton, Ronnie Pack, Evelyn Naylor, Cletys M. Peterson, Thomas H. Shelton, Columbia Falls, Mont.

Grace Powell, Kalispell, Mont.; Mrs. Stanley Nees, Poplar, Mont.; Mrs. Lizzie Stubbs, Mr. and Mrs. Leonard Marshall, Mrs. Robert Haven, Mrs. Carrie Claridge, Lulu Barnard, Esther Ober, Mrs. Roy Verity, Mrs. Fern Adams, Mrs. T. W. Wagner, Lois Magar, E. R. Haven, Tom Wagner, W. Dan Adams, Mrs. Andy Christianson, Keith M. Snodgrass, Anna E. Dale, Marie W. Lawrence, J. O. Lawrence, Mrs. Keith Snodgrass, Kalispell, Mont.; Gertrude Chubb, Columbia Falls, Mont.; J. O. Shew, Mrs. Maude D. Shew, Mavis Shew, Kalispell, Mont.

Mrs. L. E. Mapig, Mrs. N. E. Gray, Elizabeth Nicholson, Mrs. Verne Lien, Mrs. Harry Viegut, Erma S. Bensington, Loree Williams, Sally Kennedy, Alice Deck, Lewis L. Bennington, Irvin W. Hirning, W. O. Hirning, Mrs. Lee Trowbridge, Lee Trowbridge, Missoula, Mont.; J. J. Hirning, Mrs. John Hirning, Lolo, Mont.; L. E. Magsic, Mrs. Mary E. Watt, Missoula, Mont.

C. J. Gustafson, Mrs. F. W. Buck, Mrs. Geo. C. Johnson, W. W. Wetzel, Mrs. Roy Young, Maxine Dollens, Judy Carter, Roy T. Young, Mattie Needham, May Ellen Henk, Mrs. Jim Ranger, Pearl W. Mack, Cora L. Millard, A. C. Millard, E. A. Ludwig, Mrs. J. D. Ruddy, Mrs. H. C. Koch, Benita Mahugh, Jim Johnston, Mrs. H. A. McDonald, Daniel Aaron Bradshaw, Signe Franzen, Ella Schloss, Gertrude D. Farth, Sallie B. Hollenay, Isabella W. Murphy, J. D. Holly, Mary A. Giles, Charlotte N. Wright, Ida J. Gertison, Kenneth F. Johnson, John A. Schloss, Mrs. John Holm, John Holm, Glendive, Mont.

Elizabeth Dunn, Harriet Jeffries, Albert Woods, Marjorie Birky, Mrs. Chas. W. Short, Mrs. Lizzie Dunham, Mrs. Julia Knudson, Mrs. M. R. Wood, Mrs. Christine Buch, Mildred D. Boline, Mrs. Paul Birky, Mrs. H. Madsen, Kalispell, Mont.

Mrs. F. S. P. Foss, Mrs. D. J. Healy, D. J. Healy, Glendive, Mont.; Father Patrick J. Ryan, assistant at Sacred Heart Church; Rt. Rev. Msgr. J. A. Pettit, pastor of Sacred Heart Church; Elizabeth Yundoglialo, Mrs. Edward Holzworth, Mrs. Mark Scarff, Glendive, Mont.; Vanda Knels, Mrs. Ray Lowe, WCTU president, Bloomfield, Mont.

Allen F. Potter, Bertha I. Maher, Helen Hedman, Pat Doyle, Clarence R. Nelson, Mrs. R. R. Hark, Lanora C. Wallace, Roy Wallace, Bertha Stephenson, Ira M. Olaon, Mrs. D. L. Sherman, Elmer Wellhouse, Mrs. Angeline Adams, John F. Reagan, Irene M. Reagan, Mrs. Robert Hunter, Mrs. Orville Walters, Mrs. Henry E. Lee, Mrs. Ed Hedman, Mrs. O. Williamson, Mrs. R. R. Haake, Mrs. Myrtle Bowdish, Mrs. Harold Hawley, Mrs. Jeani Patton, Mrs. M. E. Woods, Mrs. C. R. Nelson, Bertha L. Peterson, Mrs. H. H. Maher, Mrs.

Alfred Walters, Mrs. W. E. Forcum, Olivia Forcum, Bertha B. Larter, all of Whitefish, Mont.

RESOLUTION OF UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the United Nations Association, of Los Angeles, Calif., relating to the promotion of peace in the Near East by the United Nations.

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

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY THE MEMBERS PRESENT AT THE MARCH MEMBERSHIP MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS, LOS ANGELES CHAPTER

To President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER:

Whereas the present local political tensions in the Near East endanger the peace of the entire world; and

Whereas the Arab countries believe that the United Nations is better able to deal with Near East problems and resolve these tensions; and

Whereas our Government helped in founding the United Nations for the purpose of promoting peace and has used the United Nations as an important instrument of our foreign policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge President Eisenhower to use the agencies of the United Nations to the fullest extent in his efforts to bring peace to the Near East.

Submitted on behalf of the Los Angeles Chapter, American Association for the United Nations.

CHARLES MACKINTOSH,
President.

MARCH 1956.

PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—LETTER AND PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Josephine C. Wheat, of Hollis, N. Y., transmitting a petition signed by sundry citizens of the States of Pennsylvania and New York, relating to the prohibition of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce.

There being no objection, the letter and petition, without the signatures attached, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLLIS, N. Y., *April 6, 1956.*

DEAR SENATOR: These 50 names also ask that the Civil Aeronautics Board requesting the Board to forbid alcohol service in the air.

We are shocked to hear that alcohol is allowed on the planes.

No wonder so much loss of life by plane.

Yours for the cause.

JOSEPHINE C. WHEAT.

PETITION

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages. At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increasing the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

(Signed by Mrs. A. E. Buckner and 49 other citizens of Pennsylvania and New York.)

THE ADMINISTRATION OF GENERALISSIMO TRUJILLO — RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by friends, associates, and colleagues of Dr. Jesus de Galindez, relating the the administration of Generalissimo Trujillo in the Dominican Republic.

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

RESOLUTION

On March 12, 1956, Dr. Jesus de Galindez, valiant and effective fighter against all dictatorships whether Communist or neo-Fascist, vanished under circumstances which make it overwhelmingly certain that he was abducted and probably murdered. Dr. de Galindez had left written records, including his doctoral dissertation, the Era of Trujillo, exposing Generalissimo Trujillo's tyranny in the Dominican Republic. He had received numerous threats because of his activity in bringing to light Trujillo's crimes. Clearly his disappearance fits into the long series of crimes of violence, including murder, committed in this country and in Cuba against opponents of the generalissimo's regime: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we friends, associates, and colleagues of Dr. Jesus de Galindez, sorely stricken by his probable murder, petition:

1. That all police enforcement agencies, Federal, State, municipal, and international vigilantly prosecute investigation for the apprehension and punishment of the perpetrators of this crime;

2. That the press seek out and publish every development in this case and in related matters pertaining to the safety of political opponents of dictators;

3. That public and private support be enlisted for publication and distribution of Dr. de Galindez' writings, especially his thesis, The Era of Trujillo;

4. That Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and Republican and Democratic leaders in Congress be urged to initiate measures for the greater security of democratic political exiles here in the United States and in other member nations of the Organization of American States.

THE HOXSEY CANCER TREATMENT—LETTER AND TELEGRAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter and telegram sent me by Dr. Gerald B. Winrod, of Wichita, Kans., relating to the Hoxsey cancer treatment.

There being no objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENDERS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH,
Wichita, Kans., April 3, 1956.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: A local representative of the Associated Press called me a few minutes ago to say that the Food and Drug Administration is issuing Wednesday of this week a formal public warning against the Hoxsey cancer treatment and lists among sponsors of the treatment Gerald B. Winrod.

He told me that the Washington office of the Associated Press requested a comment.

Thereupon I issued the following statement:

"The Hoxsey cancer treatment is precious to my heart because it saved my life as a boy at the age of 9 by removing a malignant growth near the jugular vein from which I have carried a scar for almost a half century. The treatment was in those days administered by the father of the present Dr. Harry M. Hoxsey."

With every good wish,

Faithfully yours,

GERALD B. WINROD.

WICHITA, KANS., *April 4, 1956.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

There is a reason why I would appreciate having you give consideration to inserting my letter sent yesterday in the RECORD. Thanks and regards.

WINROD.

WAR VETERANS SECURITY ACT OF 1956—LETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Charles Hartman Post, 134, American Legion, Stanley, N. Dak., signed by Ralph Hamre, post adjutant, embodying a telegram adopted by that post, favoring the enactment of House bill 7886, the so-called War Veterans Security Act of 1956.

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

AMERICAN LEGION,
CHARLES HARTMAN POST, NO. 134,
Stanley, N. Dak., April 13, 1956.

Senator BILL LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed for your information is a copy of the resolution passed at our last Legion meeting urging passage of H. R. 7886:

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas there is now pending in Congress H. R. 7886, commonly known as the War Veterans Security Act of 1956; and

"Whereas the passage of this bill will eliminate the confusion, redtape, and cost of administration of the present law and regulations by the Veterans' Administration as it pertains to World War I veterans who have reached their 65th birthday; and

"Whereas this bill now before the Congress would grant pensions to veterans over 65 years of age who are unemployable and meet income and service requirements; and

"Whereas as far as equity, justice, and previous Government policy regarding veterans of other wars are concerned, it must be remembered that World War I veterans were given no consideration when separated from service and faced two depressions at a time when they were attempting to establish themselves in civilian life; and

"Whereas the plight of many of these World War I veterans today is very serious, and the passage of this act would guarantee to them the security that they preserved for their Nation in time of war; and

"Whereas the passage of this legislation would entail no financial burden upon the increased economy of this Nation and would render justice to those veterans who are in dire need: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Charles Hartmann Post, No. 134, of Stanley, N. Dak., of the North Dakota Department of the American Legion,

meeting at Stanley, N. Dak., this 2d day of April 1956, That we vigorously support the passage of H. R. 7886; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to North Dakota's congressional delegation and members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in Congress."

Sincerely yours,

RALPH HAMBRE,
Post Adjutant.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 2424. A bill to provide that lock and dam No. 17 on the Black Warrior River, Ala., shall hereafter be known and designated as the John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam (Rept. No. 1728).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment:

S. 2712. A bill to authorize the charging of tolls for transit over the Manette Bridge in Bremerton, Wash. (Rept. No. 1729).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 2091. A bill authorizing the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill. (Rept. No. 1730); and

S. 2092. A bill transferring to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army the bridge across the Missouri River between the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation in Kansas and Platte County, Mo., and authorizing its removal (Rept. No. 1731).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain laws of the United States with respect to counsel employed by the special committee of the Senate established by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1733).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 146. A bill for the relief of Isabel Tre (Rept. No. 1739);

S. 1364. A bill for the relief of Elli Yorgiyadis (Rept. No. 1740);

S. 1885. A bill for the relief of Mario Farabullini and Alla Farabullini, his wife (Rept. No. 1741);

S. 2095. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Culcasi (Rept. No. 1742);

S. 2244. A bill for the relief of Maria Novak (Rept. No. 1743);

S. 2563. A bill for the relief of Cecile Angele Chaffoo (Rept. No. 1744);

H. R. 1099. A bill for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung (Rept. No. 1745);

H. R. 1179. A bill for the relief of Salih Hougi, Bertha Catherine, Noor Elias, Isaac, and Mozelle Rose Hardoon (Rept. No. 1746);

H. R. 2796. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Khatoun Malkey Samuel (Rept. No. 1747);

H. R. 2948. A bill for the relief of Guglielmo Joseph Perrella (Rept. No. 1748);

H. R. 3276. A bill for the relief of George E. Bergos (formerly Athanasios Kritselis) (Rept. No. 1749);

H. R. 4466. A bill for the relief of Lois O. Jennings (Rept. No. 1750); and

H. R. 4588. A bill for the relief of Antonio Penna (Rept. No. 1751).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 586. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Laddomada, Antonietta Laddomada, and children, Concetta and Paolo Laddomada (Rept. No. 1752);

S. 1013. A bill for the relief of Melecio Acosta-Morales (Rept. No. 1753); and

S. 1101. A bill for the relief of Martino Palmeri (Rept. No. 1754).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H. J. Res. 457. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens (Rept. No. 1755).

By Mr. DANIEL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 3025. A bill to amend paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended (Rept. No. 1735).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Waymon H. Massey (Rept. No. 1736).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. J. Res. 444. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson (Rept. No. 1737).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

H. R. 9428. An act to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1756).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

S. 2854. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended (Rept. No. 1757).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments:

S. 2855. A bill to provide authority to stockpile temporary housing for disaster relief, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1758); and

S. 2859. A bill to provide rent-free accommodations in certain federally aided housing for needy victims of major disasters, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1759).

INCREASE AND REVISIONS IN GENERAL AUTHORIZATION FOR SMALL FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1732)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 3272) to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorization for small flood-control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended.

Last fall and early this year various sections of our country, particularly the northeastern and western areas, were subject to unprecedented and disastrous floods. Many lives were lost and damages totaling almost $1 billion were sustained. Large cities were inundated, communities were paralyzed, major industries were shut down, in some cases for several months, and all activities were at a standstill.

Existing laws permit repair of existing flood-control structures and highways and emergency restoration of essential public utilities and cleanup work after such floods. Such laws also provide for construction of small flood-control projects not specifically authorized by Congress, with a limitation of allotment of $150,000 for any single project at a locality and total of $3 million for such work during any 1 fiscal year.

There exists the urgent need for expanding and broadening the present authority for construction of emergency flood-control projects to care for flood problems in many localities and to prevent widespread damage and suffering caused by these severe floods, without the delay necessitated by surveys and investigations, and their specific authorization by the Congress under regularly established procedures.

These recent floods in the New England, New York, and Pennsylvania areas, in my own State of New Mexico, particularly at Albuquerque, and in California, Oregon, and Nevada, have caused tremendous damages, and these areas are still subject to recurring floods and consequent heavy losses.

S. 3273 would amend section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended, to provide for construction of projects, with an estimated cost of $500,000 for any single project and a limitation of $15 million for allotment for any 1 fiscal year for such projects. This increased authorization will take care of the increase in price levels that have taken place in the last few years and broaden and expand the present law to permit flood protection at critical locations that cannot now be covered.

The committee held extensive hearings on this bill. There was no opposition whatever to it. The committee reports it unanimously and believes it thoroughly warranted and desirable. It is hoped that the measure will be enacted into law at an early date to relieve the flood hazard that now exists at many localities in our Nation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS — REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, an original joint resolution, granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 1738) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 163) granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

PRELIMINARY REPORT ENTITLED "ADMINISTRATION OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' SECURITY PROGRAM"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1760)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, pursuant to Senate Resolution 20, I submit a preliminary report of that committee's Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Federal Security Program. I ask that the report be printed.

This is the first of at least two reports which will be made pursuant to Senate Resolution 20 and Senate Resolution 154. This first preliminary report was

adopted unanimously by the full Senate committee at its meeting last week.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

WELFARE AND PENSION FUNDS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS AND STATEMENT (S. REPT. NO. 1734)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for not to exceed 5 minutes on the report of the Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit the final report of the investigation of employee welfare plans and pension funds conducted by its Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds pursant to Senate Resolution 225 of the 83d Congress, as amended, and Senate Resolution 40 of the 84th Congress, as amended, together with the supplemental views of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and a statement by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

In submitting this report to the Senate in compliance with the above resolutions, may I point out that the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare other than those who have served on the subcommittee have not found it possible to review and consider the subcommittee report within the time limits fixed by the resolutions, as amended, but transmit it to the Senate for the preliminary consideration of the Congress and the public while reserving judgment on the recommendations made by the subcommittee.

I also wish to thank the members of the staff, headed by Mr. Paul J. Cotter, as counsel, who worked with great ability and faithfulness in the preparation of this report.

I also wish to thank my colleagues, including my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

The Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds, whose authority expired on April 15, has been conducting studies and investigations in the welfare and pension fund field since May 1954, first under the chairmanship of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and, beginning in February 1955, under the leadership and direction of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. Committee membership since the latter date has included, besides the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

Legislation is being drafted to embody the recommendations of the subcommittee and will be shortly introduced, and it is hoped that it may be passed at this session of Congress.

The subcommittee also released the printed record of its hearings held in July, November, and December 1955.

Interim reports were filed in January and July 1955 with the subcommittee's initial findings. The final report comprises over 360 pages based, as the committee notes, on its studies of hundreds of individual welfare and pension plans. In this last report the subcommittee has submitted summaries of welfare and pension plans in a number of major industries and more detailed reports of the weaknesses and abuses in the welfare and pension plan operations of particular insurance companies, unions, and employers.

In its final report the subcommittee recommended the enactment of a Federal Registration, Reporting, and Disclosure Act to be effective for 3 years. Under the proposals advanced in the report, the Federal agency administering the act would, prior to its termination, and based upon 2 years' experience, make a comprehensive report to the Congress, outlining its findings, its evaluation of the act, and its recommendations with respect to the continuance, simplification, or modification of the legislation.

The recommendations call for registration by all types of employee welfare and pension plans covering 25 or more employees. Annual reports, based upon an audit and covering the complete financial operations, would be filed with a Federal agency by all plans including 100 or more employees, and also by plans which, though they have less than 100 employees, are operated or administered on some common basis with other plans and which in the aggregate include 100 or more employees. Pension plans would file a summary statement of investments, broken down by type of security and property, with the aggregate cost or present value, whichever is lower. Investments by a pension plan in securities or property of interested parties, investments of more than 5 percent of the fund in any one security or property, or investment of more than 10 percent of the fund in the securities or obligations of any one issuer, would be listed in detail.

Disclosure of the information in the annual report would be required by having copies available at the principal office of the plan and the public document room of the administrative agency, and by furnishing all the beneficiaries with information from the report in prescribed summary form by personal delivery or mail. The administrative agency would be given discretion to require reporting and disclosure by any plan covering between 25 and 100 employees if deemed necessary to accomplish the objectives of the act.

The subcommittee reported it had no strong feeling as to what executive agency should administer the act. After considering the various possibilities, it indicated that for the present it favored the Securities and Exchange Commission because of its organizational setup and its established success in the administration of disclosure type statutes.

Recommendations of the subcommittee also provide for an advisory council of 13 members to assist the Federal agency. Members of this council would include representatives of insurance, 1, banking, 1, and management, 2, to be appointed by the administering agency; labor representatives, 3, to be appointed by the Secretary of Labor; public members, 3, to be appointed by the President; and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Labor, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as ex officio members.

Federal jurisdiction for requiring enforcement of the act would be based upon the taxing authority, the general welfare provisions, and the interstate character of the many elements connected with such plans.

The report pointed out that over 75 million persons are now covered in some measure by employee welfare and pension programs, with annual contributions being made to them of over $6.8 billion, and that there are between $20 and $25 billion in pension reserves at the present time. It was pointed out that private employee welfare and pension programs have grown to such proportions in this country and involve the use of such large tax-exempt funds as to place upon the Government a grave responsibility for their sound operation and the protection of the equities of the beneficiaries and the public interest.

The report stated that—

> While the great majority of welfare and pension programs are being responsibly and honestly administered, the rights and equities of the beneficiaries in many instances are being dangerously ignored. In other cases, the funds of the programs are being dissipated and at times become the hunting ground for the unscrupulous.

It was also observed that—

> The lack of standards and the inadequacies of State and Federal laws have permitted employee welfare and pension programs to operate in such manner as to give rise to many abuses, problems, weaknesses, and unsound practices which could jeopardize the operation of this system and give insufficient protection to the rights and equities of the employee-beneficiaries.

A major problem, it was stated, is one "of assuring the immediate and long-range stability of private pension and welfare programs * * in order that they may better withstand the contingencies against which they were established. The breakdown of any significant part of either the pension or the welfare programs could, and undoubtedly would, amount to a major setback to our economy."

We do not propose Federal regulation. Regulation is left to the States. However, we do propose disclosure of essential information to a responsible Federal agency, believing that disclosure will be a preventive of most possible abuses in the future.

According to the report, the subcommittee felt that the proposed act is a moderate and sound approach, definitely necessary in the light of the evidence received, but still leaving room for action on the part of the respective States.

The subcommittee recommended criminal penalties for willful failure to com-

ply with, or violation of, the provisions of the act or the regulations promulgated thereunder, for a false statement or misrepresentation of a material fact, and for the unlawful and willful theft, abstraction, conversion, or embezzlement of the funds or property of any plan.

The subcommittee emphasized that it did not want to leave the impression that there is something wrong with every welfare and pension plan as "that is not the case." The report said:

Perhaps too little has been said of the many sound practices found in the great majority of these plans and of the conscientious and ingenious efforts on the part of industry, labor, insurance and banking to bring benefits to scores of millions of employees at low cost.

The subcommittee observed however, that it "is convinced that without some legislative direction the abuses, problems and weaknesses which do exist will not be self-correcting."

The report took note of the fact that labor had "condemned dishonesty, created committees on ethical practices established codes of ethics for the operation of employee welfare and pension plans, and recommended legislation toward that end." The subcommittee expressed the belief that such efforts would have a salutary effect but did not feel that the objectives would be quickly achieved by voluntary methods alone. The report further pointed out that representatives of labor had been involved in some of the worst abuses found to exist and, in some cases, had been found unprepared for the responsibilities of trusteeship under these programs.

Also taken up in the report was the fact that the insurance industry, while opposing Federal control or supervision, had not even set up a code of ethical practices to condemn the unscrupulous. The report concluded that—

Many of the worst abuses found in welfare-plan operations involve certain insurance practices. These abuses include high commissions, excessive administrative fees, high insurance company retentions, unequal treatment of the policyholders, activities of unscrupulous brokers and agents, including embezzlement of premiums, sometimes in collusion with union officials or management—mostly the result of inadequate control and nondisclosure to the interested parties.

Management, too, came in for its share of criticism, the report pointing out that it, management, "shares the responsibility for many of the serious problems and abuses" found, and that "management, as well as labor, has at times been unreasonable and unsound in positions taken with respect to benefit programs." Employers, it was stated, "in too many cases have abdicated their responsibilities under jointly managed plans."

With reference to the banking industry, the report observed that banks, while recognized as competently managing pension investments under corporate trusts, do not have the responsibility for actuarial soundness, often have too little control over proper investments, but still sell the features of this type of pension plan without assuming all of the responsibilities necessarily inherent in a complete pension plan.

According to the report, by far the largest percentage of employees included in health and welfare programs are covered in unilateral employer administered plans. In including this type of plan in those which should report and disclose detailed information, the report stated—

Since Congress has stated and the courts have held that employer contributions toward welfare and pension benefits are in the nature of compensation to employees, it must be concluded that whether the funds for such programs are contributed by the employers, the employees, or both, the employees have a right to know the financial details of such plans as well as to have their interest in such plans protected.

In support of its position, the subcommittee cited the Internal Revenue Code, the Defense Production Act of 1950, and court decisions which treated costs of and contributions to welfare and pension plans as part of employee compensation.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] filed supplemental views to the report, and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], who, because of other duties, had been unable to take an active part in preparation of the report, reserved judgment on the recommendations.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. The distinguished Senator from Illinois has just referred to what I think is a fine piece of work, which has just been completed by the subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I think I would be a little remiss if I did not comment on the fine work which has been done by the chairman and by the other members of that subcommittee.

While there are slight differences with respect to a few conclusions in the report as it is submitted, the subcommittee has approached the work and developed the report in a spirit of complete nonpartisanship, which the distinguished Senator from Illinois has been very careful to nurture and maintain throughout all the months of arduous work. I wish to pay tribute to him, as well as to the other members of the subcommittee, for the fine work they have done in this field, which I believe will result in shedding light upon a problem which has needed light for a long time. I believe that this effort will eventually lead to good Federal legislation covering this subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his overgenerous remarks. No one could have been more cooperative than he was during the investigation. He worked extremely hard. I think he attended almost every hearing. He went into the details of the report with great care, and it was a pleasure to work with him. I think the country owes him a great debt.

The work was begun under the chairmanship of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. Initially the staff was engaged by him, and the preliminary report was the result of work conducted by the subcommittee prior to that time. We benefited greatly from the counsel and advice of the distinguished Senator from New York.

I think this is a very happy occasion on which members of both parties can cooperate in good faith in solving a very perplexing problem. It has been a very fine experience for me. Again I wish to thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I do not have the good fortune of being a member of the subcommittee so ably headed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. As I said, I do not have the good fortune of being a member of the subcommittee so ably headed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. However, I am a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I have had an opportunity to observe the great skill and devotion to duty and the energy and industry which the Senator and his colleagues on the subcommittee have brought to bear on this very important subject. The work which has been done by the subcommittee will make a great contribution to the welfare of our country. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Illinois and other members of the subcommittee on the work they have so well performed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator very much.

I submit the report and ask that it be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 3635. A bill to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

S. 3636. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 3637. A bill to establish an advisory board to assist the commission created by the joint resolution of December 20, 1944, in considering a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNAMARA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 3638. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by amending the United States Information and Education Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3639. A bill amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 3640. A bill to provide for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury of the unpaid balance due on defaulted joint stock land bank bonds under the supervision and direction of the Farm Credit Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3641. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to permit common carriers subject to such act to provide reduced rate transportation to individuals 65 years of age or older; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 3642. A bill to transfer to the government of the District of Columbia the Public Employment Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 3643. A bill to provide for the control of destructive aphids; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DUFF:

S. 3644. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the teaching profession on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the National Education Association; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3645. A bill to amend section 1343 of title 18, United States Code, relating to fraud by wire, radio, or television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

The following concurrent resolution was submitted and referred, as indicated:

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. Con. Res. 74. Concurrent resolution to designate May 30, 1956, as a day on which to pay respects to the four surviving veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. DOUGLAS, which appears under a separate heading.)

STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, AND LIMITING SERVICE OF SENATORS ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES

Mr. DWORSHAK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 237), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That, commencing with the 85th Congress, rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section 1;

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (1) of section 1;

(3) inserting in section 1 after paragraph (o) the following new paragraph:

"(p) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures, generally.

"2. Pensions of all wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life.";

(4) striking out section 4 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed 19 Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed 7 Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may serve on 3 standing committees and no more."

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT 1734, RELATING TO WELFARE AND PENSION FUNDS

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 238), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed 3,500 additional copies of Senate Report 1734, a report on welfare and pension funds, for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AMONG THE INDIANS"

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution to print for the use of the Judiciary Committee additional copies of the subcommittee report on Juvenile Delinquency Among the Indians."

Many requests have come to the subcommittee for copies of its report on Juvenile Delinquency Among the Indians. In a large number of cases the inquiries for these reports came from Senators from Indian States. The subcommittee supply of this report—S. Rept. 1483—has been exhausted for some time. I feel that considering the interest in this Senate document, especially from Senators from States having Indian populations, that it should receive favorable consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 239) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary not more than 2,000 additional copies of the report No. 1483, 84th Congress, of the Committee on the Judiciary to the Senate on its study of juvenile delinquency in the United States.

SIZE AND WEIGHT LIMITATIONS ON FOURTH-CLASS (PARCEL-POST) MAIL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish uniformity of parcel-post size and weight at 65 pounds and 100 inches, length and girth combined.

I hesitated for some time before deciding to take this action, because the Railway Express workers in my State were told that a reduction in parcel-post service was a guarantee of prosperity for the express agency, and that, conversely, any move toward restoring parcel-post standards to those which prevailed before 1952 would hurt Railway Express.

However, the figures prepared by the Railway Express Agency and filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission do not show any discernible relationship between Railway Express volume and parcel-post volume. I would like to include those figures, together with the Post Office Department's figures on parcel-post volume, in the RECORD at this point so that my colleagues may see the facts for themselves.

	Total	Railway express shipments		Number of parcel post packages
		Carload	Less than carload	
1951	78,546,366	12,746	78,533,620	1,046,944,222
1952	93,158,470	14,160	93,144,319	1,046,575,603
1953	86,871,382	14,456	86,856,926	1,042,750,517
1954	76,247,001	11,973	76,235,028	994,750,517
1955	83,474,754	(1)	(1)	948,220,164

[1] Breakdown not available.

NOTE.—The less than carload lot shipments are the only ones which could conceivably compare with parcel post.

On the other hand, both the farm and urban people in North Carolina have been hurt by the size and weight limitations enacted in 1951. The Post Office Department states that parcel-post rates are 10 percent higher than they would have had to be had the 1951 limitations not been enacted. The added expense and the inconvenience of the present law is a continuing harassment to the small merchant and the city dweller.

The farmer has not only this extra cost but the constant danger of enactment of uniform size and weight limits which will seriously hamper his operations. The bushel of seed corn, for example, could, with the sack it is shipped in, weigh from 62 to 63 pounds.

I think our citizens are entitled to uniform size and weight limitations in the parcel-post service and it is important that they be set at figures which will meet the farmers' needs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3635) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADVISORY BOARD ON NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish an advisory board to assist in considering a site and design for a national memorial stadium in the District of Columbia. This board, representatives of which would be selected from sports, civic, and other organizations, would work closely with the commission on a national stadium which was authorized by Congress in 1944.

I think it is high time that the intent of Congress in 1944 be carried out. Our National Capital needs such a stadium, not only as a memorial to the heroic dead of both World Wars and the Korean hostilities, but as a living memorial for the use of sports groups nationally and locally. As Washington is the Capital of the Nation, this stadium could be the national capital of sports, to encourage recreation and participation, and as a solid weapon against juvenile delinquency.

The selection of representatives to this advisory board from leading national organizations would truly make the purposes of the stadium national in scope.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3637) to establish an advisory board to assist the Commission created by the joint resolution of December 20, 1944, in considering a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1948, RELATING TO PROMOTION OF THE FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948. This bill is a consolidation of S. 2410, which I introduced on behalf of myself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. MUNDT on July 5, 1955, and S. 631 which Senator MUNDT and I introduced on January 21, 1955. S. 631 was also a proposal to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948.

The bill which we are introducing today is almost identical with the March 7, 1956, committee print of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. President, I want to make it clear that we are introducing this bill at the request of the administration in order that the proposals contained therein may receive the consideration of the Foreign Relations Committee this week. It is my understanding that certain changes will be suggested by the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee. Although we are in general agreement with the purposes of this bill, we reserve the right to offer amendments to it in committee, or to question provisions which we feel need further explanation.

In general, this bill has two purposes: First, it contains provisions designed to make more effective our educational exchange program with other nations.

Second, it provides for a new career program for the personnel of the United States Information Agency along the lines of the Foreign Service career program of the State Department.

In introducing this measure today, we wish to state that we are acting in cooperation with the State Department, the United States Information Agency, and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Public Affairs, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3638) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.), introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. MUNDT), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) so much of section 2 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 as precedes paragraph (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are to enable the Government of the United States of America to increase in other countries respect for and confidence in the United States, its purposes, its democratic practices, culture, and society, to increase mutual understanding, respect, and confidence between the people of the United States and the peoples of other countries, and to broaden the areas of cooperation between them in the educational exchange, cultural, and information fields. Among other means in achieving these objectives, the Secretary of State is authorized to establish—."

(b) Paragraph (2) of section 2 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) an educational exchange service to cooperate with other nations in—

"(a) the interchange of knowledge, skills, information, and experiences;

"(b) the interchange of technical and other services;

"(c) the interchange of developments in the field of education, the arts, sciences, and professions; and

"(d) the development of projects of interest and value to the United States and the other countries involved through diffusion of knowledge."

SEC. 2. (a) The heading of title II of such act is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE II—INTERCHANGE OF KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND EXPERIENCE

(b) Section 201 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Persons

"SEC. 201. (a) As a means of insuring interchange on a cooperative basis of leaders and potential leaders between the United States and other countries, the Secretary is authorized to provide for and otherwise facilitate programs for the exchange of (1) students and trainees; (2) teachers, fellows, and lecturers; (3) professors and research scholars; (4) specialists in any of the arts, sciences, trades, or professions; and (5) leaders of thought and opinion at the national, State, or local level. Such exchanges shall be for the purpose of long- or short-term study or practical training, teaching, lecturing, or research, and observation, consultation, or other experience or activity which may be essential to the successful operation of the programs and which will not deprive American citizens or aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence of opportunities for gainful employment or professional training. The Secretary is also authorized to bring foreign nationals to the United States to interpret and present the art and culture of cooperating countries. The Secretary may also provide for the attendance of nationals of one cooperating country at selected institutions of learning or places of study in another cooperating country when he determines that urgent foreign relations objectives would be served thereby. The Secretary shall, wherever possible in connection with these programs, utilize the services of existing reputable agencies which are successfully engaged in such activity.

"(b) The Secretary may provide for orientation courses and other appropriate services and materials in the case of persons coming to the United States from other countries and going to other countries from the United States under provisions of this act or for other purposes which the Secretary determines to be in furtherance of the objectives of this act.

"(c) When any country fails or refuses to cooperate in the program provided herein the Secretary shall terminate or limit such program, with respect to such country, to the extent he deems to be advisable in the interests of the United States.

"(d) The foreign-exchange visitors provided for in this section shall be admitted as nonimmigrants under section 101 (a) (15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act for such time and under such conditions as may be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General. Exchange visitors so admitted shall not be eligible for a change of status under the provisions of section 248 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, nor for adjustment of status under provisions of section 245 of that act. An exchange visitor who fails to maintain nonimmigrant status and exchange visitor classification or who fails to depart from the United States on the termination of such status or classification, shall, upon warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and promptly deported pursuant to sections 241, 242, and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Exchange visitors who engage in activities of a political nature detrimental to the interests of the United States, or in activities not consistent with security of the United States shall be considered to have failed to maintain exchange visitor classification. Deportation proceedings under this section shall be summary and the findings of the Attorney General as to matters of fact shall be conclusive. Exchange visitors shall not be eligible for suspension of deportation under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. No person admitted as an exchange visitor under this section or acquiring exchange visitor status after admission shall be eligible to apply for an immigrant visa or for a nonimmigrant visa under section 101 (a) (15) (H) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, until it is established that such person has resided and been physically present in a

cooperating country or countries for an aggregate of at least 2 years following departure from the United States: *Provided*, That upon request of an interested Government agency and the recommendation of the Secretary of State, the Attorney General may waive such 2-year period of residence abroad in the case of any alien whose admission to the United States is found by the Attorney General to be in the public interest: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall apply only to those persons acquiring exchange visitor status or, who, having such status, obtain an extension of stay thereunder, subsequent to the date of the enactment hereof."

SEC. 3. Section 202 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Books and materials

"SEC. 202. The Secretary is authorized to provide for interchanges between the United States and other countries of books and periodicals, including Government publications, and for the preparation, publication, distribution, translation, and interchange of such writings and other cultural and educational materials, including visual and auditory materials of all kinds."

SEC. 4. Section 601 of such act is amended by inserting after the words *"Provided, however,"* the following: "That the Commission on Educational Exchange shall recommend policies and programs to further cultural relations with participating countries by means of exchange of persons and other means, and shall recommend criteria for the selection of persons for participation in exchange programs under this act: *And provided further,"* .

SEC. 5. (a) Section 602 (a) of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided*, That no office under a State university, land-grant college, or other similar educational institution shall be deemed to be a compensated Federal or State office for the purposes of this subsection."

(b) Section 602 (c) of such act is amended by striking out the words "and public service" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "public service, professional, business, agriculture, and labor."

(c) Section 602 (h) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The Department is authorized to provide the necessary professional, technical, secretarial, and clerical assistance for the Commissions."

SEC. 6. Section 603 of such act is amended by sriking out the words "a semiannual" and substituting the words "an annual" therefor.

SEC. 7. Title VI of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 604. The Secretary is authorized to establish in any country in which a program under this act is in effect an advisory commission which may be composed of citizens of such country or citizens of the United States, or both. It shall be the function of any commission so established to advise the Secretary with respect to matters concerning the administration of such program. The Secretary is also authorized, wherever practicable, to utilize in the administration of exchange programs under this act the services of any binational commission established under authority of any other law providing similar exchange programs. Appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this act shall be available to the Secretary for payment of the expenses of any commission established or utilized pursuant to this section."

SEC. 8. (a) Section 801 (6) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(6) to create, with the approval of the Commission on Information and the Commission on Educational Exchange, such advisory committees as the Secretary may decide to be of assistance in formulating his policies for carrying out the purposes of this act; and from time to time to hold meetings of representatives of United States cultural and educational institutions and other organizations interested in programs under this act for the purpose of making reports on, and obtaining comments and suggestions with respect to, such programs. Such persons will not be considered as persons 'employed or assigned to duties by the Government' within the meaning of the act. No such member of an advisory committee or representative of any such institution or organization shall be allowed any salary or other compensation for services, but he may be paid his actual transportation expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses at the rate prescribed by or established pursuant to section 5 of the Administrative Expense Act of 1946, as amended (5 U. S. C. 73 b–2) while away from his home in attendance upon meetings within the United States or in consultation with the Department under instructions."

(b) Section 801 of such act is further amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (5), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by adding at the end of the section the following new paragraphs:

"(7) to engage the services of experts and consultants, or organizations thereof, as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 55a), and individuals so engaged may be compensated at rates not in excess of $50 per day and, while away from their homes or regular places of business, may be paid travel expenses, including per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence at the rates provided for in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations."

SEC. 9. Section 802 of such act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 802.";

(2) by inserting "contracts of insurance, guaranty, and indemnity, and" after "including" in paragraph (2);

(3) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (3), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and by adding after paragraph (4) the following new paragraphs:

"(5) to pay emergency medical expenses and expenses of travel incurred by reason of illness; and

"(6) to pay the travel expenses, including a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence, of alien employees and their dependents when such employees are authorized to travel in connection with appointment, change of duty, or separation."; and

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The Department and any Government agency conducting any nonmilitary exchange of persons program or any program of furnishing technical information and assistance are authorized to pay, in the case of foreign nationals participating in such program, amounts necessary to meet United States income taxes where, except for participation in such program, the liability for such tax would not have been incurred."

SEC. 10. The first sentence of section 902 of such act is amended to read as follows: "If any other Government or any international organization shall express the desire to provide funds, property, or services to be used by this Government, in whole or in part, for the expenses of any specific part of the program undertaken pursuant to this act, the Secretary is authorized, when he finds it in the public interest, to accept such funds, property, or services."

SEC. 11. Section 1008 of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "except that the report concerning activities under the educational exchange programs authorized by this act shall be submitted annually on or before the 31st day of December of each year to apply to activities conducted during the previous fiscal year."

SEC. 12. The United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 is further amended by adding the following new sections at the end thereof:

"Payment of certain claims

"SEC. 1012. For the purpose of promoting and maintaining friendly relations abroad by the prompt settlement of meritorious claims arising in a foreign country, the Secretary of State and the Director of the United States Information Agency, and such other officers as they may designate for such purposes, and under such regulations as they may prescribe, are hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and make payments, where accepted by the claimants in full satisfaction and in final settlement, of claims on account of damage to or loss or destruction of public or private property both real and personal or on account of personal injury or death, including claims respecting personal property bailed to the Government and claims for damages incident to the use and occupancy of real property, whether under a lease, express or implied, or otherwise, whenever caused by any instrumentality, officer, agent or employee of the Department or Agency, incident to the performance of any official functions for the United States, when the amount of such claim does not exceed $5,000: *Provided*, That in cases where the amount exceeds $2,500 but does not exceed $5,000, payment shall be made only after approval by the Secretary or Director.

"The Secretary or Director may certify to Congress any meritorious claim or portion thereof which is in excess of $5,000 as may be deemed to be just and reasonable for payment out of appropriations that may be made by Congress therefor.

"No claim shall be considered unless presented within 1 year after the claim arose, except for good cause shown that the claim could not have been presented within that period of time.

"Every claim settled under the authority of this act shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary.

"United States Information Officers

"SEC. 1013. (a) In accordance with regulations prescribed by him and after suitable examination, the Director of the United States Information Agency may appoint persons to be known as United States Information Officers. Such officers shall be appointed, promoted, and retained on the basis of merit and fitness and may be separated only in accordance with law. Except for the limitations of time contained in sections 522 and 527 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, all provisions of law not inconsistent herewith which are applicable to Foreign Service Reserve officers shall be applicable to United States information officers, and the Director shall be guided by the policies and principles prescribed in those sections. The Director shall establish such examining and selection boards or panels as may be necessary for use in the appointment, promotion, and separation of United States Information Officers.

"(b) Any United States Information Officer may be separated by the Director for unsatisfactory performance of duties, but only after a review of his case by, and opportunity for a hearing before, an impartial advisory board appointed by the Director. The Director shall also provide for the periodic appraisal of such officers and, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, may separate those who are consistently

ranked below a minimum level prescribed for their class.

"(c) The Director may establish an independent retirement and disability system for the benefit of United States Information Officers based on the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as heretofore or hereafter amended. Any officer separated pursuant to subsection (b) hereof shall be entitled to the payments or retirement benefits prescribed in sections 634 or 637 of that act, as appropriate.

"United States Information Service

"SEC. 1014. The agency established by section 1 of Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953, shall hereafter be known as the 'United States Information Service,' and all references in such reorganization plan or in any statute, regulation, agreement, or other legal instrument to the 'United States Information Agency' shall be construed to refer to the 'United States Information Service.' Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter or affect in any way the functions, authorities, or responsibilities of the agency."

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944, AS AMENDED

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, which would extend by 3 years the deadline for the GI home loan program for World War II veterans.

Unless legislation of this nature is enacted, the entire GI home loan program will, for all intents and purposes come to en end by the end of this year, even though the actual termination date is July 25, 1957.

No further commitments will be made, however, by the Veterans' Administration, beyond the end of this year, according to Thomas J. Sweeney, director of the VA's loan guaranty service.

I present a brief statement prepared by me, stressing the importance of at least a 3-year extension of the deadline. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3639) amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I am introducing this bill for a great many purposes:

1. To assure justice for the millions of veterans who have not as yet availed themselves of this fine opportunity to own a home of their own.

It is estimated that 11¼ million World War II veterans have not utilized their GI home-loan privilege. In most instances, they simply have not reached the financial state where they feel they would be in a position to purchase and maintain a home of their own.

Only 26 percent of all eligible United States veterans have used their entitlement. But this percentage varies from city to city and from State to State. In Milwaukee, for example, less than 17 percent of the veterans have used their privilege—17,000 out of more than 100,000 veterans in Wisconsin's largest city.

2. My second reason for introducing this bill is because I believe in the principle of home ownership in our country.

To my way of thinking, there are few things finer than to give a man and his family genuine roots—to give them an opportunity to call a piece of ground and a building on it their own—an opportunity to beautify it, improve it, and to contribute to the community in which they reside.

We are all aware that some folks will continue to like apartment dwelling, for a variety of reasons. But I feel that the rising percentage of Americans who own their own homes is one of the soundest single factors on the national scene.

Of course, we don't want people to go in financially over their heads. We don't want them to take on financial liabilities which they cannot meet. But we do believe that a sound home construction program is essential for the moral and spiritual values of the American people—wholly aside from the material advantages.

3. My third reason for doing so is to provide a continued stimulus to the great American construction industry.

One million two hundred thousand homes will be built this year. I am anxious that this level be maintained and, indeed, increased.

There are those who think that we have reached our peak of home construction. I believe to the contrary. I believe that millions of Americans who are now in old and often obsolete homes will want new homes, and that millions who do not own their own homes will want to buy homes—new or old.

Moreover, there are literally millions of homes which must be improved throughout our country.

If the construction industry falters, the entire American economy will feel the effects. If the construction industry continues to roll in high gear, it will pump economic health into every community of our land.

I have been in continuous contact with the Wisconsin Home Builders Association, with realtor groups through my State, and throughout the rest of the Nation, and I know how important a role all of the home industry plays in the life of America at its grassroots.

I should like to point out that the VA loan guarantee program has not been a burden on the taxpayer. More than a million veterans have already repaid their GI loans in full. In the 10-year life of the program, there has been almost an absolute minimum of defaults on home loans. Losses to the VA have amounted to 0.06 percent of the total amount of over $32 billion in GI loans.

At the end of 1955, less than 1 percent of all outstanding loans were in default.

From time to time, various shortcomings have been found in the loan program. No program this large could possibly be infallible. But, in each instance where shortcomings have been found, after proper analysis and investigation, steps have always been taken to remedy such shortcomings.

I hope, therefore, that this extension legislation will now be promptly enacted in the public interest.

We only have a few months remaining in this second session of the Congress. If we do nothing, the program will lapse for all intents and purposes at the end of this year.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO FRAUD BY WIRE, RADIO, OR TELEVISION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit prosecution of perpetrators of fraud who circumvent present laws by operating from outside the borders of the United States in either Canada or Mexico.

This proposed legislation has wisely been suggested in letters to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Attorney General has specifically recommended that title 18 of the United States Code be amended by adding a new section, 1343, so as to proscribe the use of foreign communication for purposes of fraud to the present law, which merely covers the use of interstate wire, radio, or television.

In the House of Representatives on April 9, Representative KENNETH KEATING announced introduction of a bill for this purpose. Mr. KEATING acted, however, to increase the proposed penalty for this interstate or foreign crime from $1,000 to $10,000. The Attorney General had proposed the figure of $1,000, since that is now the figure in the law which is the penalty for fraud involving the use of mail.

To my way of thinking, Representative KEATING has raised a sound point in urging that these swindlers be hit by a penalty of $10,000, rather than the lower figure of $1,000.

Until such time, however, as the existing law is amended (so as to assure complete uniformity between the penalty for mail fraud and the penalty for fraud conducted through other means), I believe that the Attorney General's version should be the one which should be introduced and considered.

I am hoping, however, that the Senate and House Judiciary Committees will simultaneously take action to make the law uniform and hard-hitting by increasing penalties for all mail and wire frauds.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a release which the Attorney General sent out at the beginning of this month, emphasizing the importance of this proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and release will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3645) to amend section 1343 of title 18, United States Code, relating to fraud by wire, radio, or television, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1343 of title 18, United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1343. Fraud by wire, radio, or television: Whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, transmits or causes to be transmitted by means of wire, radio, or television communication in interstate or foreign commerce, any writings, signs, signals, pictures, or sounds for the purpose of executing such scheme or artifice, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

The release presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

RELEASE FROM DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., today asked Congress for legislation to permit prosecution of fraudulent stock promoters who circumvent present law by operating from Canada and Mexico.

The request was made in identical letters to the Vice President and the House Speaker. The text of the letters and of a proposed bill follow:

"Section 18 (a) of the Communications Act Amendments, 1952 (66 Stat. 711, 722) amended title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new section 1343 as follows:

" 'Whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme, or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, transmits or causes to be transmitted by means of interstate wire, radio, or television communication, any writings, signs, signals, pictures, or sounds for the purpose of executing such scheme or artifice, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.'

"Last year a case arose in which it was alleged that the subject in the execution of a scheme to defraud used the telephone, calling from a point in Mexico to Los Angeles, Calif. Because of the limitation in the statute to frauds involving "interstate" wire, radio, or television communication it was concluded that the telephone call from Mexico, being not an interstate communication but rather a foreign communication, was not covered by the section.

"This case demonstrates the need for amending the statute so that it will reach not only interstate communications but foreign communications as well. If so amended, the statute will cover, for example, telephone calls from Canada made by fraudulent stock promoters to victims residing in the United States. Furthermore, the amendment would remove any doubt as to the applicability of the statute to a communication between a State and a Territory or between a State and the District of Columbia.

"A draft of a bill to accomplish the suggested amendment is enclosed for your consideration and appropriate action.

"The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation."

DESIGNATION OF MAY 30, 1956, AS A DAY TO PAY RESPECTS TO FOUR SURVIVING VETERANS OF CIVIL WAR

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the eminent senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], I submit for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution which calls attention to the fact that four surviving veterans of the Civil War are alive today. Three of them are members of the former Confederate Army and one of the Union Army. All of them are over 100 years of age and represent the final remnant of the millions of Americans who, almost a century ago, served in these great armies out of a deep sense of duty and conviction of the rightness of their causes.

All of them have outlived the struggles and the issues which divided this great Nation, and have lived to enjoy the blessings of unity and peace. These men are William A. Lundy, of Laurel Hill, Fla., formerly of the Army of the Confederacy; John Salling, of Slant, Va., formerly of the Army of the Confederacy; Walter W. Williams, of Franklin, Tex., formerly of the Army of the Confederacy; and Albert Woolson, of Duluth, Minn., formerly of the Union Army.

We ask that the Congress of the United States designate May 30, 1956, as the day on which one Nation, indivisible, and with liberty and justice for all, shall pay its grateful respects to these four men in recognition of the blessings of the unity and domestic tranquillity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 74) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas there are as of this day 4 surviving veterans of the Civil War, 3 from the Army of the Confederacy, and 1 from the Union Army; and

Whereas these Americans, each over 100 years of age, represent the final remnant of the millions of Americans who, almost a century ago, served in these great armies out of a deep sense of duty and conviction of the rightness of their causes; and

Whereas these men have outlived the struggles and the issues which divided this great Nation, and have lived to enjoy the blessings of unity and peace; and

Whereas William A. Lundy, of Laurel Hill, Fla., formerly of the Army of the Confederacy; John Salling, of Slant, Va., formerly of the Army of the Confederacy; Walter W. Williams, of Franklin, Tex., formerly of the Army of the Confederacy; and Albert Woolson, of Duluth, Minn., formerly of the Union Army, being the 4 surviving participants of the Civil War: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America does designate the day of May 30, 1956, as one during which one Nation, indivisible, and with liberty and justice for all, shall pay its grateful respects to William A. Lundy, John Salling, Walter W. Williams, and Albert Woolson, in recognition of the blessings of unity and domestic tranquillity: And be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each of the said surviving veterans referred to in this resolution.

DEFINITION AND CONTROL OF HOLDING COMPANIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], I wish to give notice that we have made a slight technical change in the amendment submitted by us to the bill (S. 2577) to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests. The amendment is identified as "4-9-56-A." The purpose of the change in the amendment is to eliminate what may be a loophole in the bill. We ask that the amendment in its new form be substituted for the text of the previous amendment, and be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

SALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF AUTOMOBILES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 28, 1956,

The names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3543) to protect the public in the operation, and in performance under warranties on, delicate, complicated, sensitive, or inherently dangerous machinery, mechanisms, or apparatus sold in interstate commerce, introduced by Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. PAYNE) on March 28, 1956.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 9, 1956,

The names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 159) to establish a Joint Committee on Scientific Research, introduced by Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. LANGER) on April 9, 1956.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION PROGRAMS—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR JOINT RESOLUTION TO REMAIN AT DESK FOR ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) to establish a joint congressional committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Information Programs, be held at the desk until April 24 for the purpose of cosponsorship by other Senators.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON NIAGARA RIVER, BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, AND BUFFALO HARBOR, N. Y. (S. DOC. NO. 113)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report, dated December 8, 1955, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Niagara River, N. Y.; Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y.; and Buffalo Harbor, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of June 5, 1951. I ask unanimous consent that the reports be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Address delivered by him at the Rodger Young Auditorium in Los Angeles on the subject American Doctrine for American Progress.

EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF ISRAEL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, today is celebrated as the eighth independence day of our sister republic, Israel. On this occasion, all freedom-loving men, everywhere, and certainly all Americans, have reason to take note of and to rejoice in the fact that Israel continues, as it has in the past, to defy the buffets of adversity to which it has been subjected from the moment of its rebirth.

Never—not since those heroic days of 1948, when the collective might of the Arab world, seeking to thwart the will of the United Nations, was focused and concentrated on the extinction of the vastly outnumbered defenders of the tiny state—not since those days has Israel faced greater dangers and difficulties than it does today.

But just as Israel survived the onslaughts directed against its creation in 1948, and has survived the hazards, both economic and political, which have loomed up since then, so will Israel, I am confident, survive the dangers that are gathered today.

There is a rope of faith to which all who wish for Israel's welfare may cling in these dark days. That faith is a faith in freedom, which is stronger than tyranny; in democracy, which is stronger than totalitarianism; and in moral law, which is stronger than jungle law.

These are but words, but in these words there is a truth which has shone through all recorded history. All free men, and all who love freedom, will stand with Israel now, in her present danger.

The Soviets will not be permitted to succeed in their design of using the Arab States as cats paws to stir up conflict and war and destruction in this part of the world. And those elements of the Arab leadership who dream of Jeddah, and plan to achieve their own ambitions at the expense of the small democratic State of Israel, will not prevail. The conscience of mankind, which I believe to be stronger than the atom bomb itself, will not let this happen.

Israel will survive and prosper. She will observe her ninth independence day, and many, many more after that. Israel will survive, thrive, and prosper, and men of all nations will be glad of the fact.

Today, the urgent need is for defensive arms for Israel, so that she may be strong enough to deter aggression, and thus to prevent it. But as we scan the horizon of the future, we look for the time to come for Israel, as for our own country, when swords will be beaten into plowshares and the threat of war will be no more.

I am sure that peace will come. The Arab peoples will see the folly of their hates and prejudices. This I firmly believe. This I predict on the basis of my faith in mankind.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, today marks the eighth anniversary of the independence of Israel. On this day of celebration I am happy to join with millions of other Americans in expressing my sincere hope that the people of Israel will have many more years of freedom and independence, and that this small, new nation may have a great future in the family of nations.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to extend greetings to the nation of Israel on the occasion of the eighth anniversary of its founding. We in New Jersey have always had a warm feeling toward this young nation; journalists have frequently compared the size of Israel with that of our tiny State.

But, more significantly, we have been proud—as Jews and as gentiles—of the vigor and progress of this nation. With a population only a third that of New Jersey, she has managed to establish a government in the democratic tradition. And, by the tireless work of her pioneers, she has proceeded to build a fine economy. In addition to setting a model for other nations of the Middle East, Israel has been a humanitarian refuge for those fleeing from the Nazi tyranny.

It has been interesting to me that even though surrounded by many nations whose intentions have been far from friendly, Israel has been able to improve its own standard of living, increase literacy, health facilities, sanitation and education, and even stimulate culture. The contribution of the Israeli people to art and music are well known in this country.

It is most regrettable that what should be a happy occasion—a birthday of a young nation—should find it in the midst of great tension and uncertainty. These are difficult times, for the Israeli people perhaps more than any other, but I do know that Israel is here to stay. Our country and the other great nations of the world who were present at the birth of the new nation will not stand by and see it go under. I am sure that Israel will live to celebrate many more birthdays—happier ones, I am sure.

Mr. President, with further reference to this anniversary, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

April 16 marks the eighth anniversary of the independence of Israel. As one who was active in the establishment of the State of Israel, I am proud to salute her gallant people and her great achievements on this important occasion.

It is appropriate on this occasion to reemphasize the strong bonds of kinship which underlie the relationship between the United States and Israel. Their destinies are inexorably bound together, for they arise from the same ideals and principles and the abiding faith in the dignity of man, upon which nations are firmly built.

As the acknowledged leader of the free nations of the world the United States must point the way to the establishment of peaceful conditions in the Middle East through the encouragement of a settlement between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

More than any other nation, the United States was responsible for the creation of Israel. Whether by providing arms or by a mutual security pact or by any other effective means, we must now recognize and accept that responsibility. We must not let Israel down.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is generally agreed that there is a need for a review and reappraisal of the foreign policy of the United States. On occasion I have addressed the Senate on foreign policy, as have other Members of the Senate; and I am sure that in the months to come we shall have considerably more discussion of the world situation. It is my thought that out of such debate and review will come new ideas to fill the vacuum so as to stop the dangerous drift which has settled over foreign policy.

It is with this thought in mind that I recommend to all my colleagues in the Senate a series of searching articles on United States foreign policy which appeared in the New York Times during the past week. This paper has, in undertaking this series, performed an outstanding public service.

The correspondents of the New York Times have obtained the views of foreign and American officials and other competent observers on the strong and weak points of United States foreign policy and their suggestions for its improvement. The findings of this study were presented in a series of regional reports on Europe, the Middle East, foreign aid in Asia, southwest and southeast Asia, the Far East, Latin America, and a concluding survey.

This is the finest survey of the present world situation, as it affects America, that has come to my attention. The

Times' correspondents approach the regional situations with objectivity, reporting the strong points in our foreign policy, as well as pointing out areas where we are weak, and making appropriate recommendations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this series of articles be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all may have an opportunity to study this survey in its entirety.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 8, 1956]

EUROPE FINDS UNITED STATES POLICY TOO RIGID, SURVEY SHOWS—TENDENCY TO BLAME DULLES IN TACTICAL LAG DISCLOSED—STRESS ON ECONOMIC WARFARE SUGGESTED AS A REMEDY

(By Harold Callender)

(First of a series)

PARIS, April 7.—Europeans are convinced that American foreign policy has lost much of the vision, resourcefulness, and flexibility that distinguished it from 1947 onward, when the United States departed from its traditions by accepting far-reaching commitments to check Soviet imperialism.

Many believe the far-sighted, imaginative bipartisan policy then developed in Washington probably saved Western Europe, the region of primary American concern. A far greater number, an overwhelming majority of informed observers, contend that this policy—a work of genius in its beginnings—has failed to move and evolve with the times.

That this view is held with something not far from unanimity by these Europeans best qualified to judge seems confirmed by a survey made in Western Europe's capitals by correspondents of the New York Times.

The survey was designed to elicit what competent observers, official and nonofficial, really believe in contradistinction to what may be said officially or publicly. It reflects rather what diplomats and others say when off duty.

The makers of United States foreign policy are widely suspected of failing fully to recognize that Stalin is dead, that the strategy or at least the tactics of Moscow have changed, that war probably is less imminent than in 1950, and that western policy (without neglecting security) requires corresponding readaptation.

If Moscow seems to maneuver faster and more adroitly than the West and to excel in propaganda by talking peace while the West emphasizes armaments, if the free world has been slow to react appropriately to Soviet proffers of economic aid as a means of penetration of uncommitted regions, the blame is placed largely upon what is called the rigidity and lack of imagination of current United States policy. Many interpret this policy as sustaining a static situation in most parts of the world, including Germany.

As one diplomat expressed it, "We have built a hedge about ourselves in the Atlantic alliance with no thought of what we should do when the hedge was completed."

This military solidarity has not been supplemented by a corresponding economic solidarity. The dominant partner in the alliance, the United States, is accused of pursuing in the economic field the nationalistic isolation that it has abandoned in the political field.

Half its economic aid to its allies must be delivered in American ships, even to nations having surplus shipping. The escape clause in American tariff legislation is a threat that if these allies manage to earn more dollars by exports to replace aid, they may find the tariff rising to prevent this form of self-help.

Washington leaders are accused of a tendency to speak and act independently of their allies, and to pay too much attention to domestic politics in shaping foreign policy while paying too little attention to European needs, views, and sensibilities.

They are accused of overindulgence in diplomacy by speeches and press conferences, which often display conflicting views within the administration that bewilder allies with whom the United States is committed to cooperate. Yet it appears to Europeans that when these public debates produce a given policy, Washington assumes the discussion is over and that it only remains for its allies to accept the United States decision even if they have not been consulted.

There is little tendency to criticize President Eisenhower. There is a virtually universal disposition to blame Secretary of State Dulles for taking too rigid positions; for speaking too often, too extemporaneously and without due regard for the ideas and interests of the other allies; for confusing his own reflections or impulses with settled Western policy.

When such criticisms of the policies and methods of the United States are made in Europe, the criterion by which they are judged is that established by the United States itself when it accepted what may be called a community of power in the form of the North Atlantic alliance.

TWO UNITED STATES ACTIONS PRAISED

What Europeans consider the merits and defects of United States policy are yardsticks giving approximate measurements of the adherence to or the deviations from the doctrine of Western unity adopted by the United States early in the cold war. This doctrine crystallized in two acts of high statesmanship that Europeans never cease to praise: the Marshall plan of economic aid and the North Atlantic alliance extending a United States guaranty of security over Western Europe.

The fairly sudden and involuntary acquisition of the predominant power by the United States was accompanied by a decline of European power. The United States sought to correct this accident of history by restoring to Europe some of its former strength and independence—not as an act of pure generosity but because the United States, as powerful as it was, needed allies.

It could not risk the loss to the Soviet Union of the vast industrial resources of Western Europe. So it agreed to pool and dilute to some extent its own power with the smaller but vital power of Western Europe to create a balance of power on a worldwide scale.

This principle was difficult to apply. The United States bears about 80 percent of the cost of Atlantic defense and its officials do not always live up to the necessary diplomatic fiction that the alliance is one of equals. The Nation most noted for its advertising skill is not used to understating its power or its virtues. The bright labels pasted on every piece of Marshall plan machinery to show its origin were understandable, but hardly conformed to the need to use American wealth and power in an unobtrusive manner, if the alliance were to work well.

A similar overindulgence in publicity was seen by Europeans in Mr. Dulles' statement that he had brought the United States, and with it the Western World, to the brink of war—a place where Europe certainly did not care to go. The earlier talk in Washington of massive retaliation seemed another way of moving to the same brink without the prior approval of the allies of the United States.

Such Washington tendencies to forget that the United States has allies are regarded as having taken extreme forms in Asia. In refusing to recognize the regime that effectively rules China, the United States has created a complete breach with its European allies, all of whom consider this a hopelessly unrealistic policy dictated mainly by domestic political pressure. This policy, too, seemed to entail moving to the brink of war when Washington appeared ready to risk a conflict over the Chinese offshore islands and Taiwan (Formosa). This was an example of the rigidity of which Europeans complain.

KENNAN ADVICE UNHEEDED

Much of this rigidity is attributed to what Europeans call a moralistic and semireligious coloring given to United States policy largely by Mr. Dulles, contrary to the advice of George F. Kennan, former head of policy planning in the State Department. A similar propensity to preach is seen in the propaganda on the American way of life, which Europeans believe is neither attainable nor necessarily desired by other nations, which have their own ways of life but can be loyal allies for all that.

This way of life is associated by Europeans with the unique form of capitalism in the United States. It seems to have disproved Socialist doctrines as regards North America and to have prevented any extensive American understanding of the important Socialist movements in Europe, which were responses to a very different brand of capitalism.

In the United States, which enjoys a semi-socialized private capitalism, creeping socialism is widely abhorred as close to communism. In Europe, where socialization had to be done by the state, the resulting mixed economies reveal extensive creeping by socialism. For good or ill, this is a part of European life, and many consider socialism one of the best safeguards against communism.

This view is little understood by United States policymakers, or so Europeans believe. The socialistic British Labor Party suspects that Washington would do what it could to prevent that party again governing Britain.

The principal force working against United States policy is Soviet imperialism operating through Communist groups. Some European economists believe the test will come if the Soviet economy can offer to the Russians a few years hence standards of living above those of Western Europe.

The race, therefore, is regarded as one between Soviet and European productivity. This view lends weight to the contention that United States policy should concentrate in the economic field.

The disunity of Western Europe, handicapping its productivity, is, therefore, considered by many to be another obstacle to United States policy, which has sought to strengthen Europe by uniting it.

In resisting this union in the form of a single tariffless market, British governments have been motivated by concern for their links with the Commonwealth. They have also been influenced by the conviction that what Britons call the Anglo-American alliance entitles Britain to a rating above the continental nations of the wider Atlantic alliance.

BRITISH PRIDE HURT

Britain's pride was wounded when the United States lumped her with lesser nations as a recipient of Marshall aid. The British tend to believe they could use more skillfully the vast power that has fallen to the United States. They claim a special position in relations with the United States.

The French think this special position already exists to their disadvantage. They suspect that Washington and London get together behind their backs. The French complain of American anticolonialism, which they say injects a disruptive ideological element into the Atlantic alliance. But the Greeks, who are in the same alliance, wish that United States anticolonialism would

result in pressure on Britain for self-government in Cyprus.

The French sense of frustration in both North Africa and Europe, expressed mainly in indictments of United States policy, led to the recent statements by Premier Guy Mollet urging a more positive United States attitude toward the Soviet Union. By this he meant chiefly a more favorable response to his idea of trying to escape from the Geneva deadlock by giving priority to negoations for reduction of armaments.

BONN OUTWARDLY CONTENT

This was criticized as coming close to the policy of the Soviet Union, which sought to put security agreements ahead of German unity. The West Germans want nothing put ahead of German unity.

West Germany officially appears a more contented ally. The Germans consider their Federal Republic was created by the United States—which, however, errs in apparently considering it more than just a provisional state pending an all-German state. Yet Germans believe the United States is the only power that may 1 day persuade Moscow to accept this all-German state. Privately, many Germans agree with the widespread European view that United States policy is too static, especially as regards Germany.

In Spain, too, many look to the United States to help them toward a new kind of state, one that would succeed the Franco regime. They complain that Washington pays too exclusive attention to the powers that be and not enough to the masses of the people, who may prefer and eventually obtain a different regime.

This seems to be a plea for United States interference in the internal affairs of a European State. Elsewhere in Europe the belief prevails that there has been too much of such interference. Thus there are numerous crosscurrents and still much nationalism in Europe, so that the United States could scarcely please everybody, whatever its policy.

RECOMMENDED REMEDIES

From the remarkably similar criticisms of the United States foreign policy noted by correspondents of the New York Times in the capitals of Western Europe there emerge suggestions for improvement. Each of the criticisms cited above is at the same time a recommended remedy. In addition, many critics replied to the question: How could United States policy be improved? There was no great diversity of replies except in emphasis.

While the general lines of policy laid down in the late 1940's are sound, there have been faults, delays, and confusion in their application. Strategy is good but tactics defective. There was wide agreement, often expressed in the same terms, that the United States, without abandoning the instruments of security, should now direct its attention more to a kind of economic warfare in which the Soviet Union is considered to have taken the initiative.

Just as the United States shifted its emphasis from Marshall plan aid to defense aid after 1950, it should now shift back again to economic aid, this time not mainly in Europe but in the so-called uncommitted areas where Soviet influence penetrates.

To do this effectively some suggest that perhaps Washington needs an independent agency for foreign aid, as was recommended by Paul G. Hoffman, former Economic Cooperation Administrator, so that this function will not get tangled up between the State Department and the Treasury. At any rate, policy should be clearer and more vigorous, in the view of European critics.

The almost universal emphasis placed on economic policy was equally by that on the need for greater flexibility in foreign policy generally. For this some suggested a return to secret diplomacy would be necessary, since publicly taken positions tend to become nonnegotiable.

Greater assurance of continuity of policy—of policies not subject to change with the election returns—was urged, especially in Britain, where this continuity has been largely achieved. The suggestion was that the world ought to be sure that there would be as much American thinking about foreign policy in 1957 as in 1947, when major decisions were boldly taken. The impression is that lately the United States has become the prisoner of cold war slogans, and that the professional diplomats should have more independence in shaping policy.

It was suggested that the United States would do well not to expect gratitude from allies and other aided countries. Although aid is seen as including a substantial admixture of generosity, it is regarded as being granted primarily in the interests of the United States, as Congress specified. Advanced European nations dislike aid. They would prefer to get dollars through trade if the United States would lower some of its bars. To remind them that they are aided injures their dignity, especially since they believe the need for aid is partly a result of United States protectionist policies.

The late President Roosevelt said the purpose of lend lease was to remove the dollar sign from the relations of the United States and Britain, and later with other countries. For that sign is the mark of the predominant United States power, which many Europeans and Americans believe will be the more effective if used without being flaunted before those who, having lost power, may naturally be slightly envious.

In the Atlantic alliance, that power has been somewhat diluted and disguised. In the North Atlantic Council, Foreign Ministers of small nations speak as freely as those of great powers, and wisdom is not necessarily in exact proportion to power or wealth.

In this council, originally for defense but now for political discussion also, the United States has occasionally taken its allies into its confidence regarding its foreign policy. The council has discussed policies not only in Europe but in the Middle and Far East. It is thus a community of power and of intelligence. Some Europeans believe the most important cure for the United States foreign policy errors cited in this article would be more frequent and more thorough consultation in this council on policy in all parts of the world.

[From the New York Times of April 9, 1956]

PRECISE UNITED STATES POLICY ASKED IN MIDEAST—SURVEY OF AREA FINDS MIDDLE COURSE TOO OFTEN TAKEN FOR INDECISIVENESS

(By Sam Pope Brewer)

(Second of a series)

BEIRUT, LEBANON, April 8.—Any American who travels in these times has to get used to being taken to task over United States foreign policy.

The bases of criticism vary with different areas and even inside an area critics do not agree on what the faults are or how they should be remedied. Still there are certain criticisms and suggestions that recur more often than others.

The traveling Americans, for their part, tend to feel that much of the trouble arises from the lack of any firm and definite policy rather than from the existence of a mistaken one.

In the Arab world and the rest of the Middle East, from Gibraltar to India and from the Black Sea down to the Sudan, the United States has unquestionably lost heavily in prestige and friendship in the last few years. In the Arab countries, at least, that trend is continuing.

The reasons given by critics vary but the best simple generalization might be summed up as "too much and too little." The United States has aided nationalist aspirations and fought colonialism enough to annoy and harm its British and French allies and not enough to win the solid friendship of local nationalists.

TECHNICAL AID WELCOMED

The Americans have given generously and yet have hesitated enough, made enough conditions, and refused enough requests to irritate those who are receiving the gifts and loans.

The phase of United States policy that has won the most favorable comments and made the most friends has been the technical and educational aid that is being so widely given.

Against that, the most criticized factor in United States policy is unquestionably its support of Israel. The Arab world looks on the United States as the principal force in the creation and protection of Israel as a state. When one sees how bitterly the Arabs feel about that, the most surprising point is that there is still so much friendliness for the United States.

Balanced Arab opinion does not hold now that it is possible to do away with Israel. But it does reproach the United States for what the Arabs believe to be a consistently strong bias in favor of Israel as against her Moslem neighbors.

The Israelis on their side feel the United States could assure their survival in peace by arming them heavily.

If the United States gave in on that point, there would be extreme alarm on the Arab side and an immediate rush to the Soviet bloc for arms that have been offered and that have been bought on a small scale.

The Israelis approve economic-aid policies and the plan advanced by Eric Johnston, President Eisenhower's representative, for rational development of Jordan Valley waterpower and irrigation resources.

They think the United States should arm them and keep arms from the Arab countries. They believe the United States puts too much faith in the ability of the United Nations to prevent a major war in the Middle East.

As an improvement on present policies, they urge heavy defensive armament for Israel and the use of all possible pressures to impose a settlement of Israel's frontiers that would involve recognition of Israel's existence as a state.

The Arabs oppose such a settlement, because they feel their whole position rests on the fact they have never consented to the establishment of a foreign state in an area inhabited by Arabs. Recognition of Israel, they believe, would weaken their claim to the area involved.

Special reports from correspondents of the New York Times in North Africa indicate that there, too, the United States has failed in an effort to be moderate, though not entirely neutral.

Nationalists think the Americans have made too little effort to back up their ideals of independence and self-determination for all.

The French think their American allies have betrayed them by encouraging nationalist aspirations. That is why feeling rose so high that a mob of infuriated Frenchmen wrecked the United States Consulate and Information Service library in Tunis early in March.

The nationalists in Morocco and Tunisia are less critical of the United States than are the French. But one qualified American observer remarked that "even the nationalists are a little cynical about us because they feel they cannot count on us against the French."

In Egypt, the Israeli question is the pivot of the attitude toward the United States. The Egyptians are elated with the success of their revolution. They believe Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser outmaneuvered the

United States when he obtained arms from Czechoslovakia.

Now they would be satisfied with no lesser change in United States policy than complete abandonment of Israel and full support of Premier Nasser's new Egypt in her aspirations to dominate the Arab world.

ALTERNATIVE IS LACKING

In common with other Arabs, they talk vaguely about the United States refusal to "face realities," but they produce no workable alternative to present American policy.

The Baghdad Pact provides an example of the vacillation that has brought criticism of the United States from all sides.

United States refusal to join has irritated and alarmed the member countries, organized for defense against Soviet aggression. The members, Britain, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, and Turkey, feel that the success or failure of the alliance depends on the active membership or absence of the United States, which first suggested it.

Foes of the pact include the Soviet bloc and "neutralist" countries, with Egypt leading the chorus of criticism. They resent United States moral support of this pact, even though it has not gone beyond lip service.

One senior United States diplomat commented bitterly recently that it was impossible to know where the United States stood as long as it refused to join the pact, although the State Department periodically proclaimed its support of the alliance.

A result is that the United States incurs the ill will of both opposed camps.

The Turks, too, have criticisms of United States policy, but they do not hinge on the Israeli question.

Turkey's objections are connected chiefly with financial questions. They accuse the United States of trying to shape everybody into the American mold. That criticism is heard elsewhere and Americans living abroad generally concede there is some justice in it.

The Turks are in financial difficulties and feel that the United States has been too reluctant to bail them out and unduly critical of some of the conduct that has landed them in that position.

In all these countries, another criticism frequently heard is that the United States focuses all its attention on the fight against communism and opposes even commercial relations with the Soviet Union and its satellites.

They believe the United States exaggerates the Red menace and they suspect mercenary motives behind the objections to their trade with the Soviet bloc.

The forces with which United States policy has to deal in the Arab world, Turkey, Iran, and the rest of the Middle East are multiple. Communism is not the most conspicuous.

Nationalism is the most notable force and in these countries has become virtually synonymous with anti-Western sentiment. For hundreds of years most of this area was ruled by the Turks. When World War I ended Turkish rule (even before that in some areas) the Turks were replaced by British, French, or Italian overlords.

Now that they are sovereign countries, the Arab States intend to exercise their rights. The United States as an ally of Britain and France is suspect in the present period of struggle.

One Arab jurist said recently to this correspondent:

"After generations of being taught that the Western Powers were their oppressors, the common people of our countries cannot be convinced that those same powers have suddenly become their friends and protectors."

PERIL IN COOPERATION

The Communists manipulate those nationalist forces. Sometimes the Reds pose as having nationalist aims themselves. Sometimes they convince the nationalists that "after all we have the same enemies—the Western imperialists—and party names do not matter."

Communism as an open political force is not dangerous in most of these countries. The danger lies in the fact that the nationalists think they can cooperate with the Communists as long as it suits them and then drop them. The nationalists overlook the damage done meanwhile.

In Syria, for example, there appears to be strong Communist influence though the party as such does not amount to much. There is one Communist member of Parliament, Khaled Bagdash, but the greatest danger again lies not in him but in some of the young officers and officials who believe Communist agitation and Communist aid from abroad are useful weapons against the Western Powers and who do not realize the danger of falling into the Communists' grip.

In the Arab countries, simple hostility to Israel and fear of her supposed ambitions for expansion may also be classed as a specific force working against the United States. Until after World War II Americans were known in these countries only as benefactors. They had neither colonies nor mandates. They did provide schools and colleges, encourage the Arab political revival and send aid when there were disasters.

That vast fund of goodwill is not exhausted but it is depleted by the struggle over Israel and because of United States inability to abandon its French and British allies to please the Arab nationalists.

In north Africa, the effort to steer a middle course brings the United States up against another force—the reaction of French colonials to the alleged American encouragement of the Arab forces that are fighting a guerrilla war with the French.

The nationalists remember that the United States, especially in the Franklin D. Roosevest administrations, encouraged aspirations to independence. They are not getting the support they would like from Washington but they do not look on Americans as enemies.

FRENCH COLONIALS BITTER

Embattled French colonial officials and settlers also remember United States encouragement of such movements and they are bitter about it.

Their view was expressed by Pierre Vignau, a French landowner and member of the Algerian Assembly, who said to a correspondent of the Times:

"The question now is whether the United States intends to change its policy regarding north Africa and the Middle East. If the United States means to continue and reinforce the defense of the West, it must not only be on the side of France in her efforts to restore security in Algeria but must also undertake a concerted action designed to help bring Tunisia and Morocco back into the European-Africa bloc. Such a bloc is indispensable to western defense and desirable also in the interests of native populations for independence has put Morocco and Tunisia on the road to anarchy."

Each group offers simple and impractical solutions to its complaints about United States policy. The Arabs want Israel dropped. The Israelis want unqualified support against the Arab States. The nationalists want aid in the fight for independence. The French want help in suppressing rebellious natives.

All want money in loans and grants and all object to the policy that requires a check on what is done with the money after they get it.

The United States obviously would not gain by plunging recklessly onto one side or the other in each controversy, or by ladling out money without knowing what was being done with it.

There do stand out in the opinions from various countries certain calls for policy changes that seem to occur to many persons of different groups.

DEFINITE POLICY URGED

The basic one is a plea to decide on some definite policy, whatever it may be. In most cases, this means a demand for a policy backing up the speaker's particular group.

In the instances mentioned above, it is clear the United States cannot well drop its moderate position and back one side fully. But the so-called middle-of-the-road position too often looks like indecision.

The call is for a clear-cut policy. It would still not please the partisan groups but they would have fewer false hopes.

On less general lines, there are clear indications that money put into education facilities, libraries, and technical aid is well spent. There are different views about the efficiency of existing operations in that field but there is no doubt about the demand among Middle Eastern peoples for the facilities provided.

That effectiveness is presumably why the United States Information Service library in any city is normally the first target of hoodlums whenever political disturbances start. The Communists invariably seize the chance to steer violence into channels that suit their purpose, and the American library is almost invariably their first objective.

The library in Amman, Jordan, for instance, has been wrecked twice. However, a high Jordanian Government official, when asked what he thought was the most useful work the United States carried on in this area replied: "Education and books." He then drew a handful of United States magazines and pamphlets from his desk drawer.

Several observers think policies on loans and grants might be reviewed.

The Soviet Union has been making much headway directly and through satellites in providing underdeveloped countries with things they want, whether arey are arms, industrial equipment, or other material. They give no gifts but make business deals on terms that amount to the same thing without calling for acknowledgment of that fact. Payment may be in surplus products the aid recipients could not sell elsewhere or in weak currencies and spread over a long period.

The Soviet does not moralize about whether a country should have the arms it seeks or whether it needs the type of factory it wants.

A result is that each deal creates much goodwill at relatively low cost. Carefully supervised American loans and gifts, however lavish they may be, tend to leave the recipients with the feeling of the tramp who is required to sing a hymn to get a free cup of coffee.

[From the New York Times of April 9, 1956]

AFRICAN ISSUES LOOMING

(By Leonard Ingalls)

JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA, April 8.—In Africa south of the Sahara, the foreign policy of the United States is not particularly strong or well defined beyond the fundamental attitude of good neighborliness. The chief aim is to keep Africa alined with the West.

Very soon, however, the United States probably will be forced to take a more vigorous stand in a number of developing situations. These include both white and African nationalism, the emergence into independence of such places as the Gold Coast, the spread of communism, and the new interest the Soviet Union is taking in the difficulties African Negroes are having in rising above a position of extreme underprivilege and the continuation of colonial rule.

Of all the problems troubling this part of the continent, nationalism is perhaps the most serious. It is the basis of sub-Sahara Africa's greatest conflict. On one hand are

whites striving to maintain their identity and position as rulers. On the other are Negroes clamoring for political, economic, and social recognition, and in some places, such as Uganda, for outright control of their homelands.

The force of Negro nationalism throughout the continent is not yet great because the majority of Africans are primitive and illiterate. In South Africa the picture is further complicated by the intense rivalry for national predominance between the white descendants of English and Dutch settlers. Meanwhile, in the Central African Federation, and Kenya and Tanganyika, efforts are being made to establish multiracial nationalism through governments in which all races are represented.

Thus far in this complex and sometimes baffling situation United States policy has been one of almost complete noninterference and at most gentle suggestion. State Department representatives here, in the absence of a precise African policy from Washington, act as observers and do what they can to stimulate trade and further the prestige of the United States. Their activities, however, and the whole impact of United States operations in sub-Sahara Africa are severely restricted by a shortage of funds.

American financial aid in sub-Sahara Africa, an area desperately in need of money for such things as education and communications, has been small compared with direct Government grants elsewhere. The tightly limited opportunities for Africans to study and travel in the United States at Government expense have caused some resentment among Negroes.

Present United States African policy seems to have offended no one in official positions. However, African leaders frequently ask why the United States does not help them more in the United Nations in their struggle for human rights.

Africa's dilemma arising from conflicting racial aspirations also creates a dilemma for the United States. Should it, for example, ignore the plight of the Negro in South Africa and antagonize Africans all over the continent, or should it denounce apartheid (racial segregation) and risk losing South Africa as a strategic and commercial partner?

The most effective policy for the United States in Africa, observers here believe, appears to be one that would provide tangible support and encouragement to sincere efforts at multiracial governments and societies, with emphasis on equality of opportunity. Assistance to independent Negro states to enable them to achieve stable governments and sound economies, it is believed, also would be in harmony with such a policy.

[From the New York Times of April 10, 1956]

ASIA SURVEY FINDS NEED OF MORE AID—SOME SEE CUT IN UNITED STATES LIVING STANDARD TO PROVIDE HELP

(By A. M. Rosenthal)

(Third of a series)

COLOMBO, CEYLON, April 9.—The great challenge, and the great opportunity, facing United States foreign policy is communism's eager pursuit of nationalist movements all over the world.

The challenge springs from the fact that the Russians have grasped the enormous emotional and political drive behind what Asians like to call the age of nationalism.

Not long ago, at one of those earnest diplomatic garden parties that make up a good deal of New Delhi's official social life, an Indian Foreign Office man was talking about a favorite topic—where the United States goes wrong.

"You don't seem to be able to realize that countries see the world in different ways, that problems unimportant to you are primary to us," he said.

"That's why you are finding yourself losing out to the Russians on this colonialism business," he continued. "They have the wit to see that nationalism is the force of this decade. Intellectually you see it, too, certainly. But you expect the impossible. You expect Algerians, for instance, to take a world view, not the Algerian view."

The United States is no longer counted a sure friend of nationalist movements.

This is a bitter thought for the United States, remembering that freedom was given to the Philippines, and help to India and Indonesia. It is made more bitter by the fear that the Western age of colonialism is being replaced by Soviet political and military conquests.

But there is no point in giving argument for argument. It is enough that Asians have lost trust.

The national elections in Ceylon, which resulted in a crushing defeat of the openly pro-Western Government, were fought on domestic rather than international issues. But certainly they showed that being identified with the West has nc great political asset to an Asian politician. And they showed, too, that the West's policies had not struck a real spark in the minds of the Ceylonese.

This is a problem made infinitely more acute by the fact that the Russians, with no political commitments to the colonial powers, can and do eagerly push themselves forward as friends of nationalism everywhere.

The opportunity springs from the challenge. It is the opinion of many Asians and some important United States officials in this area that the United States, in its concern for physical and military security, is letting the political battle go by default. They believes too that Americans do not realize that good will toward the United States is ebbing. But they believe that the plain threat that the Communists will be able to identify themselves with nationalism may prod the United States into restating its own traditional friendship for independence movements.

Among some Americans here there is a belief that the best step the United States could take now would be a straight and unequivocal statement of its intention to see that every land capable of self-government attains it.

For the sake of political effect, it might help the United States to bring up the issue itself at the United Nations. It certainly would help if a declaration were made formally by the President of the United States.

This reporter has not heard that last suggestion put in as many words by Indian or United States officials. But there have been many comments that the time has come for clarification of United States policy. Putting that hope together with the fact that President Eisenhower's personal prestige is high here, it is obvious that a Presidential declaration would have more force than any other kind.

ALL CANNOT BE PLEASED

It is the opinion of most westerners in India that for the time being at least the United States cannot evolve a foreign policy that will make New Delhi or all other Asian capitals entirely happy. The reason is in the basic difference in attitude toward the Communist philosophy and toward the danger of that philosophy.

India and other Asian countries are ready to believe the danger of military aggression has passed. As far as the United States is concerned, military containment and preparedness will have to remain the skeletal structure of United States foreign policy. That means something the Indians will never like—military pacts in which their neighbors are armed.

It has to be recognized—and this comes from a number of Asians—that the United States cannot satisfy all Asians' wishes.

But, especially in connection with nationalism, Asians say that Americans must also recognize that they need not keep all their allies happy all the time.

The United States would have to pay a price for meeting the Soviet challenge on nationalism head on—the anger of some United States allies.

But the history of the last 10 years has proved that sooner or later the United States has had to take public stands that its Western allies did not like, and that too often—Cyprus, for instance—those stands were taken too late for maximum political effect. Put another way, opinion in this part of the world is that the time has come for the United States to lead the parade instead of running after the Soviet Union.

The nationalist question cannot, of course, be considered without taking the free world's military security into account. But if the last decade has shown anything—consider Suez, Cyprus, Indochina, and North Africa—it is that military security depends on political security and that democratic countries cannot hold down military bases surrounded by hostile populations.

This is not a suggestion for abandoning military security but for reconsidering the essentials for military security. To give just one example, there are United States military men in Saigon who believed that the presence of the French expeditionary corps in South Vietnam was such a political liability that it amounted to a threat to military security.

And it is being asked whether the British naval base on Cyprus is more secure now than it would have been if the British had given up sovereignty and signed a long-term lease-treaty with the willing Greeks.

ECONOMICS AN ESSENTIAL

Some American officials in Asia might disagree with the emphasis on pushing to the front on the colonialism issue. But few would disagree that economics becomes every day a more essential part of our foreign policy. One obvious reason, of course, is that the Russians have entered the picture—in Egypt, India, Syria, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Burma, the Sudan, and Yemen.

But just as important is the fact that the newly independent countries are aware more sharply than ever before of the gap between them and the developed countries. That gap is growing because Western industrialization is outpacing the painful development efforts of Asia and the Middle East.

Sooner or later in a discussion of foreign policy, the talk boils down to this: The United States will have to spend still more money and share still more of its wealth with Asia.

What is more, there is a belief among Americans in Asia that the time may be coming when the United States will have to cut down its continually rising standard of living to meet Soviet competition and to help underdeveloped countries get ahead. Indian businessmen say the United States is pricing itself out of the market.

An example among many: The Tata Iron & Steel Co., part of the biggest industrial-commercial enterprise in India, was negotiating with the United States Export-Import Bank for a loan to double its steel producing plant. The negotiations fell through because under a loan, say the Tata spokesmen, the concern would have been obliged to buy all its equipment in the United States and prices were too high, when measured against the high interest rate demanded by the bank.

One of the problems the United States must face in Asia is a drift toward nationalization of economies. Nearly everyone believes it would be unwise and impossible to try to pressure India, for instance, away from socialism.

But among Americans there is the opinion that, without interfering with Asian lands bent on some form of socialism, there is a great deal Washington can do to promote the spirit and philosophy of enlightened private enterprise.

AID TO PRIVATE INDUSTRY

One American businessman said in New Delhi recently that since the United States was willing to give hundreds of millions of dollars to governments, it should be willing to give private Asian industry a hand by making low-interest-rate loans. He mentioned the Tata episode as a case in point.

The Tata organization is now negotiating with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a loan. That means the Indian Government would have to stand behind the loan and would have a stronger voice in Tata affairs.

The point this businessman and others made was that where opportunities presented themselves to help reliable private enterprises in Asia, the United States should take them.

High United States prices and interest rates take on political importance because the Soviet Union will make sacrifices to supply goods at prices underdeveloped countries can afford.

There is a feeling among westerners that sometime soon the people of the United States may have to learn the painful lesson that continuously rising wages and profits may wreck their country's ability to compete with the Soviet Union in the economic struggle for Asia. Already India is buying most of her cement from Communist countries. Multiply this by a hundred products and the political consequences need no underlining.

The job of strengthening the economic foundations of underdeveloped countries was started by the United States a decade ago. Still the insistence of western and Asian officials is that more and more money must be appropriated because on this now hangs the future of Asia. Not only more money is needed but more imagination and more planning.

CONFERENCE SUGGESTED

So far, planning and spending have been on a national basis and sometimes without clear goals in mind. There are United States officials here who believe that one of the things the United States could do would be to call a technical-level conference to work intensively to map out Asia's needs, resources, foreign-aid requirements, and attainable objectives. There is a good chance the United States would find itself ahead of the Asian countries in the desire for regional planning, but there is nothing wrong with leading the field.

India needs more money, large quantities of it. If the United States was willing to lend India the money—$1 billion, at the least—it could assure that her own democratic way to a mixture of socialism plus private enterprise had stood the test when compared with Communist China's totalitarian economy.

It is in the interest of the United States to help noncommitted countries, but there is no reason why it should be ashamed of making a special economic effort for its allies—Pakistan, for instance. The recent meeting of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization at Karachi expressed some fond hopes about emphasizing the economic aspects of the alliance. But beyond appointing one economist the conference did nothing about it. Here, too, is a field for United States imaginativeness.

The problem of Afghanistan is one of the most difficult the United States faces. For one thing, the Soviet loan of $100 million faces Washington with a decision as to whether to be drawn into the endless, sapping process of trying to outbid the Soviet on loans. That is just what leaders of this area think Washington did in the case of the Aswan high dam in Egypt, and the action did not enhance the reputation of the United States.

But the bigger problem the United States faces in Afghanistan is the same one it must deal with in many countries in Latin America, the Middle East, and Asia. That is whether United States funds are to be used to bolster dictatorial governments just because they happen to be in power.

There is no easy answer to this. The Russians certainly have no compunctions about supporting any government in power so long as it suits their purpose. But whether that approach and that philosophy in the long run suit the objectives of freedom is questioned by many Asian friends of the United States.

Assuredly the United States cannot change the governments of the world to suit itself. But it would be in keeping with United States traditions to make it clear through Presidential statements that Washington is not ready to build up dictatorships of the right in its fight against dictatorships of the left.

The world struggle is as much as anything a struggle for minds and attitudes. And there is something the United States could do that would not cost astronomical sums, would pay off handsomely and would be welcomed by most Americans who have spent any time in the area. That would be to step up scholarships for foreign students to study and live in the United States and for Americans to study abroad. This correspondent has met many Asians who have lived in the United States and virtually every one has returned with more understanding and sympathy toward United States goals.

Many Asians feel that knowledge of their lands is almost nonexistent in the United States. An increasing number of Americans living in Asia could do much to remedy that.

It might help prevent incidents like the one involving the Member of the United States Congress interviewed at the Karachi Airport, who was asked what Americans thought about Pakistan.

"Think about it?" he asked. "My boy, they never even heard of it."

[From the New York Times of April 11, 1956]

UNITED STATES NEEDS TO EMPHASIZE PEACE, SURVEY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA SHOWS

(By Robert Alden)

(Fourth of a series)

SINGAPORE, April 10.—The tides of change are running strong in southeast Asia. The newly sovereign states just emerged from cast-off colonial shells are in danger of being swept away in the shifting groundswells.

The most important currents that tug at the nations of southeast Asia and shape their thinking are nationalism, hatred of war and a feeling of pride that Asia and the Asian people are now taking a deserved place of importance in the world.

In the last several months, this correspondent has talked with 50 or more persons here in southeast Asia with regard to the effectiveness of United States foreign policy in southeast Asia.

Some of these persons were American State Department personnel, others foreign government leaders. Some were newspapermen, local and foreign.

There was a virtual unanimity of opinion that these main forces at work in Asia must be fully appreciated if the United States is to shape an effective foreign policy for the area.

After years of living under the rule of strangers and seeing their wealth exploited by those strangers, the people here are choosing their own leaders and trying to run their own countries.

There are poverty, illiteracy, and disease in these countries. They need help to overcome these burdens. But they do not want that help if it is going to rob them of their hard-won independence.

The hatred of war is a dominant force in shaping the thinking of these countries. All have experienced war. Burma, Indonesia, Malaya, Laos, and South Vietnam are even now plagued by internal strife.

For these people, war means burned-out villages, sudden death, and the fear of sudden death. They want an end to it.

Linked with their nationalism and hatred of war is a feeling of pride in Asia itself. The dark-skinned and yellow-skinned peoples are coming into their own.

These peoples find unity in a feeling that their culture is older than the white man's, in a common past experience and common present problems. Thus any achievement in any country of Asia develops now a shared pride of achievement.

What can the United States do to harness these main forces now at work in southeast Asia so that these countries will not become the dupes of communism?

PRINCIPAL SUGGESTIONS

The general opinion was that, in spite of its global commitments, the United States, recognizing that colonialism is dead, must denounce it in clear terms.

As Secretary of State Dulles did during his visit to Indonesia, the fact should be emphasized that the United States once suffered under colonial rule itself; that it threw off that rule by force of arms and that, because it has shared their experiences, it understands the problems of the newly sovereign states.

The opinion was that the United States should support the principle that the people should have the right to choose who should govern them.

Such a stand, it was felt, is in the democratic tradition of the United States, and the Asian people should be helped to understand that this is the traditional United States position.

It is felt in diplomatic circles here that Mr. Dulles cannot uphold the principles of the United States Declaration of Independence in Indonesia while the United States Ambassador to France, C. Douglas Dillon, speaks of United States support for the French in north Africa.

The day after Mr. Dillon spoke in Paris his remarks were printed in the Communist Indonesian press parallel to those of Mr. Dulles. The Communist press considered the remarks as proof that Secretary Dulles was lying and that here was fresh evidence that the United States traditionally supported—and supported with arms—the colonial powers.

EMPHASIS ON PEACE URGED

The comment of a missionary's son who has spent all of his life in Asia represents a fair cross-section of opinion. He said:

"Putting aside the traditional American position with regard to independence and to colonialism, do we really think that in the long run the French, with all the arms at their disposal, will be able to wipe out nationalist feeling in north Africa any more than they were able to do it in Indochina or the Dutch were able to do it in Indonesia?"

He went on to say:

"If there is one lesson we should have learned in Asia, if we hadn't already learned it during the American Revolution, it's that you don't stop popular movements by killing people. You only provide martyrs and that means that there will be even more devoted followers of the cause of the revolution.

"The United States should not lose out to communism by backing unworthy causes that are already lost."

As a second point, emphasis should be put on the United States love of peace, its desire

to disarm, and President Eisenhower's "open-sky" plan for mutual aerial inspection of atomic arsenals. The feeling was that an end should be made to the continual United States talk about its armed might, its military alliances and its atomic striking power.

While diplomats in this area probably more keenly than most realize the need for such military strength, they also feel that it does great harm to publicize United States strength. It lends credence to the Communist propaganda line that the United States is bent on destroying peace in the area.

American aid is badly needed here, but it was felt the United States must not give the impression that it is trying to buy the goodwill of the Asians.

NEED FOR VIEW OF GOOD WILL

It was agreed that men of good will and ability are worth more than hundreds of millions blindly poured into the area in the hope that somehow the countries of Asia will resist communism.

There was complete agreement among those interviewed that the United States overseas-aid program must be streamlined and improved. Redtape must be cut away so that needed supplies, equipment, and men can be put at the disposal of countries quickly and efficiently.

In this connection, one idea that had been put forward met with wide approval. It was suggested that to accomplish the program the United States must call on the technical and manpower resources of American industry on a patriotic basis.

In most instances, the United States is not putting its best foot forward in recipient countries.

The proposal, therefore, is that personnel should be borrowed from large industry, with industry agreeing to lend some of its good employees to the Government for a year or two at a time to help the Asian countries and thus, in turn, help win the "cold war" for the United States.

In that way, the southeast Asian countries would have the advantage of utilizing the full abilities of good American technicians. The recommendations of the people in the field should then be trusted so that much of the Washington redtape, which now often holds up projects for a year or more, could be eliminated.

There was virtual unanimity of opinion also that the United States should stress more its own cultural and intellectual achievements. In this way, a greater appeal would be made to the students of southeast Asia, who are the potential leaders of the area.

More of these students should be sent to the United States to study, not for a few months or a year but for a full 4-year college course. It has been found that the United States is well able to "sell" itself to such visitors.

LESS TALK OF REDS ASKED

Another point that was made frequently, particularly by Asians, was that the United States should cut down sharply on the talk about communism. The United States has already made it clear that communism is a dangerous and evil system.

The feeling is that harping on communism gives Asians an impression that the United States is a narrowminded and undemocratic nation.

Sympathetic Asian officials maintain that, instead of concentrating its fire on communism, the United States should now give more emphasis to its own positive accomplishments, its rising standard of living for working people and the high health and education standards for its children.

In connection with this matter of continual emphasis on communism, one Asia newspaper editor said:

"It seems to us that the United States will not take any stand in world affairs—including the matter of colonialism—without first relating the subject to communism and mentioning the matter of communism. We get fed up with America's one-track mind."

Despite these suggestions as to redirection of United States foreign policy, there is agreement that the present policy has achieved some results in Asia.

Much of the United States effort has stressed the essential evil of communism and the trap that communism sets for unwary people. The United States has had some success in propagating this idea and many Asians have learned to recognize and detest communism.

But communism is not yet a bad word in Asia. A villager in Indonesia, just as a villager in Thailand, might very well go out and vote for a Communist in an election if the Communist promised him things that he desired.

However, probably the most important achievement of United States foreign policy has been the propping up of newly sovereign states. These states were thus able to withstand the internal pressure of communism and the external threat of aggression.

DANGER SEEN IN ALLIANCE

If it were not for United States aid, South Vietnam would almost certainly have collapsed, as might Laos and Cambodia. Aid to Indonesia in the early days of independence helped that republic to survive.

The United States has also succeeded in shaping a military alliance whose purpose is physical containment of communism and thus serves as a deterrent to war.

However, Asians in neutral countries are not kindly disposed toward the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. They are afraid it might cause rather than prevent a war.

Among those countries sensitive to foreign interference, the fact that there are only 3 Asian members as compared to 5 non-Asian participants is a glaring weakness of the pact. That imbalance leads credence to the Communist position that the alliance represents an outside threat to the peace of Asia.

The members are the United States, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, Pakistan and the Philippines. The agreement covers their territories and in addition those of Cambodia, Laos and South Vietnam.

Many persons interviewed compared what the United States had accomplished by its foreign policy with what the Communists had accomplished.

It is apparent that the Communists have concentrated on trying to channel the main currents in Asia to their advantage. Thus they talk continually of their desire for peace. Conversely they try to link the United States with the word "war." In this repect, United States saberrattling has helped them.

Colonialism is continually denounced by the Communists and every effort is made to link the United States with colonialism. Mr. Dulles' statement on Goa gave the Communists good material with which to work. From it New Delhi inferred that the United States upheld Portuguese colonialism in India.

PAN-ASIANISM EMPHASIZED

Both the Russians and the Chinese have been laboring hard on the Pan-Asia idea. Nikita S. Khrushchev, the Soviet Communist Party's First Secretary, told the Burmese flatly: "We Russians are Asians."

Chou En-lai, Red China's Premier and Foreign Minister, took a leading role in last year's Asian-African Conference.

During his tour through south and southeast Asia, however, Mr. Dulles appeared to gain a better grasp of the situation and now seems ready to modify United States policy, at least in some measure. Some elements of the problems, however, appear to resist easy solution.

Among these is the fact that the neutral countries of southeast Asia are wary of the United States close relationships with President Syngman Rhee of South Korea and President Chiang Kai-shek of Nationalist China.

It is not that they object to the anti-Communist programs of those leaders but the fact that both avowedly would like to start a war to reunify their countries. Close American support of these leaders links the United States with a threat to touch off a third world war.

Conflict of interest within the United States has also snarled American foreign policy in Asia. Thus Burma made the point that she would not accept technical assistance from the United States unless she were allowed to pay for such assistance. She could pay only with her surplus rice crop. Washington was perfectly willing to give free technical assistance but it could not accept rice because the United States had its own rice surplus.

It was not until the Soviet Union sent technicians in exchange for Burmese rice that the United States became alarmed to the point where it would take some Burmese rice in exchange for assistance.

The United States foreign policy program needs flexibility, in the eyes of those familiar with the Asian scene. Required is a flexibility that will allow the United States to give as much economic aid as possible to a neutral Burma or an Indonesia, where it appears it will do some good, and a flexibility that will allow it to cut off military aid to Cambodia, where military aid appears wasted.

[From the New York Times of April 12, 1956]

UNITED STATES SAID TO LACK TACT IN FAR EAST—SURVEY IN REGION SHOWS MOST ALLIES FEEL THEY ARE CAST IN JUNIOR PARTNER ROLE—TALK OF WAR DEPLORED—CLARIFIED AMERICAN ATTITUDE TOWARD TAIWAN'S DEFENSE EVIDENTLY IS DESIRED

(By Robert Trumbull)

(Fifth of a series)

TOKYO, April 11.—Among America's best friends in Asia, Washington's apparent disregard of Asian nationalist motivations is one of the principal complaints against United States foreign policy affecting the area.

There seems to be a feeling in most of the countries of this region that Washington, instead of soliciting local opinion and tailoring policy accordingly, is inclined "to tell 'em, not ask 'em."

Where United States foreign policy has accommodated itself to this rising nationalism, it has succeeded. Where it has not done so, it has failed.

There is no basic difference in principle with the United States or its announced aims among the four countries of Northeast Asia—Japan, Korea, Nationalist China, and the Philippines. All are opposed to communism, as is the United States. All practice democracy, in varying degrees. All are seeking to raise the living standards of their people and appreciate the help the United States is giving them to do so.

POINTS MADE BY CRITICS

In these four countries, friendly critics of Washington policy as now practiced list these points of criticism, in addition to the failure of United States officials to take Asians fully into their confidence.

Too much accent on military strength and not enough on the economic and social advancement of the area.

Too much talk of war and not enough of peace.

An unclear attitude, or a failure to make it clear, just how far the United States would go in defense of Taiwan (Formosa) and its western approaches.

Last, but none the less important, what is construed as a lack of tact in administering aid programs.

A COMMON DENOMINATOR

All four countries have in common one characteristic that helps explain their sensitivity to any slight to their pride: All have been freed of foreign domination in recent years.

Korea and Taiwan were Japanese colonies till the end of World War II. The Philippine Islands were separated from United States rule only in 1946. And Japan, though never a colony, emerged 4 years ago from a brief but nonetheless humiliating military occupation by the United States.

Compared with the problems in other Asian countries, such as India, the obstructions facing United States foreign policy in the East Asian group are relatively minor. But conversations with local officials and competent foreign observers here, and the reports from correspondents of the New York Times in the other capitals, indicate that fundmental weaknesses in the American approach elsewhere may be highlighted by the apparent failures in this most friendly area of all.

In all four countries, the strength of United States policy seems to lie in its inflexible determination to support the free nations of Asia in opposition to Communist expansionism. The four friendly governments frankly recognize their dependence upon the United States for military support to maintain their democratic integrity.

The effect of some policies of the United States is to make its allies feel like junior partners. Their sense of nationalism cries out for equality in consultations. Sometimes, as the following country-by-country analysis may show, local attitudes may call for some forebearance and understanding in Washington if the Asian sense of propriety is to be appeased.

OPINIONS OF THE JAPANESE

The Japanese feel that the Americans still think of Japan, perhaps unconsciously, in terms of the occupation and of the Korean war—in other words, as a base for American military excursions elsewhere. The use of United States troops stationed in Japan for the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization demonstration in far-off Bangkok furthered this impression.

There has been too much public emphasis by the Americans on the buildup of Japan's own defense forces, and too little on the strengthening of Japan's economy. Officially, Washington's policy today is to avoid pushing Japanese military expansion at the expense of economic and political stability. But the United States has not yet succeeded in making this clear to the Japanese public.

The Japanese people, 4 years ago after the San Francisco peace treaty came into effect, still don't feel independent, and it galls them.

The security arrangements between the United States and Japan appear to the Japanese to have been forced upon their Government as a price of the treaty. They recognize their inability to defend themselves without United States help, but they would like the present agreement, under which United States forces are stationed here, to be superseded by a new defense pact in which Japan could have a sense of equal partnership instead of dependence.

What many Americans forget is that the present pact neither obligates the United States to defend Japan, nor Japan to come to the assistance of the United States. It merely gives the United States the use of Japanese bases to preserve peace and stability in the Pacific.

The free world's strictures on trade with Communist China, to which Japan adheres, are an embarrassment to the Tokyo Government in the fact of local business interests. Japan would like the embargoes reduced at least to the levels governing Western trade with the Soviet Union.

More irritating than that, however, is a feeling that Washington may at any time make an important decision relative to Communist China, one of utmost concern to Japan. Without consulting Tokyo or even informing the Japanese Government in advance. For some reason, hard to pin down but obviously traceable to developments in the past, Japanese leaders lack this confidence in Washington.

PATIENCE NEEDED IN KOREA

The South Koreans also feel some sensitivity in what they conceive to be their subordinate role to United States officials. The situation in Korea, a country that plunged almost overnight from 35 years of colonial rule into devastating war, no doubt calls for patience and understanding on both sides.

In its simplest terms, the Korean policy under President Syngman Rhee is for the sternest possible military attitude against the Communists, who control the country north of the 38th parallel, and for a policy toward Japan that carries caution to the point of suspicion.

Aside from these two questions, the comments of Korean officials on United States policy in East Asia tended to criticize the tact with which it is administered in Korea, but not its substance.

TAIPEI FINDS UNCERTAINTY

As viewed from Taipei, United States policy on the China question appears to be marked by confusion and uncertainty. Continual exploitation of the China problem in domestic American politics has produced an impression of complete indecision, which in turn has led to a feeling of frustration among our Nationalist Chinese allies.

What is Washington's long-range policy on the whole China question? Will the United States defend the offshore islands? Is the United States really trying to make Taiwan self-sustaining economically or is it merely maintaining the island as a military base against mainland China?

All our allies—and many Americans—would like to know the answers to these questions.

Informed Filipinos, looking at Asia's problems from offshore and yet from the viewpoint of an Asian people long influenced by Western thought, agree with Japanese critics that the United States places too much emphasis on the military phase of the world ideological struggle. This is from a country that is one of the three Asian partners in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

The Filipinos want to see Taiwan and Japan defended against communism, for those islands are on the flanks of the Philippines. But, in the opinion of astute observers in Manila, the United States does so much talking about the military protection extended by Americans that the Filipinos feel a sense of inferiority.

SLOGAN GALLS FILIPINOS

"And let's forget about the slogan 'Show Window of Democracy,'" a Philippine Government official says, "We are a democracy all right, but when Americans call us a show window other Asians think we are just puppets."

In none of the East Asian countries is communism the principal opposing force to be considered in formulating United States policy, except as the military power and growing prestige of Communist China among other Asians constitute an influence counter to that of the United States. This is indeed a major factor, or should be, in guiding the American approach to Asians.

A survey in this area leads to the conclusion that issues stemming from nationalism are the basic conditioners of Asian thinking. Defense of the region's integrity against aggressive communism is one factor. But no less important to the healthy development of a free Asia are economic and social improvement, as Secretary of State Dulles said on his most recent visit here.

Underlying all these considerations must be a genuine solicitude for national consciousness. United States popularity suffers because of the feeling of junior partnership that permeates the East Asian free nations today.

[From the New York Times of April 13, 1956]

LATIN NATIONALISM CHALLENGES POLICY OF UNITED STATES, SURVEY INDICATES

(By Tad Szulc)

(Sixth of a series)

RIO DE JANEIRO, April 12.—There are signs of restlessness in the huge land mass that is South America. As it does elsewhere, the United States faces there a challenge to its leadership and foreign policy.

The challenge stems from a rising nationalism that is sweeping the continent from the Panama Canal to the bleakness of Tierra del Fuego. It takes various forms and seeks various expressions in accordance with the needs and conditions of each republic. On the whole, it is a new type of nationalism, finding its roots in the dynamism of the immense development of South America in recent decades, and particularly since the end of World War II.

It is not an exaggeration to say that a social and economic revolution is under way on this continent.

As the most powerful force now in being here, nationalism can be directed into channels useful to the South American countries themselves and can further strengthen the inter-American system and democracy in the hemisphere.

COMMUNISTS AWAIT CHANCE

But if allowed to take the wrong course, it could spill over into extremisms of left or right and the general harm that could ensue would be beyond estimation. Communism, its influence already growing noticeably in some parts of the continent, stands ready to take advantage of any such turn of events.

The challenge thus facing United States foreign policy in South America is to come to terms with the formidable new force of nationalism so it can be used for the common benefit.

Yet in the opinion of thoughtful South Americans and of many United States diplomats stationed in the region the problem does not often receive the urgent attention it deserves.

In their considered view, the United States lacks so far a coherent long-range policy tailored to meet the new situation. In this view, the present policy, too often based on improvisations, falls short of meeting the challenge.

A dramatic New Look policy, it is felt, requires a readjustment of political as well as economic relationships between the United States and its South American neighbors.

The two form part of an overall policy approach, of course, and any adjustments in the economic field are bound to have political repercussions. Of this the Soviet Union is keenly aware, as seen in Moscow's recent overtures for greater trade with Latin America and for possible technical aid.

These overtures are not likely to turn Latin America into an area of Soviet influfluence in the foreseeable future, but they have had political echoes the United States would be wise not to underestimate.

COLONIALISM MAJOR ISSUE

This is how United States problems of foreign policy in South America break down:

In the political field, South Americans no longer want to be taken for granted. They

resent being looked upon by Washington as an automatic majority in the United Nations and insist that more attention be given to their views in world affairs. This, they say, should mean more consultations with their diplomats in New York and Washington and more personal attention to the continent as a whole.

Though the consultations process has been improved lately, South Americans take offense at the fact that in 4 years Secretary Dulles has visited South America only once despite his extensive globetrotting.

One area of global policy where South Americans are growing particularly restless is the question of colonialism. Though their natural sympathy lies mainly with the colonial peoples, they often vote in the United Nations with the so-called colonial powers because of United States pressure. But there have been deep breaks in this front in recent votes in New York.

In terms of the East-West conflict, Washington has been successful in welding the continent into a solid anti-Communist bloc. South American traditions and the influence of the Roman Catholic Church have been helpful in this endeavor. But at the same time there is a growing feeling that United States policy is negative insofar as it concentrates on anticommunism and has little else to offer.

What looms as the most important and yet most difficult aspect of political relations is the question of democracy versus dictatorship in Latin America as a whole.

In a speech in New Orleans last October, Henry F. Holland, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, stated United States policy objectives in the hemisphere as follows:

"Consistent with our inter-American treaties and the principle of nonintervention, we shall try always to help those who work to perfect political institutions based on spiritual and moral principles, institutions that stand for personal freedom, and the sanctity of every man and woman."

However, liberal friends of the United States in South America contend that Washington has not lived up to this principle entirely. They deplore what they call the tacit support given by the United States to the existing dictatorships in Latin America—as well as to that of Juan D. Peron in Argentina before his ouster last September.

They contend the United States has been doing more than maintaining correct relations with these dictatorial regimes. This, they say, does not harmonize with the United States tradition of supporting democracy everywhere. It is, incidentally, also a strong argument for the Communists in those countries where they do not work along with the dictator, as was the case in Argentina at different times.

Local liberals are often dismayed when the United States seemingly goes out of its way to pat a dictatorial regime on the back. The award of the Legion of Merit to Venezuela's President Marcos Perez Jiminez is a case in point.

One experienced United States diplomat commented in this connection that relationships should be maintained with existing governments, such as they may be, but without appearing to endorse dictatorships.

It is evidently a difficult political undertaking and one that has plagued the Department of State for many years. But in the face of growing Communist infiltration in South America some form of solution is urgent if the liberals and the still uncommitted masses are to be kept on the side of democracy.

What is seen by many as a great failing of United States policy is that it is not employing its immense influence to encourage democracy and democratic processes in South America before communism and other extremisms make further inroads.

With political ferment in South America stemming from the growing social and economic pressures that follow the continent's development, extremisms are on the rise and some think it may soon become too late to check them altogether.

Thus in the political field, the United States must take care to maintain good relations with South America on the level of both world and domestic policies.

South Americans are beginning to have second thoughts about their relationship with the "colossus of the north." While nothing has happened so far to alter the basic policy orientations here and the reservoir of good will toward the United States is still brimful, it is imperative to maintain these orientations and good will in the face of changing conditions.

JUNIOR STATUS DISLIKED

South Americans who complain that they are treated as junior partners in political relations offer the same grievance about economic treatment from the United States.

Though their claim that they are kept down as suppliers of raw materials and obligatory consumers of United States finished goods is exaggerated, there is a powerful feeling among South Americans that they are not receiving the share of United States aid they deem necessary for orderly and rapid development.

They are bitter that the economic aid channeled to South America since the end of World War II is insignificant in comparison with what the United States has been spending elsewhere. This hurts nationalistic feelings here and the complaint is widely heard that Latin America's importance is not sufficiently recognized by the United States.

The contention is that, with pressing economic and social problems in this region, the United States should be as concerned over what is happening in its own backyard as it is elsewhere. This viewpoint, on both the economic and political level, finds considerable private support among veteran United States diplomats in this area. There is also resentment that too many promises have been left unfulfilled. South Americans would prefer less talk and more deeds.

A remark often repeated here half jestingly is that South America needs a bad Communist situation to attract United States attention. More seriously, the quick economic aid given Guatemala after the overthrow of her pro-Communist regime in 1954 is adduced as proof that there might be something to the remark.

South Americans—governments and private persons alike—also take exception to the basic philosophy of the Eisenhower administration toward aid to Latin America.

This philosophy is that the bulk of the aid should take the form of investments by private United States capital, with the Washington Government providing funds, usually as loans, only where private capital is unavailable and to create investment conditions.

But the South American problem is that where money is most needed is for such unprofitable yet fundamental projects as railroads, ports, highways, and dams, for which private investments are not forthcoming. Though the Export-Import Bank, a United States Government agency, has liberalized greatly its lending policies in Latin America in the last 2 years, it is felt that even these loans hardly scratch the surface of this continent's pressing development needs. This also holds true of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which also has recently expanded its operations in this region.

The current United States approach also has a side effect of attracting European competition to South America. Whereas loans from the Export-Import Bank usually finance United States equipment and technicians, European equipment is coming here at an increasing rate as European financial syndicates makes easy-term loans available to find export markets for their heavy products.

By far the brightest phase of United States aid here has been the point 4 program.

Working with limited funds, the program has done marvels in helping in basic economic and social projects in the American Republics. It also has generated much vitally needed good will for the United States. Policy specialists feel that a considerable expansion of this program would be an essential part of any "new look" hemisphere policy.

Thus the big problem facing Washington policymakers in South America is how to work out an adjustment to the enlightened nationalism that is rising here. That nationalism is backed by the power of 100 million awakening people and their immense natural resources. It is clamoring for recognition.

[From the New York Times of April 13, 1956]

LATIN-AMERICAN ISSUES

(By Paul P. Kennedy)

MEXICO CITY, April 12.—United States foreign policy for the Latin-American area north of Colombia is basically the same as that applying to the south, but there are differences of emphasis because of the region's geographic and historic position.

Policy in this region, which includes Panama, the five Central American Republics and Mexico is aimed more pronouncedly at the two objectives of establishing a solid community of interests and combating Communist encroachment.

In many respects, particularly in technical and educational assistance, the implementation of United States policy in this region generally has been highly successful. In other respects, particularly the economic field, the United States appears to be losing ground.

Aside from advances in technical and educational assistance, the most rewarding United States operation in this region is an increasing willingness to listen to the troubles of the seven nations and sincere attempts to do something about them.

This means an alacrity not only to iron out differences within the framework of the inter-American system but also to furnish material assistance where it is proved to be wanted and needed.

The weaknesses of foreign policy involve many factors, some of them beyond the control of policy planners. This is particularly true in the matter of price stabilization of commodities and the sale of United States surpluses abroad. The fluctuations in the prices of this region's basic export commodities can and usually do leave a residue of sourness toward the United States that goes far toward neutralizing the good will accumulated by those policies that have proved successful.

GROWING NATIONALISM

Growing nationalism, especially in Panama, Guatemala, and Mexico, is being generated largely because of the region's proximity to the United States and the latter's vast influence over the entire area. Essentially this growth points to a lack of that community of interests that is one of the basic objectives of United States policy.

Responsible Latin Americans of this region who are nominally friendly to the United States feel there are a number of ways to improve the potential of United States policy.

To begin with, they say, Washington, could strive for greater understanding and sympathy for Latin-American problems, not from the North American point of view but from the Latin point of view. In this connection it is felt that Europe, which is not remotely so involved in this region's welfare as is the

United States, has a far greater understanding of the area's problems.

Another area in which it is felt United States policy could be improved is the abandonment of what is viewed as an increasing tendency to trade financial and technical assistance for political advantage in the inter-American system. This is felt to be diametrically opposed to the original concept of the assistance program.

Many responsible observers, North American as well at Latin American, are convinced some of the United States policy planners see a moral lapse in any country that accepts assistance but disagrees with any of Washington's views on American affairs.

[From the New York Times of April 13, 1956]

METHODS IRK CANADA

(By Raymond Daniell)

OTTAWA, April 12.—With the broad over-all aims of United States foreign policy, most Canadians, official and unofficial, are in complete sympathy. Indeed these aims are almost identical. However, the application of these policies often occasions surprise and sometimes suspicion.

Responsible officials here are wary of criticizing the action of their big neighbor and partner in defense. However, among some of them and among Western diplomats and students of foreign affairs there is a growing feeling that all is not so rosy for the West and the free world as it has been painted recently in Washington.

It is feared that Washington has been lacking in bold, daring leadership and that the policy of containing the Soviet Union has become too rigid and inflexible and that too great a reliance has been placed on military alliances without accomanying political understanding. The feeling is strong that to meet the new Soviet challenge in the Middle East and Far East new "policies and methods" must be evolved, although there is little agreement on what form they should take.

Canadians would like to see greater coordination of policy between the United States and its allies on such matters as the Middle East crisis, more emphasis on economic cooperation and less stress and reliance on military alliances.

Canadians feel that there is no future for Chiang Kai-shek. They see no possibility of his returning to the mainland short of a general war. They would be happier if the United States were not so firmly committed to him. The idea of the ultimate evolution of two Chinas is received with skepticism.

Lester B. Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs, frequently has dissociated Canada from any commitments in the Far East other than as a member of the United Nations. He also has said that while the future of Taiwan (Formosa) remains to be settled, he regards Matsu and Quemoy as part of mainland China.

In most quarters here, it is felt that the United States would be wise to adopt a similar view. Mr. Pearson also has said often that sooner or later the West must recognize the reality of Communist control of China.

Canadians are inclined to dislike the boastfulness and bombast with which policy is sometimes enunciated in the United States. They feel also that military leaders are inclined too much to make policy statements. Secretary of State Dulles comes in for a good deal of editorial criticism for talking too much.

The chief problem for the United States in dealing with Canada is to avoid offending national sensibilities. Since the war Canada has grown in stature. Sometimes it is felt here that the United States is inclined to act as if Canada were an appendage of the United States that need be neither considered nor consulted—just told.

There is no Communist movement in Canada worthy of the name and, in fact, socialism is on the wane.

[From the New York Times of April 15, 1956]

UNITED STATES AIDES MAINLY REJECT FOREIGN POLICY CRITICISMS—HOWEVER, CONSENSUS IN WASHINGTON SEEMS TO ACCEPT NEED FOR REEVALUATION OF NATION'S COLD WAR STRATEGY

(By James Reston)

(Final of a series)

WASHINGTON, April 14.—Uncle Sam, policeman, banker, and babysitter to the world, is defensive and a little resentful about all the recent overseas criticism of his foreign policy.

As the old gentleman sees it, here he is with the Communists at the back door, a house full of complaining relatives, politicians yawping all over the place, the dishes piled high in the kitchen sink—and instead of appreciating his efforts, everybody criticizes him and nobody loves him.

That is the official attitude, and well-informed observers here are more sympathetic than their fellow grumblers in other capitals. They agree with most of the criticisms reported in this series of articles by correspondents of the New York Times, but they think these criticisms must be evaluated against this background:

This is a time of extraordinary change. The strategy of the cold war, the location of the struggle, even the nature of power itself are all in transition.

British power has declined beyond all Washington's calculations.

The same with French power, only worse.

German and Japanese power, which contained the expansion of communism in Central Europe and Asia for most of this century, has collapsed.

Since 1947, 2,800,000,000 people—half the population of the world—have changed their form of government. Most of them have achieved independence for the first time, and are struggling with misery and clamoring to be heard.

The post-Stalin rulers of the Soviet Union, allied to the might of Communist China, have changed their methods and the arena of the "cold war." Their tactics of wooing the Socialists in Europe and exploiting the anti-Western, anti-Israel sentiments of the Middle East and South Asia are much more cunning than Stalin's.

The United States, engaged in a national election campaign, with underdeveloped areas of its own to worry about, is the only nation in the free world with power equal to the power of the Communists. And it is administered by a party that has a long tradition of opposing the collective security, low tariff and foreign aid policies it is now supporting.

CRITICISMS HEARD IN CAPITAL

Against this background, what is the reaction of well-informed men in and out of the Government in Washington to the major criticisms reported in this series? This reporter has discussed them with 18 of the most experienced diplomats and officials in the capital. What follows are the major criticisms and a summary of their observations:

Criticism No. 1: The United States has been slow and ineffective in reacting to the smiling subversion of the Communists, and has placed too much emphasis on military solutions and not enough emphasis on political, economic and social solutions to present world problems.

Officials here reject this criticism. As a matter of fact, it should be said at the outset that the official line here is to reject almost all adverse criticism as ill-informed and unfair.

This reporter has not found a single official who has read all the articles. The Secretary of State would make no comment about them, and the officials who discussed them did so on the condition that they were talking for background and could not be quoted.

However, the official line is this:

The military balance has not changed. The Soviet Union retains its objectives of world conquest and its capacity to attempt that conquest by force of arms. Therefore, someone has to maintain the military balance and oppose the drift in the free world to mental and military disarmament.

From July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1955, the United States net expenditures for foreign military and economic aid totaled $51,300 million. It gross expenditures in the current fiscal year, ending June 30, 1956, will be $4,200 million for the same purpose, making a total of $55,500 million for the 11-year period.

The United States has maintained a high level of military expenditures for a permanent Military Establishment, based on conscription, without which nobody would have the freedom or energy today to criticize Washington.

ARMED FORCE EMPHASIZED

These expenditures since the Eisenhower administration came to power were: fiscal 1954, $40,300,000,000; fiscal 1955, $35,500,000,000; fiscal 1956 (estimated), $34,600,000,000; fiscal 1957 (estimated), $35,900,000,000.

The United States has emphasized military defense, because this is the primary deterrent to an attempt by the Communists to achieve their aims by force of arms. Maybe it has overemphasized this side of the cold war in the light of changing circumstances, but it has done so because of the natural tendency in free societies to let down whenever fear of imminent war declines.

At the same time, despite opposition in the Republican Party to foreign economic aid, the Eisenhower administration has made the following expenditures for foreign economic aid:

Fiscal 1954: $1,300,000,000 (military, $3,600,000,000); fiscal 1955: $2,000,000,000 (military, $2,300,000,000); fiscal 1956 (estimated), $1,700,000,000 (military $2,500,000,000); fiscal 1957 (estimated), $1,800,000,000 (military $2,500,000,000).

Moreover, officials here emphasize that by his atoms-for-peace plan and his insistence on dramatizing the peaceful rather than the military aspects of the atom, the President has produced the most imaginative nonmilitary international plan since the Marshall plan, and has been the first American politician to announce publicly that foreign aid has to be placed on a more or less permanent basis.

This, then, is the answer of the officials. The reaction of the non-Government observers to all this is that the administration was right in backing these programs, but that it was imprudent to emphasize them as much as it did.

MAJOR STRATEGIC DEFEAT

The result of this emphasis, these officials feel, was to damage the cause of the United States in Asian eyes by raising fears of war. They feel this worked greatly to the advantage of the Communists in the so-called uncommitted parts of the world; and that it was unfair to the peaceful objectives and great economic sacrifices of the American people.

Beyond this, many non-Government observers here believe that President Eisenhower, more than anybody else in the world, was responsible at the Big Four meeting in Geneva for encouraging the wishful thinking about the Communists his administration now deplores.

Almost all agree that he enjoyed a great personal success at Geneva but suffered a major strategic defeat. For it was there that the Communists really dramatized their policy and propaganda for peaceful coexistence, and got the pictures of President Eisenhower and Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin that

they scattered all over the world with General Eisenhower's public statement that he believed the Russians were as sincerely devoted to peace as anybody else.

Indeed, the fact that the Eisenhower administration is now turning around and trying to emphasize the economic, political, and social aspects of the world struggle is taken as concrete evidence that the previous emphasis on massive retaliation with atomic weapons was unwise.

Veteran diplomats here are constantly saying that history is full of evidence of policies that were good at one time and in one place but not so good or worse at another time and another place. They point to the North Atlantic Treaty as a vital military deterrent, which did much to create stability in Europe.

But they contend that Mr. Dulles' insistence on extending this same policy to the alliances involving Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan did not change the military balance in this area. These diplomats contend it resulted in infuriating the Indians, the Egyptians and finally the Russians, who leapfrogged over it into the new Moscow policy of economic and political penetration in the Middle East.

Criticism No. 2: The United States foreign economic policy has not kept pace with its policy of military solidarity, and the United States, meanwhile, has been urging upon its allies trade and political-union policies it is not prepared to adopt itself.

On this one there is little difference in Washington between Government and non-Government opinion. The Eisenhower administration is not happy about its policies on trade, ship subsidies or customs, or at least some members of it are not. The President, for example, favors a more liberal trade and aid policy.

One Cabinet member said to this reporter: "We don't have one foreign economic policy; we have 49 different foreign economic policies, some of them administered by one department and some by another. The whole thing needs to be pulled together."

He added that this should be done very slowly and carefully. His point was that the United States was probably approaching the fiercest competition from the Soviet Union, West Germany, Britain, and Japan since before World War I, and that it had to be extremely careful that it did not give away its weapons in this field.

As to the political-union pressure on the allies out of Washington, everybody here agrees that this is a good idea for Europe but out of the question, politically, here. Good idea but bad politics, Washington says. And, of course, that is what London and Paris say, too.

Criticism No. 3: The United States has been the prisoner of its own domestic political slogans in the presidential election campaign of 1952 and of the cold war slogans of liberation and massive retaliation thereafter.

It is generally admitted here, at least by observers outside the Government, that this is a valid criticism. The Republicans had been out of power for 20 years. They concentrated in the 1952 campaign, as all political parties do, on the weakness of the opposition. The best target in that opposition was that China had been taken over by the Communists during President Harry S. Truman's last term, and the Republicans set out to exploit this historic development.

In the process, they contended that this loss was the Democrats' fault, that the liberal New Deal, being oriented to the left, was soft on communism, that this was proved by Washington's half-way war in Korea, and by its policy of bridling Chiang Kai-shek, and its policy of "containment." This last was portrayed as a policy of acquiescing to the vast wartime gains of the Soviet Union.

Probably none of this was as potent in the 1952 election as the popularity of General Eisenhower, the fierce antipathy among the people to the bloodshed in Korea and the general public boredom with a party that had been in power for a generation.

WARLIKE TALK CONTINUED

Nevertheless, the combination of all these factors broke the Roosevelt coalition of the Deep South and the minority groups in the large urban areas of the North. So the Republicans carried on the aggressive talk after they got into office, while at the same time cutting their economic commitments.

Thus, they unleashed General Chiang, threatened massive retaliation, and warned the French that if Paris did not accept the European Defense Community as a means to the political union of Europe, Washington would undertake an "agonizing reappraisal" about its whole policy of alliance with Western Europe.

At no time, however, did this administration ever have the courage of its propaganda. It soon leashed President Chiang when the consequences of unleashing him became apparent. It aquiesced in the partition of Indochina. It swallowed France's rejection of EDC, and when it took a hard look at the consequences of trying to "liberate" territories taken over by the armies of the Soviet Union and Communist China, it withdrew in a torrent of aggrieved rhetoric.

Nevertheless, it hung on to its cold war slogans about Communist China, put pro-Chiang figures in key positions in the State Department (Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, for example) and placated the bloc embracing Mr. Robertson and Senator William F. Knowland, Republican, of California; Senator Styles Bridges, Republican, of New Hampshire, and Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. These four leaders opposed any change in the legal status of China.

Thus the administration found itself frozen between its allies who wanted to recognize Communist China and its political opposition within the Republican Party, which wanted an aggressive policy toward Peiping. This compromise pleased nobody—not President Chiang or the Taiwan bloc in the party, or the Chinese Communists, or the Asian neutrals.

Criticism No. 4: The leaders of the free world coalition in Washington have no effective plan for waging the more subtle second phase of the cold war. They are inflexible and inexperienced moralizers who preach against the old pragmatic diplomacy of the past but have nothing practical to put in its place.

Again the Government officials reject and resent this criticism but the non-Government observers think there is a lot to it. The view of the Government officials is that the United States is between the acts in the great world drama, and that the critics should wait until the United States, which is a democracy that must move by persuasion and congressional consent, gets the stage properties in order for the next act.

It is true that after years of experimenting with planning boards at the State Department level, and at the Cabinet level, psychological warfare experts, cold war strategists in the White House, and the National Security Council, the United States still operates largely on a temporary basis, one crisis at a time.

UNITED STATES MUDDLING THROUGH

Washington put pressure on the British to get out of Suez without insisting on a quid pro quo. It was enamored first with King Farouk, and then with Farouk's two dictator successors, Gen. Mohammed Naguib and Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser. It took credit for settling the Suez situation, which is now creating havoc with the whole Western coalition.

It risked the defection of India to placate Nationalist China and Pakistan, and by getting itself involved everywhere on a mediator basis, found itself in trouble with the Arabs and the Israelis, the French and the Algerians, the Portuguese and the Indians (over Goa), the British and the Greeks, and the Turks (over Cyprus), and the Dutch and the Indonesians (over New Guinea).

Thus, say Mr. Dulles' critics, the United States has merely replaced London's "muddling through" with Washington's "muddling through," and has sought to please everybody and ended by pleasing nobody.

Much of this is laid to the Secretary of State. The general feeling here is that the President leaves almost everything to him unless it is an issue of peace or war, and that Mr. Dulles has a weakness for trying to please the side he is talking to at the moment, and a fatal flaw of talking and moralizing too much the rest of the time.

One diplomat, who is friendly to the Secretary of State, put it this way:

"It is obviously impossible for Mr. Dulles to please everybody or to follow a consistent policy in situations all over the world which are contradictory. If he would only proceed in a hardheaded way, and with a series of clear priorities, to do precisely what he thought was in the best interests of the United States, he would get along better.

"He wouldn't be liked for that, but in the end, he would be respected, for the selfish pursuit of a nation's interests is a reality everybody with any experience understands."

In summary, the general feeling here is that there is a need in Washington for a reevaluation of the United States cold war policies, and particularly its tactics and public attitudes. There has been a loss of confidence in American leadership. This much is widely felt here, but all knowledgeable observers go back to the big point:

In short, to be policeman, banker, and babysitter to a restless and changing world when the coalescing force of fear has been largely removed, is a tough assignment.

[From the New York Times of April 15, 1956]

THE UNITED STATES AND ITS CRITICS

During the past week this newspaper completed a survey by its correspondents of the impacts and impressions made by American foreign policy on free public opinion in five continents. The survey registered so much, and such diverse, criticism as to suggest a certain failure by this Nation, which prides itself on its advertising genius, to sell its own policy or to meet Soviet competition in this field.

Some of the criticism seems to us to be justified and well worth heeding. Some of it derives from emotion, ideology, or self-interest, but mere refutation does not solve the problem. All of it should be made subject to further analysis, deliberation and consultation with our friends and allies to correct faults, to devise remedies and thereby to strengthen free world unity.

Two central facts emerge. One is that the United States, because of its wealth and power, must assume primary responsibility for the destiny of the free world. The other is that, barring only occasional suspicions to the contrary, the United States is not being accused of any selfish ambitions for conquest or self-aggrandizement. On the contrary, our contributions to economic rehabilitation and military security are freely acknowledged, even if without gratitude in some cases or full realization of the contrast between our policy and the predatory policy of the Soviets.

Taking these central facts into account, the most common criticism boils down to this—that in contrast to the bold and even revolutionary policies represented by the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic alliance, which saved Western Europe, our policy

has become too static, too rigid, and even too timid to solve the world's pressing problems. Some of this criticism may sound strange to American ears, considering President Eisenhower's efforts at Geneva, his bold atoms-for-peace, open sky, and other disarmament proposals, and his pressure for an expanded, continuous, and more flexible foreign-aid program.

But the criticism is not directed against the aims of our policy, nor even its strategy, but rather, against our tactics. Here we are being criticized both for doing too much and for doing too little. In the eyes of Europe, especially its leftist elements, and even more in the eyes of neutralist Asia, we concern ourselves too much with the Communist menace, now said to be reduced by Stalin's death, and concentrate too much on military security to the point of saber rattling. Europe still values its alliances with us, but neutralist Asia fails to realize that only the protective umbrella of these alliances permits it to be neutral with impunity.

On the other hand, we are being criticized for not doing enough by refusing to take sides in quarrels between our friends and allies, which disappoints both sides; by failing to give adequate support to anticolonial nationalism and also to colonial powers seeking to suppress rebellion, which makes both sides mistrust us; above all, by failing to share both our power and our wealth even more freely than heretofore. Much of this criticism is obviously contradictory and cancels itself. Some of it goes beyond practical possibilities. If this survey makes some of our critics realize this, it will have served both us and them.

All this, however, still leaves room for improvement. We firmly believe that we are more realistic about the Communist menace than our critics, and we shall continue to maintain and develop our military power and our alliances to deter Communist aggression. But it is still a good maxim to speak softly when carrying a big stick, and to do that will prevent the Soviets from exploiting unwise remarks for the benefit of their "peace offensive." We will also have to develop new and more comprehensive programs not only for foreign aid but also for foreign trade, investment, and development to meet the Soviet economic offensive without impairing the interests or offending the sensibilities of other nations.

Such programs can be developed only in consultation and cooperation with the rest of the free world. But the initiative will have to come from the United States, and this fact confronts us with a task worthy of the best brains we can command.

VETO OF THE FARM BILL

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, President Eisenhower has again demonstrated the courage of his convictions in vetoing H. R. 12, the so-called farm bill.

It was with keen disappointment that the President felt impelled to veto a bill containing the soil-bank provisions which he himself had recommended. However, in deciding whether to approve or disapprove proposed legislation, all provisions of a bill must be taken into account, not just its good features. In the case of H. R. 12, the President found that the bad features of the bill outweighed the good, and he made his decision accordingly.

The fact that there may be no general farm legislation this year, as predicted by the majority leadership in the event of a veto, does not mean there will be no marked improvement in the farm situation. The Agricultural Act of 1954 is on the statute books, and has recently taken full effect. Under this and other existing legislation, it will be possible to do administratively many things to make conditions better. The President has already indicated what some of these steps will be.

Had the soil-bank provisions not been encumbered by other provisions which many of us consider to be unsound and actually income-reducing, and had the bill been enacted early enough, it could conceivably have made 1956 a record year for agricultural income. However, we may still look forward optimistically to a good year—a far better year than 1955. Producers of livestock, dairy and poultry products, feed grains, and basic commodities will all benefit by the programs which the President and the Secretary of Agriculture have already approved. Markets should be recovered and expanded for some commodities.

Above all else, the farm people may be assured that their administration is constantly on the alert for means to enhance the general level of farm income.

Like President Eisenhower, many of us still hope that Congress will decide to approve a sound soil-bank program not encumbered by barnacles of either defeatism or fear.

Whether this eventuates or not, however, we have reached the point from which the American farmer, under the inspiring leadership of a great President and his Secretary of Agriculture, may look to the future with greater confidence.

FARM INCOME AND SUBSIDIES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on this occasion it seems to me only appropriate that we consider some of the fundamental things the farmers themselves are thinking about. One of the fine publications in the western section of the Nation is Western Farm Life, which has just conducted a poll in regard to Government subsidies, limit payments, livestock shows, and farm income. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial showing the results of the poll.

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

WFL's ACROSS THE FENCE—A SURVEY OF FARM AND RANCH OPINION IN THE INTERMOUNTAIN REGION

Government subsidies: Do you believe agriculture would be better off going it alone in a free market with no Government regulations and no Government payments in the form of subsidies?

	Percent
Yes	56.8
No	37.6
No comment	5.6

Limit payments: Would you favor stopping all Government payments to farmers and ranchers who have a net income from all sources of more than $5,000?

	Percent
Yes	71.7
No	24.6
No comment	3.7

Livestock shows: Do you think the major livestock shows which are held around the country are a benefit to the livestock industry?

	Percent
Yes	77.4
No	16
No comment	6.6

Farm income: Do you think your farm or ranch income will be more, or less, or remain the same in 1956, compared with 1955?

	Percent
More	14.2
Less	47.1
Same	33.9
No comment	4.8

Over 50 percent of the farmers and ranchers of the West, who took the time to answer a recent Western Farm Life survey, believe agriculture would be much better off going it alone in a free market with no Government regulations and no Government payments in the form of subsidies.

An Idaho farmer says the methods used by our lawmakers and the Department of Agriculture are not doing the farmers and ranchers any good, but keep getting us into more difficulties in every attempt.

An operator from Montana thinks subsidies and regulations should go. He believes there would be more competition and the inefficient operator would be forced to quit. And, better still, city farmers would be forced to quit because they would no longer be guaranteed a price for their commodities.

A Nevada producer says it might be tough on some for a short time, but as soon as the markets reached their levels everyone would be better off.

With labor and industry organized to protect their interests, the family-type farm cannot survive without subsidies, is the opinion of a farmer from Wyoming.

A Nebraskan thinks that we should not only keep our present subsidies but increase supports to 90–100 percent.

Nearly three fourths of western farmers and ranchers can't understand why the Government should pay subsidies to anyone with a net income of over $5,000.

A Wyoming farmer says the big operators are running the little fellow out of business as it is without paying him subsidies. A New Mexico lady said she couldn't see why business and professional men, who own farms or ranches, should be paid farm subsidies when their net income is already well above the average farmer.

An Idaho producer can't see any reason for holding down farmers when $5,000 is just a starter in many businesses. A Colorado farmer wants to continue large subsidies as long as other industries receive large Government payments.

A large majority of western farmers and ranchers believe the major livestock shows around the country are a benefit to the livestock industry. A Utah rancher says the shows encourage better breeding which in turn brings better prices to stockmen. An Arizona breeder says the shows give other people an idea of what better breeding can do for livestock.

A Colorado rancher doesn't think much of the shows because no commercial grades are shown and therefore shows do no good for the great bulk of the cattle industry. A Montana cowman says that in his opinion this is an altogether different industry than raising cattle for slaughter.

Most westerners feel their income will remain the same or be less in the coming year. A Utah farmer said besides the cost-price squeeze he is faced with a water shortage. A Nevada farmer says his income will be the same if costs remain the same. And a Colorado farmer says if his income doesn't go up it will be the first time in 7 years.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until Wednesday next at noon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO REPORT INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may be authorized to file its report on House bill 9390, the Interior Department appropriation bill, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may not be in session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

VETO OF THE FARM BILL (H. DOC. NO. 380)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a veto message which is now being read in the House of Representatives, whereby the President returns without his approval H. R. 12, designated as the "Agricultural Act of 1956."

Mr. President, the veto of the farm bill can be described only as a crushing blow to the hopes and the legitimate desires of American agriculture.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, my statement will be very brief, and at its close I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. President, the President has now drawn a line which puts his administration without any ifs, ands, or buts on the side of those who believe that low farm prices are the answer to the agricultural problems of the day. Farmers are now—by the President's own decision today—completely at the mercy of Ezra Taft Benson.

In return for depriving the farmers of more than $2 billion in income this year, the President holds forth a bone. He says Secretary Benson will set price supports on the basics at 82½ percent of parity and increase the supports on milk and butter.

Mr. President, what is significant is that, after 3 years of falling farm income and after the Congress has debated the bill for weeks, yes, even months, the administration is finally going to use administrative powers it has had all along to help the farmers. And while it accuses us in the Congress of passing a farm bill which it says is inconsistent, how does it propose to help the farmers? It proposes to help them by raising price-support levels. The only difference is that the administration's price-support levels are not quite so high as are the price-support levels set by the Congress.

Mr. President, I do not believe our farmers will find that their very real and pressing needs are met by this compromise of principle. In effect, it is merely a rigid price support set at a level too low to be useful.

The President offers to abandon the principle of flexibility if Congress will abandon the principle of adequate farm income. This cannot be considered a justified compromise in any honorable sense of the word.

In the course of his statement, the President requests Congress to pass a straight soil-bank bill as soon as possible. This is a strange request to be making at this late date.

The President himself—by deciding to set rigid price supports at 82½ percent of parity—has already conceded that it is not enough to solve our agricultural problems. If he truly wants—or truly has wanted—the soil bank, he has had ample authority to institute one all along.

All he had to do under existing law is to request funds and go ahead.

I deeply regret the action the President has taken. It is not responsive to the needs of agriculture, but it is obvious that this administration does not want to meet these needs.

By his veto, the President has created a stalemate. I have talked to prominent Members of the Senate who are deeply involved in agricultural legislation.

They are not receptive to the prospects of another long, frustrating effort to compromise what cannot apparently be compromised.

Congress is seeking to raise farm income to adequate levels. The administration is seeking to keep farm income down. There can be no answer until one or the other is changed.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, while the message itself has been read in the House, or is to be read—I assume it is now being read—in view of the statements made by the distinguished majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that there may appear in the RECORD at this point—because the veto message is not long—the message of the President of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The veto message is as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H. R. 12, designated as the Agricultural Act of 1956.

It is with intense disappointment and regret that I must take this action. I assure you my decision has been reached only after thorough consideration and searching my mind and my conscience. Our farm families are suffering reduced incomes. They had a right to expect workable and beneficial legislation to help solve their problems. This bill does not meet their needs.

I am disappointed at the long delays which this legislation encountered. My first special request in this session of the Congress was for prompt remedial farm legislation. A sound, constructive 9-point program to this end was submitted on January 9, with an urgent request for action. It was a program that came from the grass roots. Suggestions and criticisms from large numbers of farm people, in every type of agriculture, from every section of the country, were analyzed and used. It offered no magic panacea because, we can all agree, there is none. It did strike directly at the root of the low price—low-income problem.

The problem is price-depressing surpluses. Excess stocks of certain farm commodities have mounted to market-destroying, price-depressing size as a result of wartime price incentives too long continued. Any forward looking, sound program to meet the needs of farm people must remove the burden of these accumulations. They are depressing net farm income by many hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

H. R. 12 would not correct this situation. It would encourage more surpluses. It would do harm to every agricultural region of the country and also to the interests of consumers. Thus it fails to meet the test of being good for farmers and fair to all our people.

The bill is self-defeating. The soil-bank proposal has been incorporated. This would be constructive, had it not been encumbered by contradictory provisions. The soil bank would provide an income incentive to farmers to reduce production temporarily so that surplus stocks might be reduced. Other provisions of this bill, however, would result in an equal or greater incentive to increase production and accumulate more surplus.

Among the provisions which make this bill unacceptable are: (1) The return to a wartime rigid 90 percent of parity supports for the basic commodities; (2) dual parity for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts; (3) mandatory price supports for feed grains; (4) multiple price plans for wheat and rice. The effect of these provisions would be to increase the amount of Government control and further add to our price-depressing surpluses.

Specific objections relative to each of these provisions may be summarized as follows:

1. Price supports at wartime 90 percent of parity on basic crops were in effect in each year from 1944 through 1954. They were not responsible for the high commodity prices and high farm income of wartime and the immediate postwar years. Prices were then above support levels, due to wartime inflation and the insatiable markets associated with war. Neither did 90-percent supports prevent prices from falling as postwar surplus stocks began to accumulate.

Price supports at wartime 90 percent on the 6 designated basic crops did encourage production of these crops relative to others. At the same time, consumption was discouraged and the use of substitutes was stimulated. Market outlets shrank and surplus accumulations mounted. Acreage controls had to be invoked, thereby rationing the right to produce. Wheat acreage was

reduced from 79 to an allotment of 62 and then to the present 55 million acres. Cotton was cut from 25 to 20 and then on down to the present 17 million acres. These drastic reductions, forced by the application of the price-support law, penalized many farmers directly by resulting in shrunken volume and uneconomic farming operations. In addition, acreage diverted from the basic crops shifted surplus problems into many other crops and livestock. Now almost every farmer is adversely affected, regardless of what crops or livestock he raises.

If wartime rigid 90-percent supports were the answer to the problem of our farm families, there would now be no problem.

Farm incomes have declined in every year except one between 1947 and 1954, and in all these years 90-percent supports were in effect.

Farmers are not interested in price alone. What they really want for their families is more net income, which is affected by volume and costs as well as by price. The 90-percent-of-parity approach focuses on support price alone.

To return now to wartime 90-percent supports would be wrong. Production would be stimulated. Markets would be further destroyed, instead of expanded, as must be done. More surplus would accumulate—and surpluses are price depressing. Regimentation by ever-stricter production controls would be the end result.

It is inconceivable that we should ask farm families to go deeper into this self-defeating round of cause and effect.

2. The provision for dual parity would result in a permanent double standard of parity for determining price supports. Four crops would receive preferential treatment out of 160 products for which parity prices are figured. There is no justification in logic or in equity for such preferential treatment.

Particularly is this true because, under the working of the modernized parity formula enacted by the Congress, increasing the parity prices of some commodities automatically lowers the parity prices of all other commodities. If parity prices for wheat, corn, cotton and peanuts are to be higher, then parity prices of the other products must be lower.

To whatever degree prices would be further artifically raised there would be a corresponding stimulus to production, more controls on farmers, reduced consumption, increased accumulations, and lower prices in the market.

Such a device for parity manipulations could destroy the parity concept itself. It places a potent weapon in the hands of opponents of all price supports for farmers. We have no right to place the welfare of our farm families in such jeopardy.

3. The provision for mandatory supports on the feed grains would create more problems for farmers. The market for feed grains would shrink as livestock production would come to depend more on forage and less on grain. The flow of feed grains into government stocks would increase and production controls would necessarily be intensified. Price relationships between feed, livestock and livestock products would be distorted. Producers of feeder cattle, feeder lambs, and feeder pigs would be faced with downward pressure on prices. An imbalance would develop between feed crops and livestock products, with all its adverse consequences.

4. The multiple-price plans for wheat and rice would have adverse effects upon producers of other crops, upon our relations with friendly foreign nations, and upon our consumers.

There are other serious defects in the bill such as certain provisions found in the section dealing with the dairy industry. Still other features are administratively bad and would require the hiring of thousands of additional inspectors and enforcers.

I recognize that the restoration by H. R. 12 of wartime mandatory 90-percent price supports applies only to 1956 crops. This, in combination with other objectionable features of the bill, would put us back on the old road which has proved so harmful to farmers.

Bad as some provisions of this bill are, I would have signed it if in total it could be interpreted as sound and good for farmers and the Nation.

After the most careful analysis I conclude that the bill is contradictory and self-defeating even as an emergency relief measure and it would lead to such serious consequences in additional surpluses and production controls as to further threaten the income and the welfare of our farm people.

Because the good features of the bill are combined with so much that would be detrimental to farmers' welfare, to sign it would be to retreat rather than advance toward a brighter future for our farm families.

We now have sound and forward-looking legislation in the Agricultural Act of 1954. Neither that act, nor any other, can become fully effective so long as it is smothered under the vast surpluses that have accumulated. We imperatively need remedial legislation to remove this burden and enable the fundamentally sound program provided in the act of 1954 to become workable. Such remedial measures were proposed in my message of January 9.

I am keenly mindful that the failure of the Congress to enact a good new farm bill can have unfavorable effects on farm income in 1956, unless prompt administrative efforts to offset them are made immediately. Particularly the failure to enact a soil bank before planting time this year makes such administrative efforts imperative.

Consequently we are going to take prompt and decisive administrative action to improve farm income now. I have conferred with the Secretary of Agriculture and the administration is moving immediately on four major fronts:

1. In 1956 price supports on five of the basic crops—wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and peanuts—will be set at a level of at least 82½ percent of parity. Tobacco will be supported as voted in the referendum in accordance with existing law.

Within this range of price support flexibility, the administration intends to set minimum support levels that will result in a national average of wheat at $2 a bushel, corn at $1.50 a bushel, rice at $4.50 per hundred pounds.

A separate support for corn not under acreage control in the commercial corn area will be announced at an early date.

Price supports on cotton and peanuts have not yet been announced but will be at least 82½ percent of parity.

The Secretary of Agriculture will announce shortly the details of the new cotton export sales program.

2. For this year the support price of manufacturing milk will be increased to $3.25 per hundred pounds. The support price of butter fat will be increased to 58.6 cents a pound.

3. We will use Department of Agriculture funds, where assistance will be constructive, to strengthen the prices of perishable farm commodities. We will have well over $400 million for that purpose for the year beginning July 1.

These actions, the administration will take immediately.

I now request Congress to pass a straight soil bank bill as promptly as possible. It should be in operation before fall seeding for next year's crops. It is vital that we get the soil bank authorized in this session of the Congress. There is general agreement on it. I am ready to sign a sound soil bank act as soon as Congress sends it to me. That can be accomplished in a very few days if the leadership in Congress will undertake the task.

This combined program of administrative action and legislative enactment will begin now to improve the income and welfare of all our farm families.

Here is a challenge for both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 16, 1956.*

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not think anyone in this country believes the President of the United States desires to keep farm income down. There apparently is, as is the case with most public questions, an honest difference of opinion as to how the agricultural problem can best be met. But certainly, President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson have a desire to have an American agriculture that is participating in the national economy along with all other segments of the national economy.

The President feels that the piling up of the huge surpluses which have amounted to more than $9 billion have been detrimental to a sound American agriculture. Great efforts have been made, and successfully so, to eliminate many of these surpluses, and such efforts will continue to be made by the administration, and, I hope, with the full support of the Congress of the United States. Only time will tell which procedure would be best for the Nation. I have a deep conviction that President Eisenhower has as vital an interest in American agriculture, and in seeing to it that the farmers receive a greater share of the national income, as has any Member of this body on either side of the aisle.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I deeply regret the action taken by the President in vetoing the farm bill. Heretofore, Secretary of Agriculture Benson has been blamed for the present depressed plight of our agriculture, but now the farmers of the country will blame the President. They have no other alternative; the choice was the President's. He has chosen to let our farm population dangle at the end of Secretary Benson's flexible noose.

As was pointed out by the majority leader, the President has found it necessary to repudiate the flexible price-support principle and has fixed, or will fix, administratively, rigid price supports on all basics at 82½ percent of parity, with the exception, of course, of tobacco, which will remain at 90 percent.

Mr. President, I am sure that President Eisenhower was not fully acquainted with the contents of the bill. It may be he was too busily engaged in playing golf at Augusta to give our bill the study and consideration it obviously deserved; and it is my personal opinion that he had little or nothing to do with the writing of this veto message. The veto message expresses in almost identical words the position heretofore taken by Secretary Benson. The idea of the President stating in his veto message that 90-percent price supports would increase production. The idea of the President blaming Congress for being slow in enacting a farm bill. Mr. President, the

inferences are both unconscionable. All acres for the basic crops this year have already been either allocated or planted.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held extensive grass-roots hearings for nearly 2 months last fall. We went to the farmers of this country. We took their views, and from those views we hammered out a farm bill which was reported to the Senate on February 10. Of course, the Senate was unable to act upon this report immediately. Why? Because a "recess" for Lincoln Day speeches had to be taken.

The Senate passed a farm bill on March 19. All during the Easter recess, the Senate-House conference committee worked to iron out our differences. We came into agreement on April 6. On April 11 the House and Senate both passed a conference bill and sent it to the President.

Now, he has vetoed it. Now, he blames the Congress for delay. He shall not evade the responsibility for his premeditated action by seeking to place the blame on Congress. If there was any delay, Mr. President, it was the delay of Secretary Benson to recognize the economic plight of our farmers. It was his consistent effort to raise farm income with rosy words, broad generalities, and partisan politics, instead of taking action.

As I have stated, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry began hearings last October, in order to be able to present a bill to Congress in January. As chairman of the committee, I invited the Secretary of Agriculture to send some of his experts to the hearings. He took advantage of the invitation and sent two men. The basis of the President's message to Congress on January 9 was those hearings. If they had not been held, the President would not have conceived the soil-bank idea. As a matter of fact, his Department of Agriculture was opposed to a soil bank as recently as July 7, 1955.

I am not here to blame anyone for delay; but, as every Senator knows, I, as the chairman of the committee, set a goal of February 15 as the date on which to introduce an omnibus farm bill in the Senate; I expected and hoped to have it enacted before March. I did not have in mind then that the usual Lincoln birthday holidays would take place. Because of them the Senate was delayed for from 10 to 12 days.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and also the House Committee on Agriculture worked hard and diligently on the bill all during the Easter recess. It was a complicated measure; our chore was not an easy or pleasant one, but we worked at it nevertheless. I regret, I repeat, that the President did not sign the bill we agreed upon. It was a good bill; I am sorry that the President relied upon his Secretary of Agriculture's judgment instead of asking a few dirt farmers for their thoughts.

So far as price supports are concerned, as I pointed out on the floor of the Senate only a few days ago, the inclusion of 90 percent of parity price supports was the only provision in the bill which offered immediate income relief to the farmers of the Nation. Yet the President has vetoed this bill, he has cast aside 90 percent of parity in favor of 82½ percent of parity. How can the Secretary of Agriculture, who has already set the price support for wheat at 76 percent of parity, now raise the support level to 82½ percent? Such action is simply beyond my comprehension. If it is his prerogative to do so now, then the Secretary could have set the support price at 89 percent, 87 percent, or even 90 percent a long time ago, why has he waited until now to think about raising farm income, Mr. President? I simply cannot understand his proposed action except to assume that it is a calculated effort to forestall the inevitable political upheaval which will take place among the farmers of the Nation because of the action taken by the President—by his decision to toss the farmers a crumb instead of giving them their due. The President and Mr. Benson are obviously attempting to buy the good will of our farmers by offering them now, at this late date, 82½ percent of parity. This proposal, Mr. President, is a political sop and I think our farmers will realize what it is.

If the Secretary can now, by some administrative sleight of hand, raise support prices, raise farm income, then he could have done so a year ago. Think of the small farmers he could have assisted if he had chosen to do so.

The President's veto message states there are other serious defects in the bill, such as certain provisions in the section dealing with the dairy industry.

Mr. President, the provision to which he refers merely would have done by legislation what the President says he expects to do administratively in regard to the price of manufactured milk, namely, to raise the support price to $3.25 a hundredweight. That was all the bill provided. There were no other provisions in the bill which affected the administration of the milk program; the sole provision was that which set the price support for manufactured milk during 1956 at $3.25 a hundredweight, and fixed the support for butterfat at 58.6 cents per pound.

Here we have a pure anomaly—one typical of this entire veto message—in that the President has criticized the legislative provision affecting the dairy industry, while administratively he intends to do what Congress proposed to do in the bill.

The veto message criticizes the price support which would have been afforded the growers of small grains. I predict that with the 70-percent price support, which the President has heretofore ordered to be administratively fixed for small grains, the Treasury will lose many more millions of dollars than would have been the case if the bill had been signed—if our small-grain provision had been enacted. It is true that in the bill the price support for small grains was raised; but in order to have been able to obtain high price supports, it would have been necessary for the growers of the small grains to cut back their base acreage by 15 percent. They would have had to restrict their planting to 85 percent of their base acres in order to make themselves eligible for price supports. But today the door is wide open. The producers of the small grains can grow all they desire, but the support price will be at 70 percent of parity. They get 70 percent on 100 percent or more of their base acreage instead of 85 percent on 85 percent of their base acreage.

I repeat, I cannot understand the President's position on this bill. I am confident he did not know what the bill contained. He was told, I presume, by Mr. Benson last Saturday that it was a bad bill. I am wondering why it was that the President did not seek advice from some of the Members of Congress of his own party, who worked hard and diligently on the bill; but he seems to have shunned them.

The President criticizes the two-price systems for wheat and rice which the conference bill contained. In order for the two-price wheat program to have become effective, a two-thirds affirmative vote of the wheat-producing farmers would have been required. There was nothing mandatory in the two-price plan for wheat. The choice would have been up to the farmers. The President has denied them that choice. I feel confident, as I stated during debate on that provision, that it probably would have been a long time before the two-price wheat program would have become effective, for the simple reason—and I am certain the President must not have been advised of this—that the program, if it had gone into effect, would have meant continued curtailment of acreage. Acreage would have been controlled, notwithstanding the fact that there was a two-price system in effect. Some advocates of a two-price system for wheat have fostered the plan as a means of planting all the acres they might desire to plant; but the bill as we sent it to the President did not provide for that unlimited planting.

The two-price system for rice was to have gone into effect automatically, but only on a trial basis. It was a plan which I personally discussed with members of the administration. They said that although they could not support it openly, nevertheless they thought, since there was so much talk about two-price plans for basic commodities, that rice was a good commodity with which to start the system. It was an effective method of giving the two-price-plan theory a trial run, so to speak.

The President suggests that Congress should enact a soil-bank program without delay. As chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, it is my belief that the President now has ample authority to proceed with some kind of soil-bank program under existing law. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to assist him in that respect all I can. However, there can be no justification for the President seeking passage of a soil-bank bill this year. The President said on April 4 that a soil bank could not become effective this year, even if one were provided in the bill which was subsequently passed, because of the lateness of the year. It is my belief that we can wait until next year for a soil bank.

I am very hopeful that there will be a change in the administration by that

time, and that we shall then be able to take the matter up on an effective basis. It is entirely possible that next year the occupant of the White House may be more sympathetic to an effective way of assisting the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to ask one question, if the Senator will yield to me. Are all the things which the President says he and Secretary Benson are now going to do responsive to some suddenly discovered powers, or have they had such powers for the past 3 years and 3 months—powers which, if they had been put into operation, would have helped the farmer and have stopped the decline in farm income, which has been in excess of 20 percent under the present administration during the past 3 years and 3 months? Are they newly discovered powers, or are they old powers?

Mr. ELLENDER. The powers must have been available for quite some time, since they require no new legislation. They have been available for at least 2 years, since the passage of the 1954 act. What prompts their mention at this time, I shall leave to the Senator to judge. As I indicated a while ago, the price support for wheat was announced months ago as 76 percent of parity. Now, with all the surpluses we have on hand, the price is going to be raised to 82½ percent. I think it might require a little investigation to find out how the laws which are now on the statute books can be so manipulated. I myself would like to find out how it is possible to increases the support level of wheat from 76 percent to 82½ percent, when wheat is coming out of our ears and the storage facilities are strained. That is under the same law under which the support price was fixed at 76 percent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will yield further, I want to say to him that the Senator has a point there. I hope that, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, he will look into this particular matter and find out why nothing has been done for 3 years and 3 months by this administration to assist the farmers.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am going to try to get Mr. Benson, within the next 48 hours, if possible, to find out how he can do so, and if he can, why he did not help our farmers a year ago, by raising their income instead of relying upon a barrage of rosy predictions and partisan attacks to do the job.

I would also like to ascertain how he manages to square his theory of flexible price supports, which the President cited as one of the compelling reasons for his veto, with the fixing by administrative action of rigid 82½ percent price supports. Certainly the principle involved is the same, whether support prices are fixed at 82½ or 90 percent of parity. The only difference is in degree—and thus, in the amount of increase in income our farmers will receive next year.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, from his ivory tower at the Augusta Country Club, where he has been completely insulated from the voice of the people, the President has again acted on the advice of little men who made his decision for him, and has vetoed the farm bill passed by the Congress. With complete disregard of the economic depression and threatened bankruptcy of millions of farm families, he has crucified them on the cross erected by Benson, Aiken, True D. Morse, and others.

The bill which Congress passed, Mr. President, provided the only available way to increase the income of the average farmer this year. It would have increased farm income $3 billion in 1956 above the pitiful low of 1955. When men talk about the degree to which farm income has decreased, they should advise themselves of reality. They should disregard the myths being foisted upon the American people by the Department of Agriculture. The reality is that the take-home pay of the farm families of our country is down 40 percent in 3 years.

A few days ago in Oklahoma, Mr. President, representatives of the Federal Reserve bank district of which Oklahoma is a part participated in a panel discussion before a convention of Oklahoma bankers. The headline in a great metropolitan Oklahoma newspaper read: "Bankers Find Farm Income Drastically Reduced." I think it is marvelous that the bankers of that convention, after deterioration had been progressively in operation for over 3 years, finally found it. God grant that someday the President of the United States will find it, Mr. President.

The report of the panel of economists from the Federal Reserve district headquarters was to the effect that the average annual income of farm families in Oklahoma in 1955 was $1,200, a decrease of $1,000 a farm family in 3 years. That is the reality of the degree to which farm income has decreased, Mr. President. By Eisenhower's veto, he has imposed on American farmers an economic penalty which will result in still further declines this year. At the same time, all costs of business operations, including farm costs, are still rising, and national prosperity, other than for farmers, is at an all-time high.

The farm bill as passed by Congress would have increased farm income in Oklahoma at least $75 million this year over last year. The veto of the President will drive it down below the level of last year. So, Mr. President, by the act of the President of the United States, he has imposed on Oklahoma farmers an economic penalty of a minimum of $100 million for this year.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The figures given by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma are, in my opinion, conservative as to the difference it would make in the income of the farmers of the country had the President signed the farm bill. Most significant to me is the effect the action of the President will have on the independent farmer who operates the family sized farm. He was the type of farmer I think most of the Members of this body were undertaking to preserve and save in passing the bill, so that farm income for such farmers could be stimulated and be brought back to somewhere near where it was at the time this administration assumed power in January 1953.

It occurs to me, Mr. President, one of the most tragic days the farmers of the Nation have ever known was the day President Eisenhower changed his farm advisers. He had some good advisers during the political campaign of 1952. He stated that the Republican Party was committed to 90 percent support prices for all the basics and that the party would make good on that pledge. In another speech in Minnesota he even indicated he would seek to get 100 percent of parity for the basic commodities. Somewhere along the line, after the election, the President changed his farm advisers, and brought gloom, despair, and, indeed, actual suffering into many farm homes. We should not forget there are more than 1½ million farm families in the United States—not farmers, but farm families—whose gross cash income is less than $1,000 a year, who would have benefited by the bill. It would have enabled those people to hold up their heads and to be thankful they were American citizens.

Mr. President, I wish we might be able to ascertain the exact date when the President changed his farm advisers. Under the existing order of things, it will not be long until we shall be compelled, if we have any respect for the independent family-size farm operator, to build a memorial to him, because if present conditions continue he will soon be extinct. So I wish we could ascertain the exact date—in order that we might carve it on such a memorial—when the President changed his farm advisers from those who guided him during the campaign to those whose advice has resulted in the present change in the farm policy under this administration.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for yielding to me.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for his remarks. I would make one correction in what he said. He stated that the total farm income of 1 million farm families averaged less than $1,000 a year.

Mr. RUSSELL. A million and a half farm families, Mr. President. We received evidence of the truth of the statement just this morning, in the Appropriations Committee, where a representative of the Department of Agriculture testified.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Let me say that I remember that on the floor of the Senate, 2 years ago, the distinguished Senator quoted from a report of the Census Bureau, according to which at that time the average cash income of one-fourth of the American farm families did not exceed $1,000 a year. I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia if it is not a known fact that last year the income of American farm families was substantially lower than it was in the year to which that report of the Census Bureau applied.

Mr. RUSSELL. Unquestionably it was lower, and this year it will be much lower.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only will it be lower, but there will be a larger number who will have been brought within the lower bracket.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Georgia is eminently correct, and that development is a direct result of the policy of the present administration.

Mr. President, I wish we could learn when the President changed his farm advisers.

While we are having the benefit of eminent medical counsel in giving the people information about the physical health of the President, I should like to have eminent medical counsel find out, if they could, whether the President was mentally aware of what happened at the time when he changed his farm advisers. I do not know on what date that occurred; but I do know that April 16, 1956, will go down in history as the darkest day American agriculture has known during my lifetime; and when the obituaries of the present administration are written, let the record show that it was on that date that the economic crime of 1956 was committed—and committed by the hand of President Eisenhower himself.

Mr. President, it was in line with the policy of President Eisenhower's administration and his Department of Agriculture, that True D. Morse said, when speaking for Mr. Benson, "The marginal farmer must be eliminated." How successful the administration has been in doing that, Mr. President! The farmers know it, and they also know that this administration has been more successful in creating marginal farmers than it has been in eliminating marginal farmers.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the senior Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from Oklahoma stated that this economic crime was committed by the hand of the President himself. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator this question: While it was done by the hand of the President, are not the words of the veto message the words of his Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. KERR. They are. I say to my good friend, the Senator from North Carolina, that a little later I had intended to say something in that regard. However, I shall say it now: The Bible refers to the hand of Esau but the voice of Jacob. I wish to say that, this time, it was the hand of Jacob, but the voice of Esau. And with reference to the policy of this administration, it was declared on the floor of the Senate by the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], when the farm bill was before the Senate—as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 24, 1956, at page 3319:

> The soil-bank proposal as written would permit some small marginal farms to be taken out of production altogether, and the owners of such farms would be enabled to take other jobs which would pay them enough so that they could make a better living, and at the same time be sure of some income from the marginal lands from which they have been trying to make a livelihood.

Mr. President, the veto is in line with the announced and steadfast policy of this administration to eliminate the marginal farmers, to plow them under, for they have been here long enough.

Mr. President, there are those who say that Mr. Eisenhower has given up any hope of getting any farm votes, and wants to eliminate as many of them as he possibly can between now and the election in November. I wish to say, Mr. President, that he is eliminating them as productive units in our farm economy; but he is going to get the shock of his life when he receives the returns from their voting, next November.

A while ago the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] said he feared the President had vetoed the bill without knowing what was in it. I wish to say that I am convinced that the President vetoed the bill without knowing what was in either the bill or in the veto message. I would challenge him to hold a press conference and let the representatives of the press ask him what was in the bill and what was in his veto message. If that were done, I do not have the slightest fear that he would be able to give a comprehensive answer to either question.

Mr. President, I read these words in the second paragraph of the veto message:

> A sound, constructive 9-point program to this end was submitted on January 9, with an urgent request for action.

He was talking about the so-called farm program which he submitted to the Congress.

Then he said:

> It was a program that came from the grassroots.

The grassroots of what, Mr. President? The grassroots of what golf course? I wonder if that is where the President's farm message came from. Certainly it did not come from the grassroots of the farm families of the Nation.

I wish to say that that statement in the veto message is an insult to the House and the Senate and to the Agricultural Committees of both bodies and to every Member of the Congress who voted for the conference report on the farm bill. It is an insult to the 15 distinguished Republican Senators who voted for the conference report. I wish to say that any one of them knows more about the grassroots sentiments among the farm families of this country in regard to farm matters than either Mr. Eisenhower or any of the persons in the top echelons of his Department of Agriculture will ever learn. Furthermore, I wish to state that each of the 48 Members of the House who voted for the conference report on the farm bill knows more about the sentiments of the grassroots farmers of this country than the President could ever even conceive of.

Mr. President, I desire to state that the shock which would come to the President, great man that he is, if he were really to receive the information about the grassroots sentiment in this country in regard to his farm policies, would be so terrific that I would even be uneasy about the health of the senior Republican member of our Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

If the scintillating brilliance of the truth with respect to the sentiment at the grassroots should ever penetrate the insulated walls of the White House, as presently occupied, the shock would be so terrific that the citizenship of this District would think that an atomic bomb had landed there and exploded. The President is allergic to sentiment from the grassroots, unfamiliar with it, and uninterested about it. He says in his veto message:

> The problem is price-depressing surpluses.

Undoubtedly there is some degree of fact in that statement.

> Excess stocks of certain farm commodities have mounted to market-destroying, price-depressing size as a result of wartime price incentives too long continued.

Yet by his veto of the farm bill he has increased that problem. He did not diminish it. The farm bill as passed had within it provisions whereby that surplus could be curtailed and future production limited. As the distinguished Senator from Louisiana so ably said:

> the veto of this bill will not reduce the production of farm products in this country. It will increase it.

The President complains about the price support for feed grains and grain sorghums. The provision of the bill relating to them was the only effective approach ever made by the Government of the United States to bring about an equitable reduction of acreage planted to feed grains and grain sorghums.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Oklahoma that this is the best provision of the entire bill, from three standpoints: first, from the standpoint of bettering the actual cash price of feed grains; second, from the standpoint of reducing surpluses; and third, from the standpoint of making the soil-bank program work. We might add a fourth. This program would do more for the small farmer than any other provision in the bill. In order for a farmer to get the 85-percent supports for small grains he would have to put 15 percent of his small grains acreage under the soil bank. We would get more acreage in the soil bank under this part of the bill than under all the other provisions together.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct. What a tragedy it is that that information would come as such a shock to the President of the United States, if he were ever permitted to learn the truth of what the great Senator from North Dakota has just said.

On the third page of the President's veto message I find this language:

> We now have sound and forward-looking legislation in the Agricultural Act of 1954.

Nearly everything else in the message disputes that statement. The action of the Congress disputed that statement.

Every farm family in America knows that that statement is false. The President, by his announcement as to what the Secretary of Agriculture was going to do, conclusively proved that that statement was false.

At the same time he vetoes the act of 1956 he promises to spurn the act of 1954. In the very same message in which he refers to the act of 1954 as "sound and forward-looking legislation," he sets forth in detail the means whereby he expects to ignore it, override it, and spurn it. Thus even a child would know that his statement about the act of 1954 is not sincere.

It has been proved false by experience, and that proof is pointed up and verified by what the President himself says as to what he and the Secretary of Agriculture intend to do in 1956, which does not conform to the act which he himself says is sound.

There is this to be said: The President acted with dispatch. If being on the golf course in Augusta, Ga., enables him to handle big questions as expeditiously as he handled this one, he ought to spend the rest of his term there.

Members of our Committee on Agriculture and Forestry worked for more than a year on the bill. They began intensive hearings last October, which lasted for months. They started extensive sessions when the Congress convened, which sessions lasted for weeks. The Congress debated and worked on the bill for months, and hammered out on the anvil of hearings, through the voice of the people, information from the grassroots, and debate in the committee and in the Senate, not a perfect bill, but a great bill. The President of the United States vetoed it in 15 minutes.

Distinguished Republican Governors from States in the agricultural area called and requested an audience. I understand from the press that they were at the White House this very morning. The President told them to come to the White House and he would talk to them about whether or not he would veto the bill. Yes, it had already been vetoed for days. Benson carried the veto message to Georgia. The press told us that the Secretary went down there to talk about it with the President. He went down there to give the President the veto message.

I see from the press that 15 distinguished Republican Senators petitioned the President to sign the bill. His reaction was about like that of a justice of the peace in Oklahoma in the early days. He had a case before him. The attorney for the plaintiff presented his argument. Then the attorney for the defendant rose and started to make his argument. The judge said, "Go right ahead and make your argument. Speak as long as you like, and say anything you wish to say; document it as you will. When you finish, you will find my decision in this top drawer, but I must leave now to attend to other matters."

The President is too busy recovering from one vacation and getting ready for another to listen to 15 Republican Senators or 4 Republican governors petitioning him with pleas from the grassroots.

No longer can any outraged American say that Eisenhower is not to blame for the farm policy of this administration, for the acts of Secretary Benson, and for the veto of this bill. Mr. Benson has a great many skirts. I shall not assert what shape they are in, but Ike can no longer hide behind them. The mask of hypocrisy has been stripped, and now he must stand forth in the full glitter of the shining truth that he is the implementor and architect of this farm policy. The nails that have been driven into the farmer's hands, the cross upon which he is being crucified, may have been furnished by Benson, but the hammer that drove those nails into the farmer's hands was wielded by the hand of Eisenhower. The hand that placed the crown of thorns upon the farmer's head was the hand of Eisenhower.

It would be tragic indeed, Mr. President, if the action of the President was the result of a conviction that he is against fixed price supports. However, he cannot even have that refuge for his action. In his recommendation for the Dixon-Yates contract, he proved that he was not against fixed price supports, or against 100 percent of parity. By his direction, the Atomic Energy Commission wrote the contract with the Southern Power group by which they were guaranteed 125 percent of parity for 25 years.

The Federal Reserve Bank recently again increased the discount rate on commercial paper, with the result that interest rates will again go up in every financial transaction in the commercial marts of this Nation.

Therefore, President Eisenhower is not against fixed price supports, and he is not against 100 percent of parity, as a general principle. He is against them only as applied to the American farmer.

I believe the most tragic domestic act of this administration was this ill-conceived, unwarranted, unjustified, and penalizing veto by the President of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this is a tragic day. Within a few weeks Republicans from all corners of this country the Republicans will meet in the State so ably represented by the Senator who is the acting minority leader at the moment, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and draw up a platform. They will send that platform all over the Nation, and appeal for votes for the Republican Party.

Mr. President, only the greatest optimist, I may say to my distinguished friend the acting minority leader, would believe a single plank in that platform. A man who will deceive you once will deceive you again. The Republican Party set up a platform in 1952, and the man it nominated for President of the United States, running on that platform, went to Kasson, Minn., and said, "I am for 90 percent of parity, and it should be 100 percent." Then on October 4, 1952, he came to the Field House of our State college at Fargo, N. Dak., and repeated that he was for 90 percent and that it should be 100 percent, and the farmers there believed him. Then he went to South Dakota and Iowa, and day after day repeated that he was for 90 percent of parity, and that it should be 100 percent. Who will believe the Republican candidate? At the first opportunity the President has to make his word good, he reneges. What does anyone suppose the people will say to him, if a candidate makes such promises and does not keep them?

Why, Mr. President, only a short time ago the Vice President, Mr. NIXON, who had run with Eisenhower on that same platform, and was familiar with the promises made by the President of the United States when he was a candidate, cast the vote that broke the tie in the Senate against a 90 percent of parity provision in the farm bill.

Mr. President, the farmers are not as dumb as the leaders of the Republican Party think they are. Within a few days after Mr. NIXON cast his vote as Vice President, I received word that a big sign had been erected in North Dakota, and on it was printed, "He lied to us."

I do not have the least doubt that in the next campaign the Democrats will have signs erected in the farming States which will enunciate that same doctrine, and which will say, "He lied to us." It is a tragic day when the people of the United States cannot rely upon the word of the President or of the Vice President of this great Nation.

Therefore I say to the distinguished acting minority leader, "I do not care what you put in your platform. You can promise everything from the bottom of the earth to the top of the moon. Those farmers who have been lied to once are going to look askance at future promises made to the farmers of this great Nation."

I am happy in the fact that as the representative of the Abraham Lincoln-Theodore Roosevelt-Bob La Follette-George Norris-Republican Party, I have time and time again enunciated the doctrine of those great men on the floor of the Senate. Can anyone imagine any one of those great men, running on a platform and going all through the farming area and making a definite promise, saying to the voters, "Vote for me if you want 90 percent of parity, because that is what I stand for," and can anyone imagine having the candidate for Vice President of the United States follow in his wake echoing that promise, and then at the first opportunity either one of them had, breaking that promise made to the farmers of this country?

For the third time I want to tell the acting minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], my distinguished friend, "You can have a committee from now until the day of your convention drawing up platforms and putting in paragraphs that may appeal to certain groups of voters in this country. They will not believe you, no matter what you put in your platform."

I had accepted an invitation to attend tomorrow night the dinner given by the Republican Party, which will be addressed by the Chief Executive of this great Nation. Mr. President, I would be ashamed to go there. The farmers of my State would be ashamed to have their senior Senator attend that banquet.

I wish to compliment the Republican members of the Committee on Agricul-

ture and Forestry, particularly my distinguished colleague from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. He fought very hard to make the Republican Party carry out its promises. Certainly, the veto of the President of the United States cannot be held against my distinguished colleague. He fought on the floor of the Senate and he fought in committee. He fought openly, and he even antagonized the Secretary of Agriculture in his fight for the farmers of the State of North Dakota and for all the farmers of this great Nation.

Mr. President, some of my Republican colleagues who voted for the bill which the President has vetoed kept faith with the promises made by the leader of the Republican Party, temporarily.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I simply wish to state once more that I believe a campaign promise made by a President or a Vice President during their campaign should be kept.

On that note, Mr. President, I close these remarks.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, first of all, I wish personally to welcome to the Senate the present Presiding Officer [Mr. WOFFORD in the chair]. I hope that during the time the present Presiding Officer remains a Member of the Senate he will derive the same enjoyment from his service here that I have experienced in growing degree during the past 3 years.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that the type of utterances heard on the floor today, in my judgment, are a little bit lower, a little bit uglier, than those to which I have been accustomed to listen in my days here. We are governed in the Senate by rules, some of which are a little loose, and I suppose some of which are ambiguous. Some, in my view are wrong. But they govern us. There are some regulations with respect to the quality of one's utterances, and, I think, implicit in the rules of the Senate is some injunction that one ought to debate free of rancor or bitterness, and upon a reasonably decent plane.

Of course, Mr. President, there is one precedent which was established a year or so ago when a majority of the Senate saw fit to censure a Member for some utterances he had made off the Senate floor. But, apparently, Mr. President, there are some things a Senator can do with complete impunity in the Senate of the United States. He can, it will be observed, revile the President of this free country, if he wants to, and, apparently, no rule is broken by his doing so. A Senator can obtain the floor and can besmirch and vilify and condemn the President of the United States because he goes to church. A Senator can use the rostrum, as has been done, to assert that the President is physically incapable of discharging the duties of his public office. A Senator can, apparently, under the rules, vent as much spleen as he desires against the Chief Executive of this country.

Mr. President, I thought some of the comments this morning on the presidential veto of the farm bill were almost frenetic, and certainly were fantastic.

I hurriedly wrote down one of the phrases of my good friend, the majority leader. The present national administration, so says the Senator from Texas, believes that low farm prices are the answer to the farmers' problems. That statement is so patently wrong as hardly to require denial. I think my good friend from Texas was a little bit overly inclined politically when he made that statement.

At any rate, I do not think anyone can question the fact that Dwight Eisenhower vetoed the farm bill because he decided that to do so was in the best interests of the country; and I do not think anyone can accuse him of trying to obtain the farm vote by the action which he took today.

My friend from North Dakota made some comments just a few moments ago, and indicated that the platform which will be written this year by the Republican Party will not be believed by the American farmer or by the American people generally. I do not know how many people read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any more, and I sometimes wonder if Senators are needlessly taking the time of the Senate in making comments in the Senate.

But let the RECORD show that in 1948, the Democratic national platform promised the people of the United States flexible price-support legislation for basic farm commodities. That was a solemn promise to the people of the United States. It so happened that in 1948 the Republican platform made exactly the same compact with the American people. President Truman was reelected, and, to his everlasting credit, in 1949, he asked the Congress of the United States which was in control of the party to which he belonged to fulfill the commitment which the Democratic Party had made to the people of the Nation. It did not do it. It refused to do it. Four years later, Dwight Eisenhower asked a Republican Congress to adopt flexible price-support legislation, and it did.

Who on the floor is responsible in great measure for the fact that 2 years ago we adopted flexible price-support legislation? Mr. President, he is a great American. He is a member of the Democratic Party, and he was Secretary of Agriculture during the administration of President Truman. I respect CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, Mr. President, for standing up and treating American agricultural legislation as an American and in urging the Congress to do that which he had urged and which his chief had urged when the Senator from New Mexico was a member of the Cabinet. He helped lead the successful bipartisan fight for flexible price-support legislation 2 years ago, and the successful bipartisan fight against rigid price support this year in the Senate.

Mr. President, farm legislation is not going to be too much of a partisan issue in the coming campaign. When the other day we had an opportunity to vote for or against the conference report on the farm bill, most Republicans voted against it and a number of my brethren on the other side of the aisle voted against it. I think some of them will speak on the floor a little later on this afternoon. But let the record show, Mr. President, that it was a bipartisan Senate majority 2 years ago which adopted flexible price support legislation, and when the attempt was made in all its nakedness in this session to have the Senate approve 90 percent of parity, a bipartisan majority turned that down too.

Mr. President, I become a little tired of hearing some of my brethren call the President of the United States all kinds of terrible names. But, as I say, Mr. President, apparently that can be done in this great and august body. Senators can remain immune from any type of censure or stricture or admonitory taps on the back of the hand so long as they confine their epithets to the President of our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent editorial appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning, entitled "What Kind of Veto?" be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

WHAT KIND OF VETO?

President Eisenhower's decision on the farm bill is extremely difficult because Congress seems to have left him only a choice of evils. If he should sign the bill, he would again write into law principles which he and a very large portion of the people (farmers, consumers, and economists alike) believe to be unsound. If he should veto the bill, it is said that he would deny the farmer any additional relief this year from what is admittedly a serious economic plight. No wonder the President is deeply perturbed by this dilemma. There is, however, another way of approaching the problem.

We think the country will not be satisfied by acquiescence in either of the two abovementioned extremes. Despite the sharp division over support prices at 90 percent of parity, the country wants farm legislation. Specifically, it wants the soil bank embodied in the present bill. This is evident from the widespread support given the soil bank in both political parties and the almost complete absence of opposition, although there are many differing views as to its effectiveness in reducing farm production. If the President vetoes the bill, therefore, we do not think he should accept the assumption that no other farm legislation will be passed this year.

This newspaper has already expressed the view that a veto is desirable. But the veto need not be merely negative. The administration has extensive authority to alter price supports within the 75 to 90 percent formula now on the books. The President could raise basic support levels for this year only without upsetting the principle of flexibility, and he could make such action contingent upon the passage of a new soil bank bill by Congress. A simple bill for that purpose could be enacted within a week if Congress made the effort. The result would be constructive relief of the farmer's plight instead of mere political warfare to win votes.

To our way of thinking, such a compromise would be preferable either to the signing of a basically unsound bill or to a veto that would merely toss the problem into the lap of the next Congress. Additional aid to agriculture is urgent now. The President can return this unacceptable bill to Congress along with a powerful plea for enactment of the soil bank to which there is virtually no opposition. If the administration shows its willingness to meet Congress half way, we cannot believe that Congress would turn a cold shoulder to the only farm measure that has a chance of approval.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the President has seen fit to veto a bill with reference to which we have met constantly in committee since last August, hearing farmers and groups representing farmers. Yet the President sees fit to help farmers in foreign lands to the extent of $4,859,000,975, and denying our American farmers about $2 billion.

DECLINE OF DRINKING AND DELINQUENCY AMONG NORTH DAKOTA INDIANS AS A RESULT OF A NEW INDUSTRY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Drinking and Delinquency Decline Among North Dakota Indians as Result of New Industry," published in the Lewistown (Mont.) Daily News of March 21, 1956.

I take great pride in calling attention to the role being played by the Bulova jewel bearing plant at Rolla, N. Dak., in curbing delinquency. Various hearings held throughout the country by the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency have shown the beneficial effects of industry in depressed areas through better living conditions with, consequently, less delinquency. I might point out that Senate bill 2663, on which hearings are being held by the subcommittee headed by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], provides for the relief of depressed areas through industry, and the Senator from Illinois has agreed with the Senators from Montana and North Dakota to include Indian reservations within the purpose of the act. If the results as shown in North Dakota are any indication, then initiating industry in depressed areas throughout the country should cause a great improvement in living conditions, and it necessarily follows that there will be less juvenile delinquency.

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

DRINKING AND DELINQUENCY DECLINE AMONG NORTH DAKOTA INDIANS AS RESULT OF NEW INDUSTRY

Drinking among Indians and delinquency among their children has been a much discussed subject in Montana.

Not that these problems are exclusively Indian—they're not, as everyone knows they also much concern whites, everywhere in the Nation as well as in Montana.

This editorial discusses drinking among Indians, and delinquency among their children, because of the remarkable progress that has been made in lessening these problems at the Turtle Mountain Reservation near Rolla, N. Dak., since the establishment there a few years ago of a jewel bearing plant by Bulova.

The company had been asked to come in to provide employment for idle Indians.

The Lewistown Daily News has taken a great interest in this plant because of the fine precedent it has established.

It has proven that Indians are able and faithful workers once they are given the chance. It has demonstrated that certain types of industry may be established, with much success, on or adjoining Indian reservations. It reveals that this means can be used effectively in enabling Indians to become useful, prosperous, and self-supporting citizens even though living on reservations where there had previously been little opportunity.

Now there are two new and equally pleasing revelations as a result of the Rolla plant. Drinking among Indians has tapered off considerably, and delinquency among Indian children has decreased about 60 percent.

The authority for this startling statement is Clarence Johnson, sheriff of Rolette County, where the Turtle Mountain Reservation is located.

Since a letter he wrote on the subject is so revealing, and offers so much hope for the Indians if similar developments can be secured on or adjoining Montana reservations, the Daily News reprints the entire letter as follows:

ROLLA, N. DAK., *February 3, 1956.*

Mrs. STANLEY SAUGSTAD,
Minot, N. Dak.

DEAR MRS. SAUGSTAD: The juvenile delinquency on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation among the Indian people has decreased about 60 percent in the past 2 years. I have figures to this effect. I think the reason for these figures is the employment in the jewel bearing plant, which is located here in Rolla, N. Dak.

When John B. Hart, who is an attorney in Rolla and also executive secretary of the North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission, began working to get a factory of some sort for these people to work in, he had to make several trips to Washington, D. C., in order to get something built for them. After much work on his part, the jewel bearing plant was built in Rolla and it has proven to be the most wonderful thing that has ever happened to the Indian people in this area. The first year there were only about 60 people employed in the plant, but a year later an addition was built. I talked to Mr. Anderson, superintendent of the plant, and he states that they now have 136 employees, nearly all Indians. They expect to employ more soon. The starting salary now is $1 per hour. It is a busy little factory; everyone comes to work at 8 a. m. Some bring their lunches with them and others eat at the local cafes. They also have some bus service and others drive their own cars to work.

We have about 5,000 Indians living on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation. Before the jewel plant started, we had all sorts of trouble. Things were unorganized and nearly all the Indian families were on some type of welfare help—either through grants from the Indian agency at Belcourt or through the county welfare program. This was all being done to keep them in existence, but the homelife among the people was getting to be a critical situation. There was nothing to keep the family together and because there was no work in the immediate area, the husband or wife could leave the home at any time. No one had any responsibilities in providing necessities for the home. Many homes were broken up this way, therefore it caused hardships to the children and quite naturally, it did not help the juvenile delinquency problem.

I have personally visited the homes of these people, both before and after their employment at the jewel bearing plant. I find that the homes are now more stable because of self-support and hard work. Although the salaries are not large, planning in the home is fairly good. They manage with what they get. For instance, the families take their children to a show once or twice a week and possibly to some other social gathering once or twice weekly as well. A certain amount of security has now come into the homes. I absolutely think there is less drinking among those who are employed, because they have their jobs to think of and they know they have to get up early to get to them. If, as in most cases, the wife works, the husband has to gather wood and take care of the household while his wife is away for the day. This works out fine. Before, the children were left alone a good deal of the time. Much drinking and dancing was carried on in the homes until all hours of the night. The younger people saw all this and naturally followed the same routine, and as a result they would be constantly missing school.

I have noticed that since the plant was opened, the homes are in better condition and the people have better furnishings in their homes. This all has a lot to do with juvenile delinquency in as far as the parents now have taken back the responsibility of their families, which in my estimation, was their biggest problem to begin with.

The Indian people have received too freely from the different welfare agencies, and for this reason they have lost their sense of responsibility. I fully realize that the welfare agencies are doing a fine job in helping those who are in need of their services. But the point is this, when families are receiving assistance, a case worker is sent to their homes to survey their needs, to arrange for any medical program that might be necessary for different members of their families and in short, to solve all their problems for them. In these cases, they no longer have to think for themselves and that is why I feel that they had lost their sense of responsibility.

After these people become employed in places such as the jewel bearing plant, they have the satisfaction of earning their own money and they learn to manage with what they have. Therefore, they take over the responsibility for their families and create more secure homes. This has proven very helpful in controlling juvenile delinquency in this area.

I have been here over 3 years and have experienced what I am writing. Thank you.

Yours very sincerely,

CLARENCE JOHNSON,
Sheriff of Rolette County, Rolla, N. Dak.

There is reason for real encouragement from Sheriff Johnson's observations.

A better opportunity and life for Indians, a better break for their children.

Bulova deserves credit for its taking a chance and pioneering in bringing industry to the Indians.

The Indians on the Turtle Mountain reservation have proven overwhelmingly what they can and will do when they have the chance.

So here is an achievement—a guide as to what can be done on other reservations.

Carl Beck, of Indian Service, is working hard and efficiently on trying to secure other industries for Indian reservations.

He, and the program, deserve the support of all of us in Montana, and particularly in the communities near Indian reservations.

Indians and whites alike will benefit greatly from continued development along this line.

NOMINATION OF GEORGE COCHRAN DOUB TO BE ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I am honored to report that the Committee on the Judiciary this morning, by a unanimous vote, recommended the confirmation of the nomination of my good friend and fellow Marylander, George Cochran Doub, to be Assistant Attorney General of the United States in charge of the Civil Division of the Department of Justice.

I have known Mr. Doub for many years. We attended the same law school, from which we were graduated in 1926.

Before his nomination to be an Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Doub

served as United States Attorney for the District of Maryland. His work in that position was of such a nature that he immediately came to the attention of the Attorney General, who asked him to head the Civil Division of the Department of Justice, following the appointment of former Assistant Attorney General Burger as a judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2587. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes; and

S. 2755. An act to designate the reservoir above the Monticello Dam in California as Lake Berryessa.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1287) to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5265) to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOPER, Mr. MILLS, Mr. GREGORY, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. JENKINS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5862) to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FRAZIER, Mr. TUCK, and Mr. HILLINGS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7247) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gain in certain railroad reorganizations; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOPER, Mr. MILLS, Mr. GREGORY, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. JENKINS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10004) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. PRESTON, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. JENSEN, and Mr. CLEVENGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 6712) to amend section 1237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

MORALS AND ETHICS SURROUNDING LEGISLATIVE AND POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF CONGRESS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am reluctant to impose upon the business of the Senate at this time to discuss a matter which may be somewhat discomforting to some Members of this body, particularly those on the other side of the aisle.

In the present atmosphere of concern over the morals and ethics surrounding both the legislative and political activities of the Congress, however, I believe it is imperative that the American people be told the whole truth about the motives which govern the statements and actions of those individuals in public life who carry the responsibility for providing inspiration and leadership in our governmental affairs.

It was my hope that men of integrity more clearly and closely connected with the incidents which I propose to discuss would come forward willingly to expose and condemn the abominable hoax which was perpetrated upon, and enthusiastically accepted by, the high command of the Democrat National Committee at the expense of the honor and dignity of the United States Senate.

Yet, to this hour, no voice has been raised in either explanation or apology. Not one person even remotely associated with this scurrilous effacement of political integrity has experienced a sufficient stirring of conscience to clear the record before his party and his country.

For this reason, I am presuming upon the time and patience of my colleagues to tell for others more properly qualified a story of deception which they will not tell for themselves.

Mr. President, the Senate is currently pursuing an investigation into improper pressures and influences upon Members of Congress. I am privileged to serve on the special committee which has been established to conduct this study. Perhaps, as a result of our efforts, new legislation will be devised to correct certain inequities in our election laws and to strengthen the safeguards against arrogant pressure tactics employed by those few individuals and groups who would create or defeat legislation according to the pattern of their own self-interest.

Notwithstanding the effects of our investigation, the principal question at issue is one of political courage and, as I said in a statement at the time of my appointment to the special committee, we cannot legislate courage. So it is particularly appropriate, I think, that we turn our attentions now to this most recent violation of ethical conduct on the part of the Democrat National Committee.

Let me reiterate my reluctance to present the grave charges which are founded upon this episode. I know that many of my colleagues across the aisle—indeed, many Democrats throughout the country—are as repulsed as I am by such shocking evidences of political opportunism.

If we are to maintain the essential vigilance that is required for the strength and security of our political and governmental institutions, however, we cannot permit the ardor of personal loyalties to obscure our higher regard for truth and decency and the rights and freedoms of the citizens of our country.

The Members of the Senate, Mr. President, are disturbed over charges of bribery. They have rightly elected to bare their official souls in order to plug every loophole through which unscrupulous pressures might gain entrance to the legislative councils of America.

It is only reasonable, therefore, that they should be mightily concerned by activities of the National Committee of one of our two great political parties which not only come within the definition of bribery, but also involve an effort to defame the duly-established processes of the Senate.

I refer, of course, to the case of the United States against Paul Hughes, which was described in the opening statement of the prosecuting attorney as "one of the most fantastic schemes to make money in the annals of political intrigue."

The role of the Democrat National Committee in this sordid conspiracy—and specifically the part played by Mr. Clayton Fritchey, deputy chairman of the Committee and editor of the Democratic Digest—is so malicious and unscrupulous as to make even the most hardened and biased Democrat partisan blush with shame. Indeed, the fact that the righteous indignation of sincere and principled Democrats has not compelled them to protect their party's reputation from the vile implications of this offense is, to me, almost as astonishing as the incident itself.

Here was a case, Mr. President, which resulted in the defendant, Paul Hughes, being acquitted on two counts of perjury. The jury deadlocked on four other counts. Mr. Hughes is an admitted liar.

The jury which freed him apparently felt that the testimony given under oath by several witnesses was of such a conflicting nature that they did not know whom to believe. There can be no other conclusion as a result of the trial testimony and the verdict.

The facts of the Hughes case, mysterious and complex though they are, undoubtedly are familiar to most of the Members of this body. A detailed recitation of them is not essential to the present discussion. They are, in truth, only descriptive images which simplify our comprehension of the subtle pattern

of political treachery which engulfed the frenzied opportunism of Mr. Hughes.

Any examination of Deputy Democrat National Chairman Fritchey's clandestine dealings with Hughes must be weighed against the background of the official publication of the Democrat National Committee, which, at Fritchey's command, speaks to the American people in words purported to be Democrat gospel.

It is ironic that such a monumental blunder should be exposed to the light of public scrutiny in an election year during which our citizens will be particularly perceptive of evidences of political integrity. By their actions at the polls in November, as I am sure the Senators well know, they will express their conclusions as to which party they believe is best equipped—intellectually, philosophically, and morally—to provide the best Government for the United States.

They will be interested in the form and direction of persuasions employed by the candidates of both parties. Still more will they be impressed by the words and arguments which carry the force of truth and proof.

I am wondering how they will regard the uninhibited participation of Mr. Fritchey in the Hughes deception. Will this preacher of the new Democrat dogma cast a creditable reflection of character upon the candidates of his party?

I think not, Mr. President, and that is the reason I believe my colleagues across the aisle should heed the warnings of this episode with due alarm and precaution—just as they will undoubtedly be heeded by resentful citizens at the polls on election day.

No layman can properly evaluate the personality of Paul Hughes. Certainly, his unbounded imagination combined conveniently with his pathological addiction to lying to pave a broad highway for the achievement of his monetary aspirations.

The ambivalent routing of his prevarications leaves little doubt that the object of his labors was financial reward, and that he was burdened by no restraints of conscience in the pursuit of this goal. Having been rejected in the self-assumed role of an Air Force investigator desiring to give assistance to a committee of the Senate, he recast himself—with almost casual ease—in the character of a disgruntled employee of that same Senate committee who, for a price, of course, stood ready to tell all about the scandalous operations of that committee.

Naturally, when Hughes offered his services to the spewers of political venom in the Democrat National Committee, he struck the kind of pay dirt for which he had been groping. There was, at the beginning, an understandable skepticism concerning his qualifications; but the fanatic desire of Mr. Clayton Fritchey to realize the potential of this secret informer, this spy from the ranks of a Senate committee whose very purpose and existence he abhorred, quickly overrode any valid objections to Hughes or his "information."

Even when Hughes himself retracted a portion of his earlier biography, Fritchey refused to loosen his grasp on his new-found scheme to blacken the character of a United States Senator, a committee of the Senate and, ultimately, the Republican Party.

Fritchey provided Hughes with every convenience for the unfolding of his fabric of lies. Hughes, caught in the whirlpool of his demented ambitions and suddenly reaping the financial harvest of his mental images, continued to cough up his astounding allegations.

Perhaps the Senators were not taken in by such tales as that of the arsenal buried in the basement of their own office building, awaiting only the signal for an armed uprising in the corridors of the Senate. Perhaps, on the other hand, Mr. Fritchey honestly was. At the very least, the possibility was too real for him to abandon such fiction.

In addition to being paid by Deputy Democrat National Chairman Fritchey, liar Hughes was loaned a typewriter, property of the Democrat National Committee, and a dictating machine on which he recorded his phoney exposés. He was also, through the courtesy of Mr. Fritchey, given free access to the facilities of the Democrat National Committee.

During the time that Fritchey was listening wide-eyed—and believing with cash-backed astonishment—to the lies being peddled by Hughes, he was, in the pages of the Democratic Digest, pleading for truth and purity in political campaigns. He also reprinted, with obvious pride, a letter from Adlai Stevenson, in the June 1954 issue, which praised the publication for its "carefully documented information and its insight into current affairs."

We can be justified, I believe, in assuming that Candidate Stevenson may want to take another look at Editor Fritchey's outpourings as a result of the revelations of the Hughes trial. In fact, I suggest that "Candidate Anybody" on the Democrat ticket would do well, in view of the activities of the Democrat National Committee in this liefest, to view with face-saving apprehension the political contortions of this curiously motivated organization.

In all, Mr. Fritchey handed over $2,300 to Hughes, and his friend Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., of ADA left-wing fame, tossed an additional $8,500 in the till to keep Hughes' imagination well oiled so that the supply of scandalous memoranda would not dry up.

That Hughes also came under the sponsorship of the Americans for Democratic Action in the course of his sinister dealings with the Democrat National Committee was apparently a logical consequence of Clayton Fritchey's insatiable yearning to smear, by the foulest devices, the Republican Party. The fact that he pursued this ambition at the expense of the reputation of his own party and the United States Senate was obviously of no concern to him.

The ADA's Mr. Rauh, however, was not entirely satisfied with Fritchey's exploitation of liar Hughes. Rauh sought, in addition, to assist Hughes' recollections to the extent of directing him to produce "evidence" to accompany his revelations. This "evidence," of course, was created from the same brand of fiction that guided Hughes' whole effort.

One does not need a crystal ball to realize that, while the activities of both Rauh and Fritchey with respect to Hughes were essentially the same, Rauh's ideological compass did not point in the direction of the Democrat National Committee. The goal of Mr. Rauh, and the goal of ADA, is the total revamping of the American system of free enterprise. Fritchey and his fellow apostles at the Democrat National Committee are ostensibly concerned only with the election of Democrats to places of leadership within our existing governmental structure.

Of course, as I have already indicated, Fritchey was so dedicated to his responsibilities in the Hughes affair that he was willing to join forces with Mr. Rauh, no doubt in the delusion that he could have his cake and eat it, too. Such was not the case.

We find, instead, that Deputy Democrat National Chairman Fritchey was not only an enthusiastic dupe as far as Paul Hughes was concerned, but that he also danced with naive grace to the music of the ADA and Joseph L. Rauh, Jr.

I wonder, Mr. President, how my Democrat friends in this body, and Democrat faithful throughout the country, feel about the quality of Mr. Fritchey's efforts in their behalf. I am sure they know that, notwithstanding the "individual" nature of his project with Mr. Hughes, he has placed an albatross around the neck of their party which no amount of hedging or whitewash can remove. The facts are here and they add up to as disgraceful a breach of political morals as this Nation has ever witnessed.

It has been suggested that what Mr. Fritchey and his contemporaries really need is fewer Americans for Democratic Action and many more Democrats for American Action.

In the clamor of this election year, I devoutly hope, for the sake of our country, that Mr. Fritchey and his immediate superior, Mr. Paul Butler, will harken to this advice. It would be a major step toward answering the unshakable challenge created by the Democratic National Committee's guidance of liar Hughes.

In his trial testimony, Fritchey repeatedly described the vigorous activity at the Democrat National Committee which accompanied the Hughes narrations. Stenographers, researchers, and secret messengers supplied from the committee staff, and acting on priority orders, participated in the project. Yet, Fritchey avowed that it was not a committee project, but rather his own "individual" effort.

Fritchey also told the jury that all the Democrat Party had was a deficit. Still, he was able to tap his own till, he tells us, and that of several committee employees, for sums ranging up to $800, to further his private project.

This arms-length attitude of a stiff-necked virtue in keeping the project en-

tirely unofficial, led the defense attorney at the trial to conclude:

In other words, in effect, Clayton Fritchey, the individual, kept such information from Clayton Fritchey, the deputy chairman of the Democratic Committee, in effect?

To this query, the Government prosecutor appropriately commented:

That is a pretty hard question to answer.

The disgusting moral tone of the project and the corrupt principles which actuated Fritchey to cast his lot with Hughes were revealed in open court.

The defense attorney asked Mr. Fritchey concerning his encounter with Hughes:

When you arranged to meet him, you had information which would lead you to believe that he was closely associated with Senator McCarthy and that you might be able to have a spy in the Senator's camp, right?"

Mr. Fritchey answered:

Yes.

The defense counsel continued:

And that didn't disturb you any, did it, that you should have a spy in the Senator's camp?"

Mr. Fritchey said:

Well, I would say that if this had resulted in his being able to prove the charges that he was making and to demonstrate to the public that a senior official of the Government was corrupting the Government, I would have considered it a signal public service.

Defense counsel asked:

In other words, the means would justify the end?

Mr. Fritchey replied:

Correct.

Now, Mr. President, that answer by Mr. Fritchey points up vividly the whole paradox of this affair. We find the tacitly self-righteous Deputy Democrat National Chairman actively condoning the use of spies, subterfuge, and secret informers which, out of the other side of his mouth, he condemned as a part of the so-called "terrible tactics" of the Senator whom he sought to crucify.

We should remember, too, that the loudest anti-McCarthy criticism by the likes of Mr. Fritchey and Mr. Rauh followed the line: "We approve of his objectives, but we don't like his methods." In other words, the tactics ascribed to Senator McCarthy by his left-wing antagonists did not justify the patriotic aims of Senator McCarthy; but, when employed by these shining knights of the Democrat National Committee and the ADA, in a morally deceptive affair of political chicanery, they constituted, in Mr. Fritchey's own words, "a signal public service."

I would remind the Senators, also, of the analogy given by the junior Senator from Wisconsin in answer to the critics of his "methods" in ferreting out Communists. He said—and we all remember it—"You can't go skunk-hunting in a high silk hat."

How much more noble and truthful it would have been for Fritchey and Rauh—second to none among the "McCarthy haters"—to have applied a similar admission to the object of their detestable assaults. Surely, being on the opposite side of the political and ideological fence from Senator McCarthy, they hold no less contempt for him than he evidences for the cause which they—unwittingly, of course—support.

Continuing with the Defense Counsel's cross examination of Deputy Democrat National Chairman Fritchey, we find this question:

Do you recall whether Hughes at any time expressed any opinions which caused you seriously to doubt his ethics or morality?

Mr. Fritchey replied:

No, not one single thing, no.

No comment of mine upon this answer could speak as eloquently or decisively as the following excerpt from a December 1953 memorandum from Hughes to Fritchey which was an exhibit, and part of the evidence, in the trial:

Phone taps can be utilized (against McCarthy) * * * Don't discount the tremendous value in just bargaining power of recorded phone discussions.

The memorandum continued:

A program of this type, although not nice, can result in harm to no one except (McCarthy) * * * As mentioned earlier, being nice, too ethical, or squeamish, will accomplish less than nothing, where McCarthy is concerned. McCarthy has stated many times, "Ethics went out the window with button shoes." So therefore I don't see the necessity for us to send a boy to do a man's work. If both Federal and civil law-enforcement agencies use the same unethical procedures to bring to justice criminals, are we not justified in using similar methods to expose (McCarthy) * * *? It is most easy to prove and document (McCarthy's guilt) by relaxing somewhat on ethics. This is probably what I'm best suited for.

There, Mr. President, in one brief quotation, is revealed the shocking issue in this discussion: Paul Hughes, admittedly a liar and self-professed expert on unethical procedures, received payment from an official of the Democrat National Committee to supply that official with false and defamatory information concerning a duly elected Member of the United States Senate in the performance of his official and patriotic duties.

At another point in the trial the Defense Counsel asked Mr. Fritchey:

Did you ever attempt to check with anybody, Mr. Fritchey, on the authenticity of any of the material that was given you?

To this Fritchey replied:

No; I don't think * * * Not beyond our own scrutiny of it.

At another time during the trial Mr. Fritchey said that he had taken some of the material Hughes gave him to a notary and made an affidavit that he had received it from Hughes "before a certain date."

The defense counsel asked in this regard:

Now, you said that you had taken certain of these transcriptions and those typed things to a notary so as to indicate that you had received them before a certain date, right?

Mr. Fritchey:

Correct.

Defense attorney:

Did you ever suggest taking Hughes along so he could swear that they were true before the same notary?

Mr. Fritchey:

No.

It is, indeed, a sordid tale. Clayton Fritchey is the Deputy Chairman of the Democrat National Committee. He is the editor of the Democratic Digest, which is sold on newsstands and sent through the mails to subscribers. He is the Democrat National Committee's principal "seeker after the truth."

Yet, Mr. President, the facts of the Hughes case prove beyond any reasonable doubt that Clayton Fritchey is either a blind fool or one of the most unscrupulous and unethical political beavers in the history of our country. He may be all of one or all of the other, or he may be a little bit of both. In any case, he is certainly a questionable pacesetter for loyal Democrats of principle and integrity.

In summing up the case to the jury the defense counsel, Mr. Erdmann, had this to say about Mr. Fritchey:

The first man or major witness that I want to discuss, although he was called somewhat late in the proceeding, is Clayton Fritchey because, as the defendant contends and we urge, Clayton Fritchey was in at the beginning.

The Hughes case, then, clearly and unquestionably, involves an attempt to discredit a committee of the United States Senate—not to discredit it legitimately, but, rather, to do it with a mountain of scandalous and fabricated information and with the sponsorship of sworn enemies of congressional efforts to expose the Communist conspiracy.

We have here a secret informer being paid for double-crossing his alleged employer. In this, I see bribery in its most flagrant form.

We have here under-the-table payments in cash for the most absurd batch of lies ever concocted.

We have here a working arrangement between the Democrat National Committee and the leader of the leftwing Americans for Democratic Action.

Are not my Democrat colleagues in the Senate concerned about this deplorable episode? Is Mr. Fritchey really the kind of man my friends on the other side of the aisle wish to have superintending the activities of their national political organization and conducting its public relations? Does the Democrat candidate for President in 1956, whoever he may be, wish to come before the American people and ask their confidence with this monstrous deception hovering above his head?

Perhaps Mr. Paul Butler, the quite vocal chairman of the Democrat National Committee has not had the time to read the trial testimony that is available to him. Certainly, to this hour, he has attempted no explanations or apologies for the actions of Clayton Fritchey, his deputy. Perhaps Mr. Butler has not even availed himself of the opportunity

of reading the press comments on this fiasco. His silence implies either shame or ignorance. If he is not aware of what has been going on in the ranks of his committee staff, or if he is not concerned about the consequences of the Hughes hoax, he is surely laying the political integrity of a great political organization on the block of public censure.

It would seem on the surface to be an unnecessary gesture to call to the attention of the Democrat national chairman this case of the secret informer and his financial mentor and guiding angel, Mr. Fritchey.

It is the job of the Democrat Party to police its own house. It owes that much to the American people and to its faithful partisans throughout the country.

Perhaps, on the other hand, Mr. President, Mr. Butler's silence is of greater shame than we suspect. Perhaps Mr. Fritchey's influence inside the councils of the Democrat Party weighs more heavily upon Democrat policy than has yet been admitted publicly.

After all, Mr. Butler himself has never shown any aversion to the application of highhanded political tactics. This was clearly demonstrated by his brazen suggestion that legislation, however discriminatory, should be pushed in the Congress to aid in the election of Democrat Senators and Representatives in areas where appropriations for the expenditure of Federal funds on public projects would endear the proponents of such measures to the voters of the affected States. In other words, like Mr. Fritchey, Mr. Butler seems to regard the function of Congress as purely a political one. He mentions, for instance, that the Niagara bill is of "tremendous importance to the reelection of Senator LEHMAN," and that the $500 million Federal plan for Hells Canyon should be passed, since it will be "a vital factor in the reelection of Senator MORSE and Representative EDITH GREEN."

Mr. President, it could be that I have misjudged Chairman Butler, but in view of the proven tendencies of his understudy, Mr. Fritchey, I find this comparative speculation worthy of the closest scrutiny by the American people.

What I should like to leave with the Senate, in concluding this discussion, Mr. President, is this question: Does the "cops and robbers" technique of Deputy Chairman Fritchey constitute the Democrat National Committee's answer to its search for issues in the coming campaign? If it does, then I suggest that the choice before the American voters in this election year will be distinctly one of political courage and integrity. Indeed, Chairman Butler and his committee need look no further for an issue for their campaign. Mr. Fritchey has provided a classic one, and, by his silence, Mr. Butler has endorsed it.

It will be interesting to observe how my Democrat colleagues respond to this challenge, which, though inspired by their own national committee, will be hurled at them by an aroused citizenry during the coming months.

I hope, Mr. President, that the perpetrators of this intrigue will find their punishment in the wrath of men of character and integrity within the Democrat Party.

It is disturbing, however, even to a Republican, to consider that such punishment might overflow its banks and swamp the service of those Members on the other side of the aisle who are themselves innocent of this blight upon the record of their party.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to take about 30 seconds to thank the very able Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] for the comments he has made today regarding the Hughes case.

I wish he had gone a bit further and had discussed the part the Washington Post took in this case. The Washington Post, which has been criticizing the methods of McCARTHY, took part in this payment and took part in this conspiracy—Wiggins, Friendly, and Murrey Marder. I think Marder was less responsible than were Wiggins and Friendly. Wiggins certainly took a major part in the conspiracy. And up to this time they have not apologized. They have not admitted their part in the conspiracy, even though it has been proven in court that they took a major part in it—one of the most irresponsible acts on the part of a newspaper that I have seen.

I again thank the very able Senator from Arizona for his discussion of this case.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish the Senator from Wisconsin had been in the Chamber when I had the floor and was making my short speech. I wish to tell the Senator from Wisconsin that I have heard—in fact, I have read—something of the implication of the various newspapers in this dastardly plot with Mr. Fritchey and Mr. Rauh. I did not feel I knew enough about it, from the evidence I was able to see, to speak competently on the floor about it. I suggest, therefore, that if the case can be further developed, certainly it would be enlightening to the people of America to have the Senator from Wisconsin discuss the newspaper angle. I wish I had felt competent enough to do it, but I did not desire to explore in that area—an area about which I knew so little.

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope the Attorney General's office will go into that case and procure indictments of those engaged in the conspiracy. If the Senator or I had been guilty of what these men did, we would have been indicted long since. I think there is a very definite duty on the part of the Attorney General to act as I have suggested.

VETO OF THE FARM BILL

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the veto message of the President of the United States on the farm bill, which I strongly approve, presumably brings an end to one of the hardest legislative fights, in which the greatest difference of opinion was manifested, in connection with any issue which has been decided by the Congress in recent years.

In order that the RECORD may clearly reflect how keen was this difference, both in committee and elsewhere, I wish to recite a few facts at this time.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry consists of 15 members, 8 of us being Democrats and 7 Republicans. On the issue which became perhaps the dominant issue as the bill was considered, the issue of the restoration of the 90 percent rigid price supports, the committee divided 8 to 7. Not only was that division in the committee as close as it could possibly be, but the members of the committee on both sides of the table were as evenly divided as it was possible for them to be and still leave an 8-to-7 vote on this particular issue. As to the Republican members of the committee, sitting on the opposite side of the table from myself, they were divided 4 against the restoration of rigid price supports and 3 in favor of restoration. As to the Democratic members of that committee, we were divided 5 to 3, that is, 5 for the restoration of rigid high level price supports and 3 against that issue.

Not only was that close division found in our committee, but likewise, in the conference committee, the representatives from the Senate were divided on this issue as evenly as they could be, that is, 3 to 2.

I invite attention to these facts at this time preliminary to saying that I was present much of the time at all stages of the debate in the field, in the committee, and in the conference committee, as this measure was heard and determined. I wish to say for the record that I do not believe any member of the committee, or of the conference committee, changed his mind in the slightest upon this particular issue, and upon most other vital farm issues, throughout nearly a year of discussion. Apparently the conviction of the Members was very deep.

So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to accord to Senators who did not feel as I do, the depth of conviction and the soundness of conscience which I hope they will accord to me. The difference of opinion was very real. The depth of conviction was very great. There was not a single change of position in this important field during the course of the hearings, the debate, and the conference.

I have made these statements preliminary to the making of another which it seems to me hardly needs to be made, and that is that I think those members of our committee and those Members of the Senate and House who attributed to the President of the United States a smaller degree of conviction and a lesser degree of courage than they themselves had were wrong from the beginning. They should have known from the beginning, and particularly in these closing weeks, that the attitude of the President would be exactly as he has stated it in his veto message. Any other conclusion than that would leave us in the position of claiming for ourselves some exalted height of conscientious determination and conviction which we were not willing to accord as being present in the mind and heart of the President of the United States. From the very beginning

it has seemed to me, we would necessarily stand on unsound ground if we assumed that the President by reason of the force of pressure, would change what he had long shown to be his very deep conviction and would approve the bill.

The nonpartisan or bipartisan nature of the support of the bill showed up throughout the debates, both in the committee and in the conference, and was reflected by the votes upon the floor of the Senate. I wish the record now to show that upon the final vote on the conference report 10 Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle showed their continuing disapproval of the measure. I have searched in the press in vain for any indication that more than four Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle failed to approve the conference report.

The records of the Senate show very clearly that four Members of the Senate who are Democrats voted against the conference report, namely, the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the senior Senator from Florida, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. But the records show with equal clarity that 4 Members of the Senate who sit on this side of the aisle, and who, I think, are as sound Democrats as any we have, paired in such a way as to show their continuing and unalterable opposition to the conference report, those 4 being the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Unfortunately two Members of the Senate who sit on this side of the aisle could not be present for the final vote. One was recovering from surgery in Bethesda, and the other was absent in the course of his campaign for reelection. Those two Senators, namely, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and my own distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], saw to it that their position of opposition to the conference report was shown on the RECORD of the Senate where all might see it, not only that day, as did those who heard the sound of the yeas and nays, but throughout the history of this Nation.

In addition to those 10 on this side of the aisle who clearly showed their continuing opposition to this measure, there were 3 other Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle who, for reasons sufficient to themselves—and I honor those reasons—felt, when the conference report was submitted, good as it was in part, and bad as it was in part, that they preferred, in weight, the good values, and therefore voted for the conference report. The same three Members of the Senate, who sit on this side of the aisle, by repeated votes during the course of the debate and the development of this measure, had shown their opposition to rigid price supports, and to many of the other objectionable features of the bill. The three Senators to whom I refer are the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I wish that fact to show upon the RECORD because, notwithstanding all the talk of politics which has entered into the consideration of this measure since the conference report reached the floor—and I think there are abundant evidences to justify the charge of politics, at least since that time—I want it to be clear from the RECORD that there were men who, for one reason or another, satisfactory to themselves, felt that it was their duty to vote, in soundness of conscience and in depth of conviction, in favor of the conference report, although they had voted against certain provisions which were contained in it during the debate when those individual issues were presented.

I return to the position I took a while ago, and say again that, with all the depth of conviction and soundness of conscience that were shown during the debate, and with the unwillingness of any member of the committee—divided, as it was, 8 to 7, and divided as evenly as it could be on both sides of the table—to change his position upon these critical issues, I think those who jumped to the conclusion that the President of the United States, when the bill reached him, would display a poorer conscience and a weaker conviction than they themselves had evidenced were bound to be disappointed. I believe that anyone who has thought for weeks that the President of the United States would do anything else than he has done was leaning on the weakest kind of a reed, and based his opinion largely on wishful thinking.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator no doubt has had occasion to recall the statement the President made in Brookings, S. Dak., when he referred expressly to a pledge to maintain 90 percent of parity support for the basic commodities. The Senator from Florida never made such a statement, but I am sure he will agree that any man who makes that kind of pledge should keep his promise.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the first place, I was not present at Brookings. In the second place, I was not following with great interest the statements made by the then candidate of the Republican Party, because I was not supporting him. Furthermore, I have heard from many sources that the statement which the present President of the United States made at that time differed in some detail from the statement which has been mentioned by the Senator from Louisiana. I repeat, I was not present, and what I say is based on hearsay, but my understanding was that the present President and the then candidate of the Republican Party said his party was committed to the temporary 90-percent price support that was then provided in the law on the statute books, and that he wanted to make it clear that he would stand by that commitment until the provision expired.

However, I certainly do not wish to argue the point with the Senator from Louisiana, because neither he nor I was present on the occasion when the statement was made. Fine lawyer that the Senator from Louisiana is, he realizes that we would be on unsound ground to argue the matter. Besides that, I do not believe that either of us is interested either in besmirching the character of our President or in upholding his every statement, because his statements will have to stand on the record.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to say that the statements the present President of the United States made, when he was campaigning in Kasson, Minn., and also in Columbia, S. C., showed that those statements left no doubt, as I am sure the Senator from Florida will agree, that the candidate would support the 90 percent of parity program. That being the case, some of us were certainly entitled to rely upon a statement made on at least three occasions by the candidate. Perhaps we should not believe what a man says while he is a candidate. However, certainly some of us had reason to hope that he would keep his promise.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would neither defend nor decry the position taken by the President of the United States. I certainly was not present when he made either one of the statements to which the Senator has referred. However, I call the attention of my good friend to the fact that there are areas in this Nation which have not supported rigid price supports and have strongly favored flexible supports, but they nevertheless strongly supported the President. Therefore there could not have been much understanding on their part that that was the candidate's position.

However, I go back to what I said—and I think it will hold up, and that it cannot be broken down—that the men who were claiming for themselves the right to stand by their convictions—and not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry changed his position on this important issue—were standing on unsound ground when they assumed that the President of the United States would follow any different course than he followed today, since repeatedly, in the course of the last year, he had stated his conviction that high rigid price supports had contributed very greatly to the building up of farm surpluses and to the disastrous condition in which agriculture finds itself. Certainly I have not heard anything even remotely indicating that he was sliding from that conviction.

I believe that my friend from Louisiana and other Senators—and I have the highest respect for them—who felt that the President of the United States, despite his conviction and the dictates of his conscience, would do other than what he did today, were standing on shifting sand. I say that because the President had repeatedly stated that he was going to stand up to his conviction, in spite of various efforts in different parts of the Nation, by men who wanted high rigid price supports, who threatened political reprisal if the President failed to support them. One of them, as I recall, the President of the National Farmers Union, went so far as to deliver to the press, before it was received by

the President of the United States, a very insulting and derogatory telegram, which, if anything had been needed to sustain the President of the United States in the firmness of his conviction, would have served to do so.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like first to continue my comments on this point and to yield further to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I wonder whether the Senator believes that some of us stood on unsound ground when we thought the President would sign the natural gas bill, which he vetoed, even though he said it was a good bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not know too much about that, or as much as some of my distinguished friends know about it, particularly those Senators who are lucky enough to have natural gas deposits in their States. I should also like very much to have it appear in the RECORD that I do not put forth as much gas on the floor of the Senate, but I am afraid that I could not truthfully say that. [Laughter.]

Let me say on that issue that a great diversion came up which created in some minds, though not in mine, the fear that perhaps there was general corruption, so to speak, behind the efforts of some of those who were urging the passage of the natural gas bill. I voted with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for its passage.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum? While I disagree with much he has said, I believe he is making a very important speech, and I believe more Senators should hear it. Therefore, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the willingness of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin to extend that courtesy to me. However, I would rather proceed with my rather brief remarks. Then the Senator from Wisconsin, on his own time, may be heard and I shall be very glad to suggest the absence of a quorum for him after I have concluded my remarks, if he wishes me to do so.

Mr. President, so much for what has happened up to now in this matter. I said on the floor of the Senate, when the conference report was being passed upon by the Senate, that I thought Senators and Members of the House were overlooking a very real point in the whole issue, and that was the position of the general public throughout the Nation.

I remember placing in the RECORD an analysis of the opinions of country editors throughout the United States, taken from the trade journal which serves that group of very fine people. I remember that that analysis showed, even in the areas where the sentiment for rigid price support was high, that, as a rule, the country editors were shaking their heads and saying that there is not any soundness in continuing that provision which creates overproduction and oversupply and the unremitting buildup of agricultural surpluses.

I have said several times on the floor of the Senate that, so far as the press in my State, the agricultural organizations in my State, and the general public in my State are concerned, I feel that the tremendous majority is strongly against the restoration of rigid price supports, and that there can be no question as to their position in that regard. I have stated in appearances I have made on the floor—and I am afraid I made too many appearances on the floor on this bill—that the Farm Bureau Federation of my State, which is the only organization with a general membership of farmers, throughout the State, the citrus industry organizations, such as the Florida Citrus Exchange and the Florida Citrus Mutual, the vegetable organizations of Florida, particularly the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, and the State Cattlemen's Association had repeatedly gone on record in such a way that no one could question or misunderstand how they stood on this important issue. They do not want high price supports reinstated, and, in fact, many of them are against all price supports.

I have always held that reasonable price supports for storable basics, not calculated to create and maintain surpluses, are necessary at this time when we are moving out of the war period. But, unfortunately, Mr. President, many good people, farmers, throughout the Nation, have learned to rely so heavily upon the weak stick of high price supports that they are unwilling or unable to plan for themselves and to produce in such a way as not to oversupply the market.

Of course, no one in Florida knew until today what the President's decision was going to be, but in order that there may be some showing on the RECORD that the people of that State, which produces $600 million worth of agricultural products each year, have rather strong convictions on this subject, as represented by newspapers in the centers of agricultural production and as represented, as I have already stated, in farm organizations which I have mentioned. I wish to place in the RECORD some editorials which have come to my attention, which were published the latter part of last week and reflect the attitude of Florida people, I think, correctly.

The first is an editorial from the Tampa Daily Times which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in toto as a part of my remarks.

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

IKE, DON'T HESITATE; VETO THE FARM BILL

President Eisenhower should veto the farm bill.

All of the talk about getting no farm legislation this session unless he allows the monstrosity passed yesterday to become law is far-down, low-grade politics designed to put Mr. Eisenhower on the spot in this election year.

But the truth of the matter is that if he blocks this legislation by a veto and it is not overridden he will have left just what he wants because the present farm law which his administration fought for so bitterly and won two years ago would continue in force.

Congressional action on this new, definitely costly and destructive farm bill has been the worst kind of presidential year politics. There has been far more evidence of designing the measure for farm votes than for farmers.

The vicious determination to continue rigid price supports if not vetoed by the President will mean the piling up of more farm surpluses instead of bringing relief. It is a complete contradiction of the theory behind the soil bank idea which was approved in the same measure. The purpose of the soil bank obviously is to help restrict production, yet 90 percent of parity guarantees will defeat that objective.

President Eisenhower should take his cue on whether to veto the bill from the results of Tuesday's primary voting in Illinois. The President's evident strength downstate where he outran Stevenson 2 to 1 shows no real revolt among farmers against the administration.

The mock concern of the Democrats and some of the farm State Republican Senators and House members for the plight of the farmers shows they are not being realistic because the farmers themselves have been disproving the assertions that they are against the administration.

The President should not weaken at this last minute in his previous resolve to fight rigid prices. He knows the consequences of rigid supports. His failure to veto would indicate he had yielded to political pressure and would mean he was deserting the public interest hoping to catch a few more votes.

A courageous stand will bring him far more respect.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I quote two small paragraphs of the editorial, and I assure the Members of the Senate that they are representative of the sense and meaning of the editorial. The first is as follows:

Congressional action on this new, definitely costly and destructive farm bill has been the worst kind of presidential year politics. There has been far more evidence of designing the measure for farm votes than for farmers.

Then the closing paragraphs:

The President should not weaken at this last minute in his previous resolve to fight rigid prices. He knows the consequences of rigid supports. His failure to veto would indicate he had yielded to political pressure and would mean he was deserting the public interest hoping to catch a few more votes.

A courageous stand will bring him far more respect.

The next editorial is from the Tampa Morning Tribune, a morning newspaper published in that area of my State which is the greatest citrus producing section, one of the greatest small-vegetable producing sections, and the greatest cattle producing section. It is an editorial entitled "Integrity Versus Political Pork." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, published on April 13, 1956, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

INTEGRITY VERSUS POLITICAL PORK

It is hard to figure how Congress could pass a more thoroughly bad piece of legislation, or one loaded with more pure political pork, than the election-year farm bill it has just sent to the White House.

If a measure ever merited a Presidential veto, this one is it.

Those Democrats and the farm State Republicans who approved it may try to say with a straight face that it will provide long-run help for the farmer. Actually it

is clearly fashioned to use him as a political football.

Supporters of the bill realized the President wants the so-called soil-bank plan which is authorized in the legislation. That plan is designed to reduce the present farm surplus. But the congressional majority coupled it with a provision restoring flat 90 percent price supports, the discredited system which brought on more production than the free market could absorb and so accounted for the present surplus. The bill thus is a self-contradiction, an antisurplus measure that would inevitably encourage the production of more price-depressing surplus commodities.

Mr. Eisenhower has frequently spoken out sharply against the rigid parity system. But Democratic strategists consider they have him backed into a corner this time.

If he lets the legislation slide through, they figure to go to the hustings as the party that demonstrated its concern for the welfare of the farmer. If he vetoes the bill on the ground it violates the principles for which he stands, they plan to make the farm bill the main issue of the campaign.

The political dilemma confronting the President is obvious. We may be sure a good deal of pressure will be applied by members of his own party in the farm belt as he mulls over the question the next few days at Augusta. They will argue he must sign the bill if threatened GOP congressional candidates in the farm areas are to be helped and strategic States in the Midwest are to be carried in order to win the Presidency in November.

But the price these fellow Republicans and many Democrats are asking him to pay is far too high. For his signature on the farm bill would mean a bowing to political expediency. It would blemish the integrity of his administration. It would throw into sharp reverse the long-range plan he and Secretary of Agriculture Benson have prepared for reducing farm surplus.

Certainly, Mr. Eisenhower has made it clear that he is a leader capable of rising above political pressure. His recent veto of the natural-gas bill was only one of many such demonstrations.

May he rise above the pressure this time and accompany a veto of the farm bill with a frank and full statement that the upholding of integrity and sound economic principles is far more important than the fate of farm-belt politicians. That course of action may lose the votes of some already disgruntled farmers, but it will kill a bad bill and win the respect, confidence, and support of the country as a whole.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I quote a part of the editorial, as follows:

May he—

Meaning the President—

May he rise above the pressure this time and accompany a veto of the farm bill with a frank and full statement that the upholding of integrity and sound economic principles is far more important than the fate of farm-belt politicians. That course of action may lose the votes of some already disgruntled farmers, but it will kill a bad bill and win the respect, confidence, and support of the country as a whole.

Mr. President, the next editorial is peculiarly interesting, because it was published in the Miami Daily News, a newspaper identified with former Gov. James M. Cox, of Ohio, at one time the Democratic candidate for President. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

GOP REAL LOSER OVER FARM BILL

The repudiation of the Eisenhower farm policies, not only by the opposition in Congress, but by many Republicans as well, would normally be taken as a political setback for the President.

In the case of President Eisenhower, it seems to be different, however. People generally appear to place him above party politics and the blame for an unworkable farm measure, or none at all if the President vetoes it, will mostly rest with Congress.

This is a political phenomenon which enrages the Democratic politicians, yet it is one of the realities in this election. We don't presume to know what the President will do about the farm bill, but whether he signs or vetoes it the congressional candidates will be the ones mostly affected.

If the President vetoes the new farm legislation on the ground it restores rigid high price supports for basic crops, Republican candidates in the farm belt will feel the effects of his action. If he signs it on the theory it is better than a return to the present price support law under which farm income has declined a billion dollars in a year, then Democratic candidates will claim credit for reversing administration policy.

In any case, the Democrats who framed the hodge-podge measure passed by both Houses of Congress yesterday, and the Republicans who voted for it, have little reason for pride. As passed, the 1956 farm bill is an undisguised political measure hopefully designed to garner votes, with little regard for the welfare of the Nation as a whole. In the parlance of the day it's strictly for the birds.

Mr. HOLLAND. I read from the editorial two excerpts which I think may cause some searching of souls here, Mr. President, since they come from the source I have mentioned.

As passed, the 1956 farm bill is an undisguised political measure hopefully designed to garner votes, with little regard for the welfare of the Nation as a whole. In the parlance of the day, it's strictly for the birds.

Earlier in the editorial there are these words:

The blame for an unworkable farm measure, or none at all if the President vetoes it, will mostly rest with Congress.

Mr. President, I hope Senators will reread that part of the editorial very carefully, because I so firmly believe it to be true, particularly when we have a veto message which invites Congress speedily to consider and report a bill setting up the soil bank and perhaps other commendable features, so that it may be promptly passed. I think the general public, if Congress fails to follow that course, will come indisputably to the conclusion that most of the Members of the Congress were interested in votes rather than in farm support.

I again quote the portion of the editorial which I just read:

The blame for an unworkable farm measure, or none at all if the President vetoes it, will mostly rest with Congress.

Mr. President, the next editorial is from the Miami Herald of April 13, 1956, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

FARM BILL CONFOUNDS FARM CONFUSION

The political analysts are hard at it interpreting the farm bill which Congress passed over expressed Executive displeasure.

The President most likely will veto the measure, although Democrats and Farm Belt Republicans say that there is no way open to him—electionwise—but to sign it.

If the President vetoes the measure the session will probably end without any farm-relief legislation.

That would not be all to the bad. Congress enacts a lot of bills that would better serve the country if tossed into the wastebasket before they got to the discussion stage.

The farm bill is an amorphous creation. It seethes with confusion.

Actually, it does nothing to stabilize the agricultural industry.

Rather, it has incorporated some provisions previously tried, which in themselves are largely responsible for the problems which this new bill purports to solve.

The President said before Congress passed the measure it was not a good bill. It isn't.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I read a few paragraphs from the editorial:

The farm bill is an amorphous creation. It seethes with confusion.

Mr. President, I hope Senators will look up the meaning of the word "amorphous." I looked it up and was delighted to find what it means.

I read further from the editorial:

Actually, it does nothing to stabilize the agricultural industry.

Rather it has incorporated some provisions, previously tried, which in themselves are largely responsible for the problems which this new bill purports to solve.

The President said before Congress passed the measure it was not a good bill. It isn't.

Mr. President, the last of the editorials which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD is from the Orlando Sentinel of April 11, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that the short editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PARAGRAPHS

Secretary Benson will have no truck with the thing called a farm bill which the politically minded House and Senate have passed. And we're glad to see that Senator HOLLAND would not sign the conference committee report either. It would only add to the farmers' problems.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there cannot be the slightest doubt that Congress has it within its power now to have submitted to it quickly from committee and to pass a bill which will create a soil bank. Is there need for a soil bank? I think there is very great need for it. I heard a statement made on this floor within the hour to the effect that all the planting had been accomplished in connection with all the basic commodities. I think that statement was thoughtlessly made, because everyone knows it is not completely correct as to the wheat industry. Anyone can plant up to 15 acres of wheat anywhere that wheat can be produced in this Nation and not be under the provisions of the present allotment program. So there

will be an unbridled invitation for the planting of wheat, and there would have been if the bill had been passed as it was. It seems to me there is a need for soil bank diversion of wheat, and there would be if the soil bank provision were separately considered and passed by the Congress.

Likewise, in the case of corn there is plenty of its acreage and mostly in the commercial areas that has not yet been planted. There is plenty of time to make good use of the soil bank in the case of corn if Congress has the will to do so.

Congress again is challenged. Shall we not live up to our opportunity to create a soil bank?

Mr. President, I have been reading in newspapers within the past few days about the terrific destruction accomplished in the Wheat Belt, in six States, Colorado, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, and Nebraska, by the recent dust storms. The amount of wheat which has been blown out of the ground is stupendous. I do not suppose anyone knows the exact amount. It certainly must total many hundreds of thousands of acres, and, probably, from what I have read, 2 or 3 million acres. There is a need, right now, for the soil bank.

There are other situations, none, I am glad to say, so acute as that which I have just mentioned, which likewise call for the use of the soil bank to reduce production and to give useful employment for many acres in such a way as will enable farmers to get their land out of production and claim the beneficent effects of the soil bank.

Mr. President, we are about to conclude, so far as Congress is concerned, unless someone should be so unwise as to call up the Presidential veto and to attempt to override it in either House of Congress. I think there is no advocate of this monstrous bill in its present form who would be so unwise as to do that. If so, I think the result would be eye-opening, because I believe it would show a majority of both Houses clearly holding up the hands of those who now realize, and who have realized for a long while, that the provisions of the bill simply are not sound, and would not stablize the agricultural industry of the Nation, but instead would create greater surpluses and greater difficulties, and would add to the dependency of our people upon the Government.

Mr. President, I cannot too strongly urge that in the whole field of agricultural legislation one of the points we must always keep in mind is that the farm areas where there have been high rigid price supports, first in the war years, then in the year that followed, are the areas in which too many farmers have shown continuing inability to plan for themselves, continuing unwillingness to work out their own problems, and continuing failure to cut their production to fit consumption needs.

Throughout the Nation, many other agricultural industries which are being called upon to plan for themselves and to produce wisely, are prosperous and are doing well. Not only do they not want help, but they have seen the baneful effects of the too-great assistance which has been given in other places, and they do not want to subject themselves to the effects of the overuse of high support prices, as they see those effects developing, and unfortunately as such effects have already been greatly overdeveloped in some parts of our Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONFUSION SURROUNDING THE ADMINISTRATION'S SO-CALLED PARTNERSHIP POWER PROGRAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, so much confusion and misinformation circulates around the present administration's so-called partnership power program that citizens directly affected are hard put to understand the full meaning of its implications. In my home State of Oregon, the efforts on behalf of partnership have been directed toward needed multiple-purpose projects which are already authorized by Congress for construction as units in the Federal system.

I have attempted to clarify this aspect of the drive for partnership in a recent letter replying to an editorial published in the Eugene Register-Guard of April 8, 1956. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my reply to the editorial which appeared April 8, 1956, and the text of the editorial at issue.

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

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of April 8, 1956]

SENATORS BLOCK EUGENE WATER AND ELECTRIC BOARD FROM COUGAR

There have been many people who have asked in recent weeks about the chances of the Eugene Water and Electric Board gaining approval for partnership participation in Cougar Dam on the South Fork of the McKenzie.

It is a good question. Ray Boals, superintendent for Eugene Water and Electric Board, says that work currently being done on the project by the Army engineers will not prevent the local utility from participating in the project later on. But the chances of partnership authorization getting through this session of Congress are indeed slim. A bill for partnership by Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH was approved in subcommittee but has been held from the full committee by the subcommittee chairman, JAMES DAVIS, Democrat of Georgia. Even if the bill reached the floor of the House and passed it would never pass the Senate because it would be blocked by Oregon's Senators, as it was once before by Senator MORSE after passing the House.

They believe it will wreck Federal power development in the Northwest and cut off the region from cheap hydroelectric power which they say is vital to attract industry.

In the case of aluminum and a few other industries this might be the case. But to contend that it would stop industrial development generally is pure poppycock. (To belabor this point, it hasn't stopped industrial development in California where private steam generation handles most of the power load.)

Our Senators want all-Federal development within the Bonneville system. But with the needs that are foreseen in the next 10 to 15 years, it is not realistic to believe that Congress will appropriate all the funds necessary to do the job.

Private capital, and capital from municipal utilities such as Eugene Water and Electric Board, is needed to take up the slack. Vital flood control dams are traditionally a Federal cost and it takes some doing to get appropriations for these.

So again, we must ask, what's wrong with the idea of partnership development of some of these projects? Is it an unfair use of a natural resource? We don't see how. Falling water is used to generate electricity to meet the needs of the population. If Eugene Water and Electric Board developed the power facilities at Cougar it would provide power for this area that would not have to be taken from the Bonneville system. Either way we get the power for the Northwest region. But with partnership development we get it now or in the near future when we will need it. In fact, it is our opinion that if we wait for all-Federal development we shall never meet our requirements, whether there is a Democratic or Republican administration. In the past 20 years the Federal Government has put about $2 billion into the Bonnevile system. Can we logically expect about $8 billion in the next 10 to 15 years? That is the estimated need to meet our requirements.

Opponents of partnership argue that private and municipal firms desiring to develop electric power would be taking all the profit from multi-purpose projects. This is a flimsy argument. When the Government builds the power features of a dam, the sale of the power over 50 years pays back the cost of the power part of the structure. It does not pay back the cost of the flood control features.

Under partnership, at Cougar for instance, Eugene Water and Electric Board would pay the costs of the propect allocated to power. It would be constructed under specifications acceptable to the Government and the Government would own all of the project except the powerhouse and the generators. Eugene Water and Electric Board would have the right to use the power for 50 years under a Federal Power Commission license. The Government would pay for the costs allocated to flood control and construct the project with Eugene Water and Electric Board and Federal funds.

At Cougar and at Green Peter-White Bridge on the Santiam the Government would be saved the expenditure of an estimated $40 million on power allocations, a sum that could well be applied to Libby or a number of other Federal projects so urgently needed.

If our Senators desire to aid development of the Northwest, they should get off their all-Federal power high-horse and take the lead on partnership development, particularly on some of the smaller multi-purpose projects. Their argument for all-Federal development is a political pipe dream and they know it.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
April 11, 1956.

To the EDITOR OF THE EUGENE REGISTER-GUARD:

Your recent editorial asked why Senator MORSE and I are blocking partnership construction of Cougar Dam. For your information, Cougar Dam is presently authorized and construction is underway as a Federal project. The law must be changed for it to become a partnership proposition. Why, I ask, are McKay, Ellsworth, Coon, and Norblad blocking Federal construction of Cougar which has already started? Why are the Republicans generally opposed to continuing the Federal program that has been so successful?

When Cougar Dam's powerplant is integrated into the Bonneville Power System, the Eugene Water and Electric Board will share—along with other public and private utilities of the region—in the new power supply. Contrast this with what happens under a partnership in which the Eugene

Water and Electric Board would own all the power. How would the power consumers of the Springfield Utility Board, Lane County Electric Co-op, Blachly-Lane County Co-op, and Pacific Power & Light Co. fare under a partnership which gave all the power to Eugene?

The Eugene customers, like those elsewhere, should receive a fair share of the Cougar power, and that's what they will get when Cougar is completed as a Federal project. I do not agree with your belief that customers of the Eugene Water and Electric Board have a greater right to Cougar power than those who reside outside the city limits. I think the power should be shared equitably, and this can best be accomplished with Cougar Dam as a Federal project.

Your editorial headline: "Senators Block Eugene Water and Electric Board from Cougar," can only have been motivated by political partisanship. Let's look at the record. The President's budget for 1956 requested $100,000 for Cougar Dam planning. The House, of which Mr. ELLSWORTH is a Member, approved the $100,000. Following this less-than-desirable action, Senator MORSE and I urgently requested the Senate Appropriations Committee to increase the funds so construction on Cougar could be started, and the day advanced when Eugene and other Bonneville customers could share in the Cougar power supply. The Senate approved an increase to $500,000 and work on Cougar has begun. Perhaps it is only during election years that words can be twisted so that work toward starting a project can mean that it is being blocked.

With great political fanfare, President Eisenhower recently signed the bill authorizing $785 million worth of Federal power projects in the upper Colorado Basin. The same Oregon Republicans, who plead so fervently for partnership in our region, were quite enthusiastic about Federal projects in the upper Colorado. Why are they blocking Federal projects in Oregon? Is the answer to be found in the fact that no private utilities would have the poor Colorado power sites, whereas the fine hydroelectric sites in Oregon's Columbia Basin are desired by so-called local interests?

The Federal-power program has brought the Northwest the cheapest electricity in the United States, as well as irrigation, navigation, and flood-control benefits. It is remarkable that every partnership proposal represents a retreat from these comprehensive values. Why do our Republican Congressmen lament that they cannot secure more funds for Federal development in the Northwest, when they themselves have helped push through $785 million worth of development for the upper Colorado?

It is true that Senator MORSE and I voted for the upper Colorado program, but we also are fighting hard for Federal projects in our own region. We would never be so hypocritical as to favor $785 million worth of upper Colorado Federal construction, while lamenting lugubriously that Congress would refuse further Federal funds in our own area. That, however, is the record of the Oregon Republicans—a record which some Oregon daily newspapers, ironically, find quite commendable.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

CONSTRUCTION BY IDAHO POWER CO. OF DAM IN HELLS CANYON STRETCH OF SNAKE RIVER

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, only a few months ago the supporters of the Idaho Power Co., seeking to block construction of a high Federal dam in Hells Canyon, claimed that the water rights of irrigators which were established by State law would be impaired if a Federal project spanned the canyons of the Snake. These spokesmen for the company represented the Federal Government as some kind of a predator, crouched to override the water laws of the upstream States.

How quickly the leopard can change its spots.

The Idaho Power Co. has proceeded with the construction of a dam in the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake River in defiance of the laws of the State of Oregon. It now contends that its license received from the Federal Power Commission places it above the jurisdiction of the State, that permission of the State of Oregon is not necessary when the company appropriates a water resource of the State after receiving a Federal license.

What has happened to those stanch defenders of States rights who, before the Federal licenses were granted to the Idaho Power Co. for the dams in Hells Canyon, pictured the high Federal dam as a form of piracy threatening the farmers' water rights? Their silence is proof of the falseness of their claims.

The legislation to authorize the construction of a Federal dam at Hells Canyon specifically subordinated the operation of its power facilities to the water rights of upstream irrigators. The laws of the States were to govern in this respect.

The contrast between the respect for State law which would have been provided under the Federal construction of a dam in Hells Canyon and the defiance of State law which has resulted from licensing of Idaho Power Co. projects is pointedly discussed in an editorial from an outstanding Oregon newspaper.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial entitled "Is This Case Different?" published in the East Oregonian, of Pendleton, Oreg., of April 6, 1956.

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

[From the East Oregonian of April 6, 1956]

IS THIS CASE DIFFERENT?

When Douglas McKay was governor of Oregon he said to a luncheon meeting in Walla Walla, "You know, I find that I have to remind Len Jordan that the State of Oregon has quite an interest, too, in the Snake River." It was at a meeting of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee at which Idaho's Governor Jordan was present. Mr. McKay was speaking, of course, of Mr. Jordan's oft repeated statement that the State of Idaho must protect its rights to Snake River water by opposing Hells Canyon Dam. Mr. Jordan did not concede that Oregon might have some interest in Snake River waters that flowed between the borders of Idaho and Oregon.

In recent days the attorney general of the State of Oregon has decided that the Idaho Power Co. should have asked permission of the State of Oregon to construct Brownlee Dam on the Snake River. He has started proceedings to force the company to seek that permission. Idaho Power Co. has said that the only permission it considers necessary is that granted by the Federal Power Commission. The company so thoroughly believes it that it undertook construction of a bridge over the Snake without asking permission of the Corps of Engineers.

When Idaho's Governor Jordan was doing everything possible to prevent the construction of Hells Canyon Dam he and his followers warned that the high dam would encroach upon State rights. Now that Idaho Power Co. flaunts the rights of the State of Oregon, those same people in the State of Idaho are strangely silent.

In the State of Oregon some of the stoutest defenders of State rights see in the attorney general's action a political motivation. The same citizens see in a different light the move of Portland General Electric Co. to build a dam on the Deschutes River that has been opposed by the State hydroelectric commission.

Apparently, it is all a matter of whose ox is being gored.

Our hope is that we never shall see the day that Oregon's attorney general will not guard the rights of the State in the use of any and all waters in which the State has an interest.

The Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune has some interesting comments on the State of Oregon versus Idaho Power Co. case:

"The supporters of the 3 dams the Idaho Power Co. hopes to build as a substitute for a high Hells Canyon Dam have devoted several million words in recent years to the threat of Federal encroachment upon State rights. The theme had infinite variations. Every effort to reassure the public, particularly in southern Idaho, that a Federal high dam would operate in compliance with State law was drowned in the flood of 'man your floodgates' oratory. The Federal Government was pictured as the fearsome ogre which would crush all State rights in its sweep toward domination of the region. The Idaho Power Co., by contrast, was pictured as a local interest under full supervision and control by State agencies and dedicated unswervingly to preservation of State rights.

"The question arises, of course, as to why the Idaho Power Co. currently is paying such devoted attention to the wierdly reasoned decision of a Federal agency, the FPC, and so little attention to the protests of the Oregon attorney general. The answer, of course, is that the FPC opinion is favorable to Idaho Power's objectives, and the Oregon attorney general's protests are unfavorable to those objectives.

"The rest is campaign oratory, as most of it has been throughout the Hells Canyon battle. The crusade for State's rights' does not happen to have much bearing at the moment upon Idaho Power's plans. Therefore, it can be ignored for the time being while construction of Brownlee goes ahead at full speed.

"There is nothing particularly alarming about this situation. Idaho Power's approach seems to be realistic and logical. Its objectives have been clear enough to anyone who cared to see them. It is proceeding toward those objectives according to plan.

"The disturbing thing has always been the uncritical acceptance by thousands of people of the image of Idaho Power as the stalwart champion of State's rights and protector of the people from their own Federal Government.

"The slight disagreement between the Oregon attorney general and Idaho Power would be mainly useful if it persuaded some of these people to make a belated reexamination of some of the campaign oratory."

DUPLICITY OF ADMINISTRATION'S ACTIVITIES IN FIELD OF WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the duplicity of the present administration's activities in the field of water-resource development is reflected in many recent developments. The claims of the administration spokesman that there is not sufficient money in the Treasury for

Hells Canyon Dam is contradicted by approval of the $750 million Upper Colorado storage project. The administration contends that the magnificent Columbia River basin dam sites can be developed only by private power company partners, but at the same time gives its full backing to wholly Federal construction on the Colorado. What is the reason for this Jekyll-and-Hyde philosophy in a field of vital concern to our national welfare? Are powerful pressures at work which require one pattern for development of one river system, and a completely different approach to another?

The method by which word and action often differ in the present administration's power policy is discussed in a recent column by the distinguished journalist, Thomas L. Stokes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article written by Mr. Stokes, which was published in the Washington Evening Star of April 12, 1956.

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

WORD AND ACTION SOMETIMES DIFFER—EISENHOWER O. K. OF COLORADO RIVER BILL VIEWED AS RUNNING COUNTER TO POLICY

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

It's easy to understand how our people can be fooled about what goes on here. Often there's a difference in what is said about policy and what is actually done.

An example is what President Eisenhower said at Augusta, Ga., when he signed into law the bill recently passed by Congress for the mammoth upper Colorado River storage project to be developed by the Federal Government.

"This," he said, "represents something I believe in." It follows his idea, he explained, of "treating river valleys as a whole thing—it goes from top to bottom—it recognizes that one thing is certainly true—water is getting to be one of our most valuable resources."

Such an aim first was expressed half a centry ago by President Theodore Roosevelt. He told Congress in his first message of the need for great storage works to equalize the flow of streams which, he said, were too big to be undertaken by private interests, as is the case with the Colorado River project. In a later message to Congress, Theodore Roosevelt advocated integrated public development of our river systems for navigation, flood control, reclamation, and production of electric power.

It was not until many years later that his vision began to come true in great public projects—Boulder Canyon Dam in Nevada during the Hoover administration, later renamed Hoover Dam, and, in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, a whole bevy of giant projects—TVA in the South, Bonneville in Oregon, Grand Coulee in Washington, Shasta in California, Hungry Horse in Montana, and so on.

But, if President Eisenhower believes in treating river valleys as a whole thing, he either has not told the responsible officials in his administration or they have not followed his instructions. For, until the upper Colorado, in which special factors are involved, the administration's policy had been contrary to treating river valleys as a whole thing. That's why conservationists have so bitterly attacked the administration policy.

In letter or spirit the principle now espoused by the President has been violated in numerous instances. Perhaps the most graphic illustration is in the case of another great river system like the Colorado—the Columbia, which spans our Pacific Northwest. Both Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams are on it. When built in the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration they were envisaged as part of a series to develop the Columbia system from top to bottom. A grand plan for unified and integrated development of the Columbia Basin was completed by the Army Engineer Corps in 1950 after Bonneville and Grand Coulee were built.

But the Eisenhower administration has scrapped this in the so-called "partnership" of Federal Government with private utilities proclaimed by President Eisenhower in his 1952 campaign speech at Seattle and faithfully executed by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

This violation of "treating river valleys as a whole thing began at Hells Canyon on the Snake River, a Columbia tributary, along the Oregon-Idaho border. The Army engineers had recommended a high dam there to be built by the Federal Government to utilize the full potential of the river and fit Hells Canyon most effectively into the Columbia River plan. But Secretary McKay stopped this. He withdrew an application for a license for Federal development submitted by the Interior Department in the Truman administration to the Federal Power Commission to carry out the Army engineer plan. That opened the way for a private power company, Idaho Power, to put in its bid to build, instead, three small dams, which subsequently was granted by the FPC. This would mean piecemeal development that would throw the whole Army engineer plan askew.

Though this was represented as "partnership" with a local power company, that came to be a joke around here. For Idaho Power stock is owned mostly in the East, and stockholders were, in fact, holding their annual meeting at Augusta, Maine, the day that Secretary McKay opened the way for them to cut in on Hells Canyon by withdrawing the application for a license to carry out the Army engineer plan. In turn, this discarding of the Army engineer plan at Hells Canyon led to other private utility companies coming forward with plans for small "partnership" dams at other points in the Columbia system. That, if carried through, would prevent the building of larger dams called for by the Army engineers. It can only be stopped through a suit now pending in the courts brought by the Hells Canyon Association to invalidate the license of the Idaho Power Co. or by Congress acting on bills which have been bottled up.

Thus far the utilities have been successful in fighting the public development of the Columbia as projected by the Army engineers and are making a mockery out of the Eisenhower theory of "treating river valleys as a whole thing." In the case of the upper Colorado, the utilities were not interested, as this is not to be utilized for power on the same scope and does not offer the rich profits of the Columbia and so they were content to let the Government develop it.

THE VETO OF THE FARM BILL

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, for the reasons so well outlined in the President's message, a veto was the only course open to him on the farm bill. Enactment of the bill would have resulted in further piling up of surpluses, restricting markets, and bringing about more restrictive controls.

In 1957 the cotton industry will be faced with further acreage reductions to the overall tune of 8.9 percent, as the reductions would affect each State, according to a table which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks.

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

States	1956 allotment	1957 allotment	Acreage reduction for 1957	Percentage reduction from 1956 to 1957
Alabama	1,025,141	905,503	119,638	11.7
Arizona	343,640	328,995	14,645	4.3
Arkansas	1,424,511	1,271,412	153,099	10.7
California	782,405	737,294	44,111	5.8
Florida	36,974	34,111	2,863	7.7
Georgia	903,221	805,369	97,852	10.8
Illinois	3,110	3,110	0	
Kansas	29	29	0	
Kentucky	7,799	6,841	958	12.3
Louisiana	610,891	543,435	67,456	11.0
Maryland	25	25	0	
Mississippi	1,646,562	1,458,671	187,891	11.4
Missouri	378,055	341,192	36,863	9.8
Nevada	2,324	2,324	0	
New Mexico	179,378	167,373	12,005	6.7
North Carolina	483,932	428,152	55,780	11.5
Oklahoma	845,616	755,397	90,219	10.7
South Carolina	726,193	649,484	76,709	10.6
Tennessee	563,491	510,836	52,605	9.3
Texas	7,410,893	6,877,025	533,868	7.2
Virginia	17,114	14,956	2,158	12.6
Total	17,391,304	15,841,584	1,549,720	8.9

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as for cotton, the most depressing problem facing cotton farmers and the cotton industry was the need for regaining and maintaining our traditional and historic export markets.

This could be done only by meeting the price competition of foreign-produced cotton and foreign synthetics in the foreign markets. Cotton producer organizations from one end of the Cotton Belt to the other clearly recognized that fact last fall, and agreed that if the Secretary of Agriculture would exercise the authority vested in him by Congress to make United States cotton competitive, pricewise, in the export market, the cotton producers would make their contribution toward the solution of the overall problem by accepting a moderately lower support price, thereby improving cotton's competitive position with synthetics in the domestic market.

The cotton growers' organizations agreed to accept price reductions of from 3 to 3½ cents a pound in order to make cotton competitive with rayon. Under the 82½ percent of parity, which was announced today in the President's veto message, cotton prices will be reduced only about 2½ cents a pound. That is a rough estimate, which is very close to being correct.

So far as cotton is concerned, the main thing wrong with H. R. 12 was that it would have provided a return to a rigid system of price supports, thereby holding a price umbrella over domestic synthetic fiber production, which would have made impossible an improvement in the position of cotton in competition with rayon in the domestic market, and would have seriously impaired our chances for obtaining the kind of export program for cotton which would have been really adequate in effectively meeting foreign price competition from foreign-produced cotton and synthetics.

It was for this reason, which dealt with the very heart of cotton's most serious problem, that I felt compelled to vote against the conference report. That is not to say that there were not a number of provisions in H. R. 12 which were constructive and urgently needed, so far as cotton is concerned.

Mr. President, what is necessary is to establish a minimum acreage allotment for cotton for the years 1957 and 1958. Otherwise, there will be an additional reduction in the acreage allotment for 1957 of 8.9 percent, as I have said, and a further acreage reduction in 1958 of, roughly, 6 percent. Mississippi would take an acreage reduction of, roughly, 8 percent. Acreage reductions are destructive of the industry, tend to pull down farm income, and, if continued, there will be no way whereby a cotton farm can be operated at a profit.

Furthermore, in the South there are millions of small farmers who plant 4 acres of cotton or less. They must be provided for by appropriate legislation.

Third, H. R. 12 contained a provision which would clear up the question as to whether the President had the authority to deal with the problem of textile imports by negotiation with the individual countries from which such imports emanate.

Fourth, the bill contained a provision to rectify a very serious injustice which is being worked upon the producers of extra long staple cotton.

Fifth, the bill contained provisions for the soil bank, which would have made possible further voluntary reductions in production, without the loss of net income to farmers.

Mr. President, I therefore feel that the most constructive course we could now pursue would be to delete from H. R. 12 the specific provisions to which the President has objected so seriously, and return to him the remainder of the bill without further delay.

It would be a simple matter for the Congress to follow this course, and place upon the President's desk a farm bill which he could sign before the end of this week.

I urge my colleagues to take such action as is necessary to bring this about.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY—DOCUMENTS FURNISHED BY SENATOR McCARTHY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to give the Senate some information.

A few days ago when the Senate was considering the CIA joint resolution I stated that if the resolution were passed I would turn over to the proposed new joint committee some 50 or more documents having to do with everything from incompetence to communism in the CIA. The resolution failed, and the joint committee was not established.

The question arose as to whether the information should go to the Armed Services Committee, headed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], to the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, headed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], or to the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. I felt that the Internal Security Subcommittee had the most complete jurisdiction of the subject, so I have turned over the documents, as of today, to the subcommittee of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], not because I preferred that subcommittee to the other committee but because I thought that it had unquestionable jurisdiction on the subject.

I know they will have difficulty getting the witnesses from the CIA. They refused to appear before our committee. However, I hope that we will test on the Senate floor the right of the Internal Security Subcommittee to get the necessary information. For that reason I have turned over all the pertinent material to the Eastland committee.

PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization and authorizing appropriations therefor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the unfinished business, which is Senate Joint Resolution 97. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment heretofore proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, this joint resolution authorizes an increase in the ceiling on the authorized United States contribution to the Food and Agriculture Organization from $2 million a year to $3 million a year. It also authorizes an increase in the ceiling on the authorized contribution to the International Labor Organization from $1,750,000 a year to $3 million a year.

The joint resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Relations on July 27 of last year. It was considered briefly in the Senate July 30, but no action was taken in the adjournment rush.

When Congress reconvened in January, the Committee on Foreign Relations again considered the matter in the light of developments in the intervening months. After discussion with Assistant Secretary of State Francis O. Wilcox and Assistant Secretary of Labor J. Ernest Wilkins, and after further consideration, the committee saw no reason to change the position which it had taken last July—namely, that the resolution is a meritorious one and should be passed.

Indeed, Mr. President, passage of the resolution is daily becoming more urgent, particularly so far as the ILO is concerned. Let me review the situation briefly for the Senate.

At a meeting in March of this year, the ILO governing body adopted a budget for the calandar year 1957 amounting to a net of $7.6 million. The vote, by the way, was 28 to 10, with the United States voting "No." This budget will be presented to the ILO Conference in June for final approval; but in view of the almost three to one vote in the governing body, there is little reason to anticipate contrary action by the Conference.

On the basis of 25 percent, which is the current rate of assessment of the United States in the ILO this budget will call for a United States contribution of $1.9 million. The net contribution can be reduced to $1.8 million by taking advantage of an expected credit accruing from earlier years; but, even so, our assessment will be $50,000 above the existing statutory ceiling.

Thus, it is clear that the United States will be confronted with an assessment which it cannot pay unless Congress raises the ceiling. Although this budget is for 1957, and we would not actually be in default until that time, our influence at the June conference would obviously be at a low ebb if we went there with the whole world knowing that we would be unable to meet our obligations. An organization does not pay much attention to the thoughts of a member who is avowedly about to refuse to pay his dues.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, our delinquency might turn out to be even greater than the figure of $50,000 which I mentioned. That figure was based on a calculation of our assessment at the rate of 25 percent. That rate has been in effect since 1951, and there has been growing pressure within the ILO to revise all assessments to bring them more into line with the United Nations scale, under which the United States pays 33.3 percent. I do not think that the ILO would undertake such a drastic revision in one step, but I do think we have to anticipate some increase in the percentage of our assessment.

The question has been raised as to whether we should continue to participate at all in the ILO; or, if we do continue to participate, whether we should increase our contributions. To state the question another way, we have three possible courses of action:

First. We can withdraw entirely from the ILO. For reasons which I shall elaborate on a little later, this would not be a wise course for us to take, but it would

at least have the merits of being forthright and unequivocal.

Second. We can defeat this bill and continue in the ILO under our present legislation. This, I think, is probably the worst thing we could do. We would be half in, half out, delinquent in our assessments, utterly without influence, and in general offering an altogether sorry spectacle for a Nation which is supposed to be in a position of world leadership.

Third. We can pass this measure and continue to participate in the ILO on a vigorous, wholehearted, full-membership basis. This seems to me to be clearly the wisest course for us to take. If we are going to belong to an organization as important as the ILO, we ought to belong to it all the way—we ought to work in it and try to get our ideas adopted by it. We ought to take a seat up in front, and not one by the door, where we can walk out every time something does not go to suit us or where the other members can throw us out for nonpayment of dues.

The ILO is unique among international organizations in that its delegates represent private groups, as well as governments. Each member of the ILO has two government delegates, plus one delegate representing employers, and one representing workers. The organization was established in 1919 to promote the voluntary cooperation of nations in improving working and living conditions. The United States has been a member since 1934.

The principal impetus for United States withdrawal from the ILO at this time comes from Mr. William McGrath, who was the American employer delegate in 1954 and 1955. In his public statements, Mr. McGrath has voiced numerous complaints about the ILO; but so far as I can determine, all of them come under three main headings:

First, a great many foolish proposals are advanced in the ILO. While Mr. McGrath evidently differs with a good many persons, even in his own country, as to what is foolish and what is not, I think we can all agree that there are some foolish proposals advanced in the ILO. Well, Mr. President, there are some foolish proposals advanced in every organization—even in the Congress of the United States; but I never heard of an individual's refusing to serve in Congress because of that fact. The truth is that most of the foolish proposals in the ILO meet the same fate as those in Congress: They are buried, and never are adopted.

The few which may be adopted can be farmful to the United States only to the extent that we ourselves are foolish enough to put them into effect. This fact destroys the validity of Mr. McGrath's second major complaint, which is that the ILO is an international lawmaking body bent upon legislating socialism into existence throughout the world. This can only be described as plain nonsense. The ILO has no power whatsoever over any sovereign country on the face of the world. The ILO can only act through recommendations, which do not have to be followed, or through conventions, which do not have to be ratified, and which, of course, are not binding unless they are ratified.

Finally, Mr. McGrath complains that the employer and worker delegates from the Soviet Union and other Communist countries are, in fact, merely additional government delegates, and do not represent free employers and free workers. This is a valid point, and I disagree with Mr. McGrath only as to the conclusion to be drawn from it. He thinks we ought to get out of the ILO. I think we ought to stay in it, and fight harder than ever to show up this Communist fiction for what it is.

Incidentally, Mr. President, I may say that at the present time there is within the International Labor Ogranization a subcommittee looking into the matter of so-called employer representation on the part of the Communist states which happen to be members of the Organization.

I am not alone in believing that we should remain in the ILO. The executive council of the AFL–CIO thinks so. It recently said:

> We regard the ILO as a vital forum through which to promote the cause of freedom and democracy in the world. We take this opportunity to officially reiterate our full and unqualified support of the ILO and of United States membership and active participation therein.
>
> We urge the Congress of the United States to enact Senate Joint Resolution 97.

The Catholic Church thinks so. I quote from an editorial of March 16, 1956, issue of the New World, official Catholic paper of the archdiocese of Chicago and the diocese of Joliet:

> The Holy See has been one of the ILO's strongest supporters from the very beginning of the Organization. In November 1954, the Holy Father enthusiastically welcomed the members of the ILO governing body in a special audience at the Vatican and, echoing the sentiments of his predecessor, vigorously endorsed the important work that they are doing for the cause of social justice. * * *
>
> Moreover, as recently as January of this year, a French Jesuit, Father Joblin, was appointed to the staff of the ILO with the advice and consent of the Holy See. * * * The fact that Father Joblin's appointment was made long after the problem of Communist representation in the ILO became a public issue is an obvious indication that the Holy See is not in favor of scuttling the Organization merely because of the fact that Russia and some of her satellites are included in its membership.

Further, Mr. President, as recently as April 4, less than 2 weeks ago, the economic subcommittee of the Catholic Association for International Peace found that American withdrawal from the ILO "would play directly into the hands of the Communists."

Finally, Mr. President, the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers—the two groups who nominate our employer delegate—have decided to continue their participation this year. Although they are not without some misgivings about the matter, they have rejected Mr. McGrath's proposal for immediate withdrawal from the ILO.

Mr. President, let me say just a word about the paragraph of the joint resolution relating to the Food and Agriculture Organization. I think there would be general agreement that this agency has done one of the best jobs of any of the UN specialized agencies. It certainly has one of the most important jobs—namely, that of keeping food production up with population increases in underdeveloped countries.

The FAO Conference last fall voted a budget of $6.6 million for 1956 and of $6.8 million for 1957. The vote, incidentally, was 24 to 23, with the United States voting "No." After taking account of small miscellaneous income, the amount of these budgets which will have to be met by assessments is $6.5 million in 1956 and $6.7 million in 1957. The United States assessment for each of these years is 31.5 percent. These assessments can be met within the existing ceiling by taking advantage of a credit which has accrued to the United States in the FAO Working Capital Fund.

It is apparent, however, that the United States is operating on a very thin margin, that our 1958 assessment will breach our ceiling, that the ceiling would therefore have to be raised next year in any event, and that in the meantime our whole position in the FAO will be strengthened by timely action to raise the ceiling now.

Mr. President, the amounts of money involved here are not large. The total increase provided for by this resolution to be spread over a period of years is less than half of one one-thousandth of the unexpended balances of appropriations for military assistance. The amounts involved here appear even more trifling when considered in relation to the damage our international position would suffer if we were to fail to play our full part in both the ILO and FAO.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee unanimously reported the joint resolution. I know I express the hope of the chairman and of other members of the committee when I urge the Senate to pass the joint resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say to the Senator that I intend to support the joint resolution, either with or without some of the amendments which have been suggested, depending upon the discussion which may follow.

However, I think it is only fair to say that in the Committee on Foreign Relations there was the feeling that both the FOA and the ILO had a part to play, despite the objections, and perhaps some of the legitimate criticisms which have been raised. The viewpoint of the American Federation of Labor and the CIO as to their usefulness was pointed out. While the representatives of the United States Chamber of Commerce had some questions, they felt, as I understood, that perhaps the ILO should be continued for another year or so, and

that perhaps further studies should be made by the Congress as to its value.

While the representatives of the National Association of Manufacturers were perhaps not so enthusiastic, I think it may be said that many of them felt that the organization should not be terminated without further investigation, and that perhaps it was too early to terminate it. For that reason I do not believe it should be terminated at this time.

However, I think it is only fair to say that there was considerable discussion in the Foreign Relations Committee apropos of the question of the percentages which the United States might properly contribute to these agencies and to the overall situation.

At one time we were contributing considerably more than 33⅓ percent for the total United Nations operation until, at the instigation of the late Senator Vandenberg and other members of the Committee on Foreign Relations at the time, and also members of the Appropriations Committee, a limitation of 33⅓ percent, as I recall, was established.

In the discussions before the Committee on Foreign Relations—I know it has been true in the Appropriations Committee—it has been pointed out that this figure was not necessarily intended to be a permanent level, and that it might properly be 30 percent or 25 percent. I do not know just what the amount might properly be. However, it seems to me that there are other nations which are not carrying their fair share of the load, and there are some which, for various reasons, have not been able to pay their assessments. At least we have been doing that, within the limitations established.

I hope the Department of State will bear in mind that there may very well arise—and properly so—in the Congress a feeling that 33⅓ percent for support of the independent agencies and the United Nations itself is too much, and that the figure should perhaps move toward 25 percent, rather than upward, or rather than necessarily remaining stationary.

I thought that the discussion today should at least point out the fact that that particular topic was the subject of considerable discussion in our committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what the distinguished minority leader has just said is true. He has given us a very good, though very brief, résumé of the discussions which took place in the committee relative to this particular subject. I can corroborate every statement he has made.

Of course, we are all in accord with his idea that at the first favorable opportunity we should do what we can to reduce our contributions, if we can do so legitimately and within reason, and not be wedded to a figure of 33⅓ percent, or a higher figure.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from Louisiana that an amendment offered by him is already pending before the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the amendment I have just sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Possibly it is the same amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is the same amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the amendment has been pending since July of last year. Without objection, the clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the ratio of (a) the contributions made hereafter by the United States in any year to defray the expenses of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, or of the International Labor Organization, to (b) the total contributions made by all nations in such year for such purpose shall not exceed the ratio of (1) the contributions made by the United States for such purpose in the year in which this section is enacted to (2) the total contributions made by all nations for such purpose in that year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that for the past few years the Committee on Appropriations has been carefully examining these contributions in an effort to make them uniform, if possible, and to not further increase the amounts percentagewise. That is now being done with respect to the various international organizations.

It will be recalled that when the United Nations was first organized, the contribution made by the United States amounted to almost 40 percent of the entire amount required to operate that organization. Over the years the amount has been decreased percentagewise, to where it is now 33⅓ percent of the total.

Great Britain is, as of now, contributing 8.55 percent. The U. S. S. R. is contributing 15.28 percent. France is contributing 6.23 percent.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point tables showing the contributions being made by all members of the United Nations.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 2.—*United Nations: Scale of assessments*

Member countries	Calendar year 1954		Calendar year 1955		Calendar year 1956	
	Percent	Assessment	Percent	Assessment	Percent	Assessment
Afghanistan	0.08	33,040	0.08	31,712	0.06	28,998
Argentina	1.40	578,200	1.32	523,248	1.28	618,624
Australia	1.75	722,750	1.80	713,520	1.80	869,940
Belgium	1.38	569,940	1.38	547,032	1.38	666,954
Bolivia	.06	24,780	.05	19,820	.05	24,165
Brazil	1.40	578,200	1.32	523,248	1.20	579,960
Burma	.13	53,690	.13	51,532	.11	53,163
Byelorussian S. S. R.	.50	206,500	.53	210,092	.53	256,149
Canada	3.30	1,362,900	3.63	1,438,932	3.63	1,754,379
Chile	.33	136,290	.30	118,920	.33	159,489
China	5.62	2,321,060	5.62	2,227,768	5.62	2,716,146
Colombia	.41	169,330	.41	162,524	.41	198,153
Costa Rica	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332
Cuba	.34	140,420	.30	118,920	.30	144,990
Czechoslovakia	1.05	433,650	.94	372,616	.92	444,636
Denmark	.78	322,140	.74	293,336	.72	347,976
Dominican Republic	.05	20,650	.05	19,820	.05	24,165
Ecuador	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.05	24,165
Egypt	.47	194,110	.40	158,560	.40	193,320
El Salvador	.06	24,780	.06	23,784	.06	28,998
Ethiopia	.10	41,300	.12	47,568	.12	57,996
France	5.75	2,374,750	5.90	2,338,760	6.23	3,010,959
Greece	0.21	86,730	0.21	83,244	0.22	106,326
Guatemala	.07	28,910	.07	27,748	.07	33,831
Haiti	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332
Honduras	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332
Iceland	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332
India	3.40	1,404,200	3.30	1,308,120	3.25	1,570,725
Indonesia	.60	247,800	.56	221,984	.56	270,648
Iran	.28	115,640	.25	99,100	.30	144,990
Iraq	.12	49,560	.11	43,604	.13	62,829
Israel	.17	70,210	.17	67,388	.17	82,161
Lebanon	.05	20,650	.05	19,820	.05	24,165
Liberia	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332
Luxembourg	.06	24,780	.06	23,784	.06	28,998
Mexico	.75	309,750	.80	317,120	.77	372,141
Netherlands	1.25	516,250	1.25	495,500	1.25	604,125
New Zealand	.48	198,240	.48	190,272	.48	231,984
Nicaragua	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332
Norway	.50	206,500	.50	198,200	.54	260,982
Pakistan	.75	309,750	.67	265,588	.60	289,980
Panama	.05	20,650	.05	19,820	.05	24,165
Paraguay	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332
Peru	.18	74,340	.18	71,352	.16	77,328
Philippines	0.45	185,850	0.45	178,380	0.45	217,485
Poland	1.73	714,490	1.73	685,772	1.70	821,610
Saudi Arabia	.07	28,910	.07	27,748	.07	33,831
Sweden	1.65	681,450	1.59	630,276	1.59	768,447
Syria	.08	33,040	.08	31,712	.08	38,664
Thailand	.18	74,340	.18	71,352	.18	86,994
Turkey	.65	268,450	.65	257,660	.69	333,477
Ukrainian S. S. R.	1.88	776,440	2.00	792,800	2.02	976,266
Union of South Africa	.78	322,140	.78	309,192	.78	376,974
United Kingdom	9.80	4,047,400	8.85	3,508,140	8.55	4,132,215
United States	33.33	13,765,290	33.33	13,212,012	33.33	16,108,389
Uruguay	.18	74,340	.18	71,352	.18	86,994
U. S. S. R.	14.15	5,843,950	15.08	5,977,712	15.28	7,384,824
Venezuela	.39	161,070	.44	174,416	.47	227,151
Yemen	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332
Yugoslavia	.44	181,720	.44	174,416	.40	193,320
Total	100.00	[1] 41,300,000	100.00	[1] 39,640,000	100.00	[2] 48,330,000

[1] 60 members.
[2] 76 members. New members admitted in December 1955; assessments not yet determined: Austria, Albania, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Ceylon, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Laos, Libya, Nepal, Portugal, Rumania, Spain.

TABLE 3.—*Food and Agriculture Organization: Scale of assessments*

Member countries	Calendar year 1954		Calendar year 1955		Calendar year 1956	
	Percent	Assessment	Percent	Assessment	Percent	Assessment
Afghanistan	0.16	$9,481	0.12	$7,068	0.08	$5,168
Argentina	1.83	108,437	1.60	94,240	1.63	105,298
Australia	2.00	118,510	2.06	121,334	2.29	147,934
Austria	.38	22,517	.55	32,395	.49	31,654
Belgium	1.78	105,474	1.76	103,664	1.75	113,050
Bolivia	.06	3,555	.08	4,712	.06	3,876
Brazil	1.52	90,067	1.71	100,719	1.52	98,192
Burma	.16	9,481	.15	8,835	.14	9,044
Cambodia	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Canada	4.76	282,054	5.69	335,141	4.61	297,806
Ceylon	.13	7,703	.20	11,780	.15	9,690
Chile	.31	18,369	.41	24,149	.42	27,132
Colombia	.40	23,702	.65	38,285	.52	33,592
Costa Rica	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Cuba	.46	27,257	.50	29,450	.38	24,548
Denmark	1.08	63,995	.91	53,599	.91	58,786
Dominican Republic	.05	2,963	.07	4,123	.06	3,876
Ecuador	.05	2,963	.06	3,534	.06	3,876
Egypt	.55	32,590	.60	35,340	.51	32,946
El Salvador	.05	2,963	.08	4,712	.08	5,168
Ethiopia	.15	8,888	.13	7,657	.15	9,690
Finland	.43	25,480	.56	32,984	.52	33,592
France	6.70	397,008	7.49	441,161	7.91	510,986
Germany	4.73	280,276	5.66	333,374	5.85	377,910
Greece	.27	15,999	.38	22,382	.28	18,088
Guatemala	.08	4,740	.10	5,890	.09	5,814
Haiti	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Honduras	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Iceland	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
India	5.18	306,941	4.55	267,995	4.13	266,798
Indonesia	.52	30,813	.83	48,887	.71	45,866
Iran			.34	20,026	.38	24,548
Iraq	.12	7,111	.12	7,068	.16	10,336
Ireland	.40	23,702	.27	15,903	.27	17,442
Israel	.13	7,703	.19	11,191	.22	14,212
Italy	3.19	189,023	2.99	176,111	2.88	186,048
Japan	2.25	133,324	2.79	164,331	2.73	176,358
Jordan	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Korea	0.09	$5,333	0.16	$9,424	0.11	$7,106
Laos	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Lebanon	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.06	3,876
Liberia	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Libya			.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Luxembourg	.06	3,555	.07	4,123	.08	5,168
Mexico	.81	47,996	1.14	67,146	.98	63,308
Nepal	.10	5,925	.08	4,712	.04	2,584
Netherlands	1.70	100,733	1.26	74,214	1.59	102,714
New Zeland	.65	38,516	.58	34,162	.61	39,406
Nicaragua	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Norway	.66	39,108	.65	38,285	.69	44,574
Pakistan	.98	58,070	1.15	67,735	.76	49,096
Panama	.05	2,963	.06	3,534	.06	3,876
Paraguay	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Peru			.21	12,369	.20	12,920
Philippines	.22	13,036	.74	43,586	.57	36,822
Portugal	.65	38,516	.37	21,793	.34	21,964
Saudi Arabia	.06	3,555	.09	5,301	.09	5,814
Spain	1.37	81,179	1.62	95,418	1.59	102,714
Sweden	2.11	125,028	1.97	116,033	2.02	130,492
Switzerland	1.56	92,438	1.54	90,706	1.60	103,360
Syria	.10	5,925	.10	5,890	.10	6,460
Thailand	.17	10,073	.30	17,670	.23	14,858
Tunisia					.06	3,876
Turkey	.66	39,108	.79	46,531	.88	56,848
Union of South Africa	.95	56,292	.77	45,353	.99	63,954
United Kingdom	15.03	890,603	10.49	617,861	10.87	702,202
United States of America	30.00	1,777,650	30.00	1,767,000	31.50	2,034,900
Uruguay	.25	14,814	.23	13,547	.23	14,858
Venezuela	.45	26,665	.57	33,573	.60	38,760
Vietnam	.23	13,629	.21	12,369	.22	14,212
Yemen			.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Yugoslavia	.66	39,108	.60	35,340	.51	32,946
Total	100.00	[1] 5,925,500	100.00	[2] 5,890,000	100.00	[3] 6,460,000

[1] 67 members.
[2] 71 members.
[3] 72 members.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the joint resolution we are now considering is passed, we will automatically have abandoned the proposition that many of us have advanced in the past, to decrease the amounts of our contributions percentagewise, or at least, to hold them at present levels. The total amount of the contribution that is now assessed against the United States for the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations is $2 million. Percentagewise we are now furnishing 31.5 percent. If we increase the amount to $3 million, as is being asked in the joint resolution, it is entirely possible that the amount of the contribution percentagewise will be much greater than the overall limitation on contributions of 33⅓ percent, the goal toward which we have been aiming for several years.

If with our contribution of $2 million, we have now reached the percentagewise level of 31½ percent, then with $3 million the percentage may well climb to 37 or 38 percent of the total.

Therefore the suggestion I would make is that instead of fixing the amount at so many millions of dollars for the Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Labor Organization, we limit, percentagewise, the amounts to be contributed. The amount, as I have indicated, that we are contributing to the Food and Agriculture Organization is 31½ percent. With respect to ILO, we are now contributing 25 percent. The limitation that is now on the statute books is $1,750,000. If we raise the amount to $3 million, it is entirely possible that our contribution will be in excess of the overall limitation on U. N. contributions of 33⅓ percent which is certainly an ample burden for us to bear.

I do not wish to withdraw from any of these organizations. However, I do believe that our contributions should be within reason, and that if increased expenditures are necessary, that other nations should contribute a pro rata share of those increases.

With respect to all these organizations, our contribution is far in excess of that of any other country in the world.

For example, the contribution we are making to the Organization of American States is in the neighborhood of 66 percent of the total budget. In the United Nations, in connection with the technical aid program, we have been contributing as much as 65 percent for that program. That is entirely aside from any amount that we contribute directly to the various nations of the world through our own technical aid and mutual assistance programs.

As was stated by my distinguished friend, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], instead of increasing the amounts percentagewise, it strikes me that we should let them stand where they are or fix a ceiling of, at the maximum, 33½ percent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana has made what I believe to be a very meritorious and worthwhile suggestion. I have discussed the matter with the distinguished minority leader and with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], both of whom are members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and they have proposed the possibility of offering an amendment from the committee which would read as follows:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of this act, the payments by the United States to the Food and Agriculture Organization and to the International Labor Organization shall not exceed 33⅓ percent of the total assessed budgets of those organizations.

That does not mean that that percentage should be reached automatically, but it does set a ceiling. Of course, it would be the intent of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and especially of the Committee on Appropriations, of which the Senator from Louisiana is a member, as well as of Congress as a whole, to make certain that our requirements be held down to the most reasonable minimum.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator concedes that if we should put a limitation of $3 million instead of the $2 million in the joint resolution, it would be entirely possible that the amount we might contribute to the Food and Agriculture Organization would be in excess of 33⅓ percent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The same would be true with respect to the International Labor Organization.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. As a matter of fact it is probable that such would be the situation if we raised the contribution from $1,750,000 to $3 million.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the Senator's point is a good one. If we had a dollar limitation alone, it might

have—depending on what the size of the budget was—the tendency to do what the Senator suggests. I think the amendment which the Senator from Montana has suggested would at least keep the figures from getting out of line with the other percentages.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator—I do not know whether he was in the Chamber when I spoke on this subject earlier today—that we must make a close study of the situation to determine if we cannot get the percentages to move downward, instead of upward. At least the amendment would tend to keep them in conformity with the efforts which Congress has heretofore made, to keep the top limitation at 33⅓ percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. The purpose of the amendment I offered is to fix the percentagewise contribution at its present level. However, I realize that it may be a little difficult to do that. Instead of using dollar figures, the Senator would limit the amount percentagewise to make the amount not over 33⅓ percent, the ceiling which we have been trying to apply with respect to other organizations. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say that that would be correct. However, I am inclined to believe—and I would also wish to check the matter with our staff—that unless we add a dollar amount, the problem would not be solved, because there is already a dollar restriction in effect. Therefore, it seems to me that the suggestion of the Senator from Montana, to let the dollar figure stand but to provide also that in no event shall the amount exceed 33⅓ percent, would take care of the situation at both ends.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I stated earlier, the Senate should not abandon the idea of not increasing the amounts, percentagewise, of our contributions to these agencies; on the contrary, we should adopt those limitations. In the past 4 or 5 year the Senate Appropriations Committee has been able to considerably reduce the amounts we have been contributing to various international organizations, and particularly with reference to the specialized agencies of United Nations. If the amendment which I have proposed should be adopted, it would mean that the amount could be increased—that is, if the agency budget were increased—but, percentagewise, our contributions would remain fixed at the present levels. With respect to the International Labor Organization, it would remain at 25 percent, and with respect to the Food and Agriculture Organization, it would remain at 31½ percent, if my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. President, I hesitate to take a backward step, but rather than passing a bill under which it may be possible to go above the 33⅓ percent which has been our goal, I would much prefer that the measure be amended as suggested by the distinguished Senator from Montana, to limit the amount percentagewise, so that in no event can either of those organizations obtain a larger contribution for this Nation than 33⅓ percent of the total agency budget.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me for the purpose of submitting an amendment and asking that it be read?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana is pending, it might be well if the Senator would temporarily withdraw his amendment. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana, which would be placed at the end of the joint resolution, would fix the maximum at 33⅓ percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, I am a fair compromiser. I should like to see my amendment adopted, of course, but, with so many apparently against it, I shall withdraw it with the understanding that a limitation will be imposed, as was suggested by the distinguished Senator from Montana, so that the amounts to be contributed cannot exceed 33⅓ percent of the budgets.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the language is very clear, because it is proposed to add section 2, reading as follows:

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of this act, the payments by the United States to the Food and Agricultural Organization and to the International Labor Organization will not exceed 33⅓ percent of the total assessed budgets of those organizations.

Mr. ELLENDER. With the understanding that the amendment will be offered and adopted, I shall withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana is withdrawn. The Senator from Montana has an amendment at the desk, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution, it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of this act, the payments by the United States to the Food and Agricultural Organization and to the International Labor Organization shall not exceed 33⅓ percent of the total assessed budgets of those organizations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the amendment is a wise one, but I wish to be certain as to what is proposed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We are now proposing to fix a percentage ceiling, a question which has been discussed among the members of the committee. We think it is quite agreeable and is probably the best compromise which can be reached at this time.

It means, of course, that, if necessary, in the case of the ILO the amount could be raised from approximately 25 percent to as much as 33⅓ percent. As I recall, the amount contributed for FAO is now approximately 31.5 percent. I think it should be satisfactory to all concerned.

Mr. LEHMAN. As I understand, if in the event of the allocation to this country of its share the expenditure for ILO were raised to 33⅓ percent, which is provided for by the amendment of the Senator from Montana, there would be sufficient money——

Mr. MANSFIELD. There would be more than sufficient money so far as the dollar amount is concerned, but that would be a matter for the Committee on Appropriations to decide, based on the facts made available to them as to how much would or would not be appropriated to these subsidiary organizations.

Mr. LEHMAN. The reason why I press the question is because in the statement submitted by the Department of State, explaining the reasons for the proposed legislation in great detail, I find the last paragraph reads as follows:

If the present ceiling of $1,750,000 remains, the United States will have little or no flexibility for negotiation, particularly as regards the assessment scale when this issue is considered by the governing body in November. The Department of State and the Department of Labor believe that the United States would be in a better position to obtain a reasonable solution on this issue, and on other financial and substantive issues, if this Government were not forced to take a completely negative stand on these matters. The proposed increase in the statutory ceiling to $3 million would provide the flexibility which is required.

I have never been a delegate to the meetings of the ILO or the FAO, but I have been a delegate to the World Health Organization. The same question arose in 1951 or 1952. We wanted it to have a certain amount of flexibility and the arrangement which was made was in the interest of this country. But there was no limitation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The proposal has been discussed, has been agreed on, and has been considered as containing much in the way of merit.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to call up my amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 2, line 5, to change the period to a comma, and insert the following: "and by inserting before the semicolon at the end of such subsection a colon and the following: *'Provided, however,* That no sums in excess of $1,750,000 shall be appropriated to defray the expenses of the International Labor Organization for any calendar year after the calendar year 1956, if during the preceding calendar year delegates allegedly representing employers and employees in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or in any nation dominated by the foreign government controlling the world Communist movement were permitted to vote in the International Labor Conference or in other meetings held under the auspices of the International Labor Organization'."

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, in support of the amendment, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks an article entitled "How Useful Is the ILO?" written by George Sokolsky, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 5, 1956. The article points out the need for the amendment.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I am fearful of the amendment which has just been offered by the Senator from Montana, because it is an open invitation to increase our contribution to the amount set forth as the maximum. I feel quite assured that that is what ultimately would happen. Furthermore, I am supported in this position by the American delegations to both the FAO and ILO. They voted against the increases which are here provided for.

Senate Joint Resolution 97 would:

First. Increase the ceiling on United States annual contributions to the Food and Agriculture Organization from $2 million to $3 million; and

Second. Increase the ceiling on United States annual contributions to the International Labor Organization from $1,750,000 to $3,000,000.

I do not oppose the recommended increase in the statutory ceiling on contributions to the FAO. To the best of my knowledge and belief, FAO has done a good job. Our participation in that U. N. agency is relatively noncontroversial. FAO assessments on the United States for the calendar year 1956 may exceed the existing ceiling figure.

I may say, in connection with the Food and Agricultural Organization, that much has been done by private organizations throughout the country, by voluntary contribution, to promote the building up of productivity in the various countries of the world where there is great need for food and agricultural production.

Entirely different considerations arise with respect to the ceiling on contributions to the International Labor Organization. First, continued participation by the United States in ILO is a highly controversial issue. And, secondly, the committee report indicates that the ILO ceiling will not be pierced until the calendar year 1957. Accordingly, I believe that the Senate should amend Senate Joint Resolution 97 by striking out subsection (b) concerned with United States contributions to the ILO.

I am advised that no public hearings were held by the committee in regard to the increased appropriations. There are very important organizations in the country which are entitled to have and ought to have a voice. They should be heard, and a record ought to be made. It is my understanding that conferences were held in executive session between the committee and representatives of the State Department and, perhaps, of the Department of Labor, in regard to the increased contribution, all of which will be paid by the taxpayers of the United States.

If the pending resolution is limited to the Food and Agriculture Organization, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee can then make a full investigation of the International Labor Organization. No hearings have been held on Senate Joint Resolution 97. It is an original joint resolution reported favorably from the committee at the request of the State, Agriculture, and Labor Departments.

Why should we authorize the spending of more money for the International Labor Organization when public hearings on the question have not been held, when the need for increased funds will not arise before the calendar year 1957, and when United States participation in the ILO is a matter of growing public concern? The Senate should amend Senate Joint Resolution 97 by striking therefrom subsection (b), page 2, lines 1 through 5.

If Senate Joint Resolution 97 is not so amended, the Senate must face this question: Why should the International Labor Organization be rewarded for an intolerable act of Communist appeasement? I refer to the action of the ILO Conference in 1955 which seated employer and employee representatives from Communist countries and granted them voting privileges. If the ceiling on United States contributions to the ILO is raised, the following condition should be imposed:

Provided, however, That no sums in excess of $1,750,000 shall be appropriated to defray the expenses of the International Labor Organization for any calendar year after the calendar year 1956, if during the preceding calendar year delegates allegedly representing employers and employees in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or in any nation dominated by the foreign government controlling the world Communist movement were permitted to vote in the International Labor Conference or in other meetings held under the auspices of the International Labor Organization.

Each member of ILO is represented by four delegates. Under the ILO constitution, 2 delegates represent government; 1 delegate represents employees; and 1 delegate represents the employers of his country. Under this tripartite arrangement the nongovernment delegates must be free of government dictation; that is, they must be truly representative of free, voluntary associations of employers and employees.

The United States employer delegate is nominated by the National Association of Manufacturers and by the United States Chamber of Commerce. The United States employee delegate is nominated by the AFL–CIO. The two Government delegates are nominated by the Secretary of Labor.

At the ILO Conference in Geneva in 1955, so-called employer and employee representatives from Communist countries were seated and granted voting privileges. The United States Government and employee delegates protested this action but bowed to the will of the majority. In contrast to this rather feeble protest, the United States employer delegate, Mr. W. L. McGrath, of Cincinnati, Ohio, refused to sit with so-called employer representatives from Communist Russia and its satellites. Had he done so, he would have declared, in effect, that employer associations in Communist countries are free and voluntary associations; that their representatives have just as much right to participate in ILO deliberations as employer delegates from the free nations of the world. In other words, Mr. McGrath stood on principle. He refused to act out a lie. The question now is: Will Congress support his stand? I hope so.

Why should the Senate reward the ILO by raising the statutory ceiling on United States contributions from $1,750,000 a year to $3 million a year? I shall not vote for this increase unless its effectiveness is conditioned on the ILO unseating so-called employer and employee representatives from Communist countries. In addition, I hope Congress will take a new look at the ILO technical assistance program and at all other U. N. technical assistance programs in which Communist "experts" are financed—directly or indirectly, in whole or in part—with the dollars of American taxpayers.

It is perfectly proper for President Eisenhower to sit at the conference table with Bulganin or for Secretary Dulles to meet with Molotov. No matter how much we despise the fact, the fact is that Bulganin and Molotov represent the Government of Communist Russia. Moreover, except for the slim hope of revolution in Russia, the only alternative to war is patient negotiation with the rulers of the Kremlin. I believe that both President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles should be commended for their efforts along this line.

Although heads of government must maintain diplomatic intercourse, this does not mean that the great organizations of American business and labor must stultify themselves by having their representatives treat so-called employer and employee representatives from Communist Russia as coequals. These phony delegates from Communist Russia do not resemble free employers or free employees any more than Outer Mongolia resembles a sovereign nation.

We have been told that the United States must continue to be a member of the ILO no matter how that Organization handles the Communist issue. We have been told that this must be done in the interest of universality. So far as I can tell, universality in internationalist lingo usually means that honorable men and free nations should abandon their principles for the privilege of associating in the same club with Communists, atheists, and barbarians. That is what the argument for universality in the International Labor Organization really means.

The National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce have voted for employer participation in the International Labor Organization for 1 more year. According to my information, the United States employer delegate will not sit in committees in Geneva with Communist agents masquerading as representatives of free employers. Both the NAM and the chamber have asked the President to appoint a commission to study the question of further participation by the United States in ILO. The concern of

American business organizations is reflected in the following resolution adopted by the United States Chamber of Commerce on January 28, 1956:

Whereas the Chamber of Commerce of the United States reaffirms its belief in the fundamental objectives of the original constitution of the International Labor Organization which were:

"Universal and lasting peace can be established only if it is based upon social justice.

"Conditions of labor exist involving such injustice, hardship and privation to large numbers of people as to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperiled."

Whereas since 1934 we have cooperated and participated in the efforts of the International Labor Organization to effectuate these principles;

Whereas our participation has convinced us that the International Labor Organization is not accomplishing these objectives, but instead has shown that—

1. The activities of the International Labor Organization have gone far afield from the original concept of the achievement of social justice within the field of labor-management relations;

2. There has been undue interference with the internal affairs of nations, beyond the proper scope of international agreement;

3. The International Labor Organization is being used as a propaganda forum for statism and socialism;

4. The technical-assistance program has been subverted to the distribution of statist and Socialist ideologies and propaganda;

5. The tripartite system of representation by Government, employer and worker delegates is a failure;

6. The entry of the Soviet Union and its satellites into the International Labor Organization has made a mockery of free and independent employer and worker representation;

7. By and large the staff of the International Labor Organization is nonobjective and dangerously devoted to the accomplishment of statist and Socialist ideologies;

8. The proper functions of the International Labor Organization are now or could be performed by various other agencies now in existence;

Therefore, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States is convinced that continued support of the International Labor Organization by the taxpayers and by the Government of the United States should be questioned seriously at this time, and recommends—

1. That the executive department should reexamine the activities of the International Labor Organization;

2. That there should be an immediate and thorough congressional investigation of the activities and structure of the International Labor Organization, to determine whether the United States should continue its support of and participation in this organization;

3. That, pending such investigation and subsequent decision, the United States should not increase its financial support or participation; and

4. Pending this investigation and decision at the request of representatives of the United States Government, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States will again participate in the nomination of employer delegations to the International Labor Organization for the year 1956.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator is making a very important and very powerful argument. I wish to explore with him precisely the meaning of his amendment. As I understand the viewpoint of the Senator and of the organizations to which he has referred, it is that presumably the ILO was to consist of certain delegates representing governments as governments, certain delegates representing employers as employers, entirely independent of governments, and certain delegates representing labor movements which were free labor movements, independent of either employers or governments. Is that the concept the Senator has of what ILO should be and what he believes was the original intent?

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from California, the distinguished minority leader, is exactly right. That was the original concept of the International Labor Organization when we joined it and in its early days. Much could be accomplished if it were actually organized in that way; but last year, over the protest of the American delegation, and I think the delegation as a whole, the representatives of labor, of industry, and of government in Russia were seated, with four votes, just as the United States had. That means Soviet Russia has four times as many votes on one side as we have, because they all vote as a unit. They do not represent free employers, because there is no such thing in Russia as free employers.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Or free labor.

Mr. BRICKER. And they do not represent free labor, because there is no such thing in Russia as freedom of labor, as we understand it, and as the original concept of the International Labor Organization contemplated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is what I understood the Senator's point to be. Now I am trying to find out for the RECORD the meaning of the Senator's amendment, if the Senator does not object to this interruption.

Mr. BRICKER. No.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The amendment reads as follows:

Provided, however, That no sums in excess of $1,750,000—

I may say parenthetically that is the limit now in effect.

Mr. BRICKER. That is right.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The amendment continues:

shall be appropriated to defray the expenses of the International Labor Organization for any calendar year after the calendar year 1956—

So this would not apply until the subsequent year.

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct, and it is not needed in 1956, anyway.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I continue to read from the amendment:

, if during the preceding calendar year delegates allegedly representing employers and employees in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or in any nation dominated by the foreign government controlling the world Communist movement were permitted to vote in the International Labor Conference or in other meetings held under the auspices of the International Labor Organization.

What I am trying to do is get the Senator's intent. It would still be possible for the representatives of Government to be seated, but only so long as they were not masquerading as delegates purporting to represent free employees, free labor, or free employers, neither one of which exists in the Soviet Union or under the Communist union. Am I correct?

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator is correct in that interpretation. In other words, the amendment would hold the appropriations for the years ahead to what they are at the present time, without increasing them—the vote now being completely unbalanced in favor of the Soviet philosophy—until the things asked for could be accomplished, and until there could be a hearing by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate in regard to this very important field, so that there might be a reappraisal of our position, and representatives from industry and labor might be questioned by the committee. That could be done in the next year, and no harm would be caused, because the ceiling would not be pierced until 1957.

Furthermore, I suggest that the executive department completely reexamine its position, so that the United States delegates and free employees and free employers may know exactly where it stands with regard to the International Labor Organization. At the present time it is working on treaties and executive agreements to be entered into, many of which are opposed to our concept of free employers and free employees and the private enterprise system of our people and Government; and many of which tend toward the socialization of the country, which many of us fear at this time, under the leadership of the radicals, Socialists, Communists, and the totalitarians who now dominate, in voting power, the philosophy and the actions of the International Labor Organization.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In effect, the message which might go out behind the Iron Curtain might very well be that what we were doing was looking after the interests of a real free labor movement behind the Iron Curtain, and whenever they had that opportunity they would be able to be represented in the International Labor Organization. Is that the Senator's point?

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator is exactly correct. If we were to increase the amount, it would be a source of encouragement to Soviet Russia, because it would dominate the activities. It would have a single voice in four votes, and we would be at a disadvantage.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield again at this point?

Mr. BRICKER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator from Ohio has the answer to the question I have in mind, I shall be glad to have him state it. Let us consider one of the countries—there are several of them—in which, although there is not a totalitarian dictatorship, in the sense that such a dictatorship exists in the Soviet Union, nevertheless, any semblance of a free labor movement or of free employers, for that matter, has been

completely eliminated, although the government is freely elected by the people, even though they may be under a Socialist system, as we understand it, under which there is a large degree of government ownership. In such a case, of course, there would still be a free labor movement, presumably.

Mr. BRICKER. Yes; to a degree, although not to the degree in which it exists in the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course. Nevertheless, to that extent they would be independent.

Mr. BRICKER. Yes; and they could objectively approach their responsibilities.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. I presume that in such instances the railroads, the mines, and so forth, would be government owned and government operated, but certain businesses would be privately owned. In the case of such a country, what has been the custom in the ILO? Does such a country have in the ILO one representative from the state-owned industries and another representative from the privately owned industries?

Mr. BRICKER. I do not know. It may be that that information is in the possession of the Foreign Relations Committee. I judge that the staff of the committee would have the information.

In my opinion such a country's two delegates would represent its government, and there would not be an additional delegate to represent the free employers, for in case there were a delegate representing the free employers, the country would have in the ILO three representatives, instead of two. At least, if the original plan of the ILO were followed in that case, that would be the situation.

Mr. President, American labor leaders seem to favor continued participation in ILO, notwithstanding ILO recognition of Communist agents as representatives of free associations of employees behind the Iron Curtain. I do not understand such a position. Consistently, and to their great credit, leaders of American labor unions have fought the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions—WFTU—and have joined with free trade unionists abroad to create the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

For American labor, the question of continued United States' participation in the ILO presents this issue: Shall representatives of free American labor deal on a basis of equality with phony employee representatives from Communist Russia and her satellites? When a Member of Congress suggested to Mr. George Meany that he get all maritime unions, including Harry Bridges' longshoreman's union, together on industry problems, Meany declared that the AFL-CIO have no intention of sitting down "with Commies and gangsters"—Seafarers' Log, February 17, 1956.

That is the issue in connection with the International Labor Organization at this very moment, Mr. President.

Delegates representing the Government of the United States also protested the seating of so-called employer and employee representatives from Communist countries. For example, Mr. Warren Burger, then Assistant Attorney General of the United States, said at the 1954 ILO Conference:

> Every step which the majority report asks you to take toward accepting employer's or worker's delegates who are completely controlled by a government is a step towards changing the essential nature of the ILO. It is precisely because the United States Government does not want this to happen that we raise our voice today in warning.

Gov. Arthur B. Langlie, of Washington, said:

> We are confronted with a bloc of 7 Iron Curtain countries, 7 countries who do not know the meaning of freedom—7 countries whose 28 ILO representatives function as 1. There is ample evidence to show that the delegates sent to this peaceful forum from these countries do not conform with the spirit of this organization.
>
> It is plainly ridiculous to speak of "worker's" representatives or "employer's" representatives from these countries.

In other words, the official position of representatives of the United States Government at the 1954 conference was that Communist "employer" and "worker" delegates are mere mouthpieces of government, and are, therefore, ineligible under the ILO constitution to vote in ILO meetings. The ILO has not finally ruled on the eligibility of Communist "employer" and "worker" delegates to participate in the work of the Organization. That is one more reason why the Senate of the United States should not now raise the ceiling on appropriations to the ILO.

If United States labor, business, and Government delegates to the ILO do not stand firm on this Communist issue, they will approve by their deeds the following statement from Trud, published by the Central Headquarters of the Soviet Trade Union Organization:

> In the course of recent years, hundreds of workers' delegations and people of different political or religious convictions have visited the Soviet Union. All are agreed in finding that there is full freedom of association in the U. S. S. R. The Soviet unions are the center of organization for millions of workers and employees, constituted on a basis of freely acquired consent. They reflect the inflexible will of the workers of our country to build up the splendid organization of Communist society. They protect the interests of the workers and the employees and seek to improve their living and working conditions. The administration of social insurance, to which the Soviet Government subscribes millions of rubles, is in their hands. In the Socialist countries, where the power lies in the hands of the people, there are and could be no breaches of trade union rights or liberties; antilabor or antidemocratic laws, such as the infamous Taft-Hartley Act, laid down by the reactionary bosses of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, cannot exist.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I strongly urge the Senate to take one of the following courses of action:

First. Keep the statutory ceiling for the ILO at its present figure, pending hearings on the advisability of raising the ceiling and on the desirability of continued United States participation; or

Second. Make any increase in the statutory ceiling contingent on ILO rejection of Communist agents as bona fide employer and worker delegates. This is the effect of the amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 97 which I proposed on January 12, 1956.

Mr. President, I think my amendment should be willingly accepted by the Foreign Relations Committee. The committee members know as well as I do that we are completely out of sympathy with the position taken by the Communist governments of the world in regard to employer-employee relationships. As a matter of fact, in the Communist countries there are no such relationships; all such relationships are completely eliminated, and all employee groups are dictated to by the governments controlling those countries at the time. So it would stultify the position of free business and free labor in the United States, as well as the position of our Government itself, if our representatives to the ILO were to sit around the conference table with representatives of the Communist countries, for the consideration of the very important matters connected with employer-labor relationships. At such a conference our delegates would be greatly out-numbered and out-voted by the delegates representing the Communist governments, just as our representatives to the ILO now are out-numbered and out-voted in connection with the positions the Soviet and Communist governments take, whereas we should be able to oppose them effectively.

Mr. President, the way for the United States to take affirmative steps in the best interests of free labor and free business is for us to say that we are not going to increase by 1 cent the United States' contribution to the International Labor Organization, for which we are now paying more than our share, until the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate hold a public hearing on this subject, so that, first, the American people will be able to know what the issues are; and, second, until the representatives of those tyrannical governments are excluded from the consideration of the rights and relationships of free workers and free business in the world.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 5, 1956]

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

HOW USEFUL IS THE ILO?

The United States has become a member of a large number of international organizations in addition to the United Nations. Most of these organizations come quite expensive because the United States quota usually runs to about one-third of the budget. It is difficult to assess the value of all these international efforts; some are useful, others are only continuous.

The International Labor Organization is one of the least useful and effective. Because of the increase of government-owned enterprises throughout the world, the nature of employment has changed in many countries to such a degree that slavery has been restored. The ILO was established during a capitalistic era; much of the world is now socialistic.

As the American employer representative, W. L. McGrath, of Cincinnati, says in his report:

"At annual ILO conferences Communist orators, outnumbering ours in the ratio of 32 to 4, will tell the representatives of 69

nations about the decadence of the free-enterprise system, the superiority of the Communist system, the exploitation of the workingman by the American capitalists, and our greed and desire for war. These speeches will be reprinted by the ILO and circulated all over the world. One cannot imagine a better ready-made vehicle for the promotion of Communist indoctrination. Do we want to continue to finance this Communist operation?"

To many careless readers throughout the world, such publication by an international body will give the impression that the material is not Russian propaganda, but is the conclusion reached and assented to by the body.

McGrath objected to seating the Russian employer delegates. As all industry in Soviet Russia is owned by the Government, who are these employers? How, in a country which forbids private ownership of an industry, can there be an employer?

This may not be an exciting argument, except that the reason for the existence of the ILO is to have government, employers, and labor-union heads meet together to lay down certain policies concerning labor and working conditions on a universal basis. That this cannot be accomplished with the varieties of standards of living in the various countries is obvious from the small accomplishments of the ILO, but the excuse that is being given for its continued existence is that it is useful to have such a cooperative body.

In fact, the Marxian aim of Soviet Russia is to abolish the private ownership of enterprise throughout the world so that employers will not be permitted anywhere. Why then does such a country hold membership in an international organization which recognizes the right of an employer to exist, to hire labor and to bargain with a free labor union?

McGrath says:

"If we are simply to accept the present situation in the ILO, the end result is, to my mind, inevitable. The Communists, with 8 nations to our 1, and 32 votes to our 4, will remain firmly entrenched and will progressively dominate the ILO. It will become merely an international forum for the dissemination of Communist propaganda, financed to at least 25 percent by the taxpayers of the United States. In fact, at its next session, our Congress will be asked to raise the ceiling for the United States contribution to the ILO from $1,750,000 a year to $3 million a year."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I dislike very much to disagree with my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Ohio; and I dislike it the more because there is a good deal of truth and merit in what he says. However, I invite his attention to the fact that financially the ILO is operated on a calendar-year basis. Its appropriations are effective on the first of January each year.

It is true, as the distinguished Senator from Ohio has said, that there have been no public hearings on the pending joint resolution; but, as I recall—and I should like to be corrected if I am mistaken—the reason why there were no public hearings is that there were no requests on the part of anyone to come before the committee at that time.

I point out to the senior Senator from Ohio that the administration sent to the committee representatives of the State and Labor Departments, and that those representatives were quite urgent in their request to us that we report the joint resolution favorably. It was reported unanimously from the Foreign Relations Committee.

The Senator from Ohio has mentioned something about our being outvoted. I do not believe that is exactly true, because while there are eight Communist countries in the ILO, they have, as I understand, 32 votes out of a total of 284 votes. I think we ought to recognize the fact that we are in a pretty tough scrap with communism and with the Soviet Union.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. How many votes has the United States?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Four, as I understand.

It is my feeling that we should remain in an organization of this sort and not get out, because if we were to show our pique, if we were to refuse the necessary funds, and refuse to cooperate with other freedom-minded members of the organization, I feel that the end result would be the creation of a vacuum into which the Soviet Union and its satellites would move. I think we ought to recognize the fact that, while it is true that so-called employee and employer delegates are fictions so far as the Soviet Union is concerned, nevertheless, at the present time the ILO does have a committee looking into this particular subject and trying to find out what can be done to bring about a clear declaration regarding the Soviet Union and its captive states, so that this myth or fiction of so-called employer and employee delegates can be done away with.

I think the Senator from Ohio made a sound suggestion when he said that the President should create a commission to study the question of further participation by the United States in the ILO, based upon the arguments advanced. It is my hope that the joint resolution will be passed without the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, that the President will appoint a commission, and that we can go along, in the interest of harmony in this country between labor, management, and Government, because I understand that the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce have nominated their delegate for this year. It seems to me that what we should do is to fight out the issue in this particular Organization, and not back out and allow the Soviet Union and its captive states to come in. So I sincerely hope that, even though there is a great deal of merit in what the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio has said in offering his amendment, the joint resolution will be approved as it is, and that we shall proceed to work out some of the details later.

Inasmuch as the Government is in the process of appointing its delegates; inasmuch as the AFL-CIO is participating; and inasmuch as employers have appointed their delegate, let us go ahead and give this program a chance. Let us try to do what we can by fighting within the Organization, instead of trying to withdraw and allowing the Soviet Union and its satellites to take over.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Ohio—and I must say that during the course of the discussion today I have somewhat changed my views with respect to it, in the light of the statement of the Senator from Ohio—he is not proposing that the United States withdraw from the organization. So I do not believe that point is at issue. Certainly he is not proposing that we withdraw at this time. While some people on the outside had suggested that possibility at one time, and while it may still be suggested by our former representatives in the ILO, that is not the issue before the Senate today.

We have adopted an amendment which increases the amounts for the Food and Agricultural Organization up to the maximum of 33⅓ percent. By that amendment, as I view the legislative picture, we have contingently increased the ILO amount up to 33⅓ percent.

The continguency or proviso in the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio is that that not be done until two things have happened—first, until the Senate and the executive branch of the Government shall have had an opportunity to review the situation growing out of the action by the ILO in obviously going counter to what had been the original intent, of having representatives of free labor, free employers, and the Government, rather than to have the Government unilaterally voting for all three when, in fact, free labor and free employers are nonexistent.

Secondly, after the executive branch and the Congress shall have had an opportunity to study the problem, our representatives will still be on hand, as the Senator from Montana points out, to carry on the battle, to see if the problem cannot be solved within the ILO itself.

If that can be done, the Congress of the United States will certainly be in a position next January to act. The contingency will be removed, because if the ILO solves the problem, the amendment of the Senator from Ohio will not apply. If, on the other hand, despite nonaction by the ILO, hearings bring out the desirability of continuing in the Organization on the basis of a contribution of 33⅓ percent, at that point the Senate and the House could, in effect, strike out the proviso.

I must say, in all fairness both to the Senate and to the distinguished Senator from Montana, that I do not purport, as minority leader, to speak for the administration in this connection. I agree with the Senator that the administration made it very clear before the committee that it thought the amount should be increased; and the Senator is quite properly carrying out the mandate of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

However, on my own responsibility, let me say that I think the arguments which have been made by the Senator from Ohio are very persuasive. I believe that a question of moral principle is involved. I believe that at some point we shall have to draw the line and say that we cannot continue to have the Soviet

Government, in effect, making a dead letter of what has been the intent and the normal practice, of having free labor and free industry represented.

As a result of the discussion today, I have personally come to the conclusion that I will support the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the pending joint resolution.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to answer the distinguished minority leader first before I yield to the Senator from New York. I can well understand the reasons for the consideration given by the Senator from California to the suggestions of the Senator from Ohio. It is true, of course, that the so-called employee and employer delegates representing the Soviet Union in the ILO are phonies and myths, and that it is all a fiction, and does not stand up. However, I would like to point out to the Senate that the issue of the Soviet Union employer and worker representation in the ILO became acute at the ILO Conference in 1954. At that time, the United States Government, employer, and worker delegates all supported challenges that had been filed to the Soviet employer and worker delegates on the grounds that they were in fact representatives of the Soviet Government and not of free employers and free workers. Nonetheless, the Soviet were seated.

Subsequently, in March 1955, the ILO governing body appointed a committee, headed by Lord Arnold D. McNair, former president of the International Court of Justice, to study the question of the freedom of employer and worker organizations in each of the ILO member countries. That committee made a voluminous report shortly before the March 1956 meeting of the governing body. Because of the shortness of time, the governing body decided to postpone full discussion of the problem until its November 1956 meeting. In the meantime, however, the governing body is proposing that the ILO Conference in June discuss the question, not with the purpose of taking formal decisions, but in order to give the governing body the benefit of the delegates' views.

The problem is by no means so simple as it might appear. There is reason to hope that in time it can be worked out to our satisfaction, but the approach embodied in this amendment will certainly not contribute to such a solution.

I should like respectfully to suggest to the Senate that at this time the amendment be rejected, and that the joint resolution be passed as it is. In the meantime, we should follow the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio that the President set up a commission, that the Committee on Foreign Relation consider the matter and hold public hearings—which I must insist again have not been requested up to this time—and that the ILO itself, through a subcommittee, keep looking into this question, so that there may be demolished the myth of Soviet employer and employee representation. Of course, there are other things to be considered also.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the Senator from Montana that his arguments would be quite persuasive if the Senator from Ohio or any other Senator had suggested that either the United States withdraw at this time under those circumstances, or indeed if an amendment had been offered which would cut the amounts which the United States is now contributing to ILO. But that is not the situation which confronts us. In either case the Senator's arguments would be persuasive under the present circumstances, and such an amendment could properly be rejected by the Senate.

However, the situation confronting us—and what I say now is in addition to the statement made earlier—is that for the first time the Senate is being asked affirmatively to put what may be termed its stamp of endorsement upon the changed condition in the ILO, and to indicate what might be considered to be full approval of the action which has been taken.

It seems to me that there is an entirely different situation confronting us in view of the event which took place a year or so ago. As the Senator has pointed out, a committee has been appointed, which is to make its report in March of this year, and the matter is to be considered presumably in June and perhaps in November, or whenever the organization next meets. Therefore it seems to me that under those circumstances—and I admit this is true in the present situation, as it is in the case of many other issues which come before the Senate—there is ample room for an honest difference of opinion on this subject. No one can speak dogmatically on it and insist that his solution is the proper one. However, it seems to me, in view of the facts which have been presented—the outline by the Senator from Ohio, and the fact that it is not being proposed that we withdraw from the organization, or that we so much as cut a single penny from our contribution—that there is certainly great concern felt, not only among the employers of our country but also among our labor organizations as well. Although our labor organizations feel very strongly that we should not withdraw from ILO, I do not believe any inference should be left that the American Federation of Labor—if I know that organization and Mr. Meany, or even the CIO organization, or any other labor organization—believes that the method of letting the Soviet Government or any other Communist government represent both its employers and its employees is the right approach to the situation. On the contrary, they would be very adamant in opposing such an approach.

Therefore, it seems to me that, under the circumstances, the Senate would be justified in accepting the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. It is for those reasons—and I must say that it has been brought out by discussion here today, and I am not speaking as a party leader, but only on my own responsibility—that I feel there are strong reasons to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As the Senator from California has said, there are two sides to every question, and there is room for an honest difference of opinion.

However, I feel that if we pass the joint resolution as is, what we will be doing will be to back up the employer and employee delegates representing our country. Certainly there is no reason why the situation should be regarded as being as dangerous as some people think it is. If the commission the Senator from Ohio has suggested is appointed, if the committee appointed by ILO itself looks into the matter, and if perhaps also the Committee on Foreign Relations looks into it—especially if the committee were to hold public hearings and look into the matter—plus the constant watchdog attitude of the Committee on Appropriations, I think we would probably be in a better position next year to find out how this matter is coming out and what would be the best way to fight against some things we do not like at this time.

However, as I say, and as the minority leader says, it is purely a matter of opinion.

Mr. LEHMAN. I rise to support the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. It seems to me we ought to pass the joint resolution as it reads in its amended form, although I sympathize with the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio that the matter be studied and investigated by the administration, by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and by the ILO itself. Certainly no harm would come from passing the joint resolution as it reads in amended form. There will be ample opportunity to take action next year if it is considered desirable, as necessary to do so.

I wish to point out that nothing dangerous has developed in connection with this entire situation. I wish to read from a statement submitted by the Department of State, which explains the joint resolution and states the reason for the support of the joint resolution by the Department of State. It reads as follows:

> Since 1950, there have been significant developments in the ILO program which have increased the costs of the Organization. Four ILO operational field offices have been established on a regional basis to permit more effective assistance to governments in meeting problems in such fields as manpower utilization, industrial safety, administration of labor standards, social security, etc. In addition, the ILO has been instrumental in exposing violations of basic rights of labor, particularly in Iron Curtain countries, and in promoting and strengthening democratic institutions among workers. Jointly with the United Nations, the ILO has carried on a worldwide investigation of the use of forced labor for purposes of political coercion or for the fulfillment of the economic plans of a State. This investigation has done much to dispel the Soviet fiction of the "workers' paradise" in the minds of those whom the Soviets are most anxious to influence. In regard to freedom of association, the ILO has brought to public attention specific, documented cases of governmental control or domination of worker organizations in a number of countries for political purposes. At the same time, careful screening procedures are employed to

weed out allegations which are propagandistic, malicious and unsubstantiated.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that what the ILO has accomplished along the lines of breaking down and refuting false statements and false propaganda is highly important. I think we would be making a serious mistake if we should undertake to give the impression that we are seeking to take unilateral action. The voting strength of the Soviet bloc in ILO, I believe, represents numerically one-seventh or one-eighth of the voting strength of the non-Communist countries having membership in the ILO. I consider the ILO highly important and effective. This organization has done much to break down the myths and the false propaganda employed by the Communists regarding the position of labor in Communist countries and in refuting the claim that they represent democratic principles. We all know that such a claim is completely untrue. I think the work of ILO is tremendously important and we must not handicap it.

I do not believe the resolution as it now stands, with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana, would in any way jeopardize the rights of this country which are already recognized by the representatives who have been selected to sit as members of the United States delegation in the ILO. I hope the resolution as amended by the Senator from Montana will be agreed to.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I should like to say, further, that if there has been anything accomplished in breaking down, as the Senator from New York has said, the myth of Soviet imperialism and the lack of freedom of labor and business in communistic countries, it has been done without their participation, because up to this time they have not been members at all of the Organization. So that any work that has been done has been done on the part of the other nations before the Soviet Republic was represented.

The Senator from New York says that the Organization has only one-eighth of the voting power of the other nations represented; but when we add to that the fact that there are totalitarian countries which do not agree with us with respect to the right of labor and business to be free and to bargain collectively, and the like, I might point out the fact that the Soviet countries have eight times as many votes in this Organization as has the United States. Furthermore, if we increase the appropriation, what the Senate will be doing is saying to representatives who have voted against us that we are going to increase the amount, willy-nilly, and, in fact, it will weaken our position when we come to confer with employer and employee delegations. It will weaken the hands of the United States representatives in carrying out the plan and purpose of maybe getting rid of the captive representatives who will vote against us on every possible occasion. It will further nullify the effectiveness of the ILO in calling to the attention of the world the default in the Soviet system of imperialistic control and domination of the rights of labor in those countries and the complete servility of their people.

Mr. President, I have searched the records to find out what justification there is for the increase. There was no testimony, so far as I know, concerning it. There is certainly nothing in the report to justify it except the vote of the ILO Council itself asking that the United States increase its appropriation. It may be that since Soviet Russia and her satellites are in the Organization, they want their share of clerks and stenographers, their share of propagandists in the ILO, so that they may multiply their influence and say to the United States and other countries and to the Organization itself, "We are in now, and we are entitled to an appropriation proportionate to the number of employees of the Organization who are sympathetic to our philosophy and who will agree with us when our representatives vote."

I do not know what the justification is, except that they voted for it against the vote of the representatives of the United States Government, United States business, and United States labor.

So, Mr. President, I think my amendment should be agreed to. There should be a full record of what justification there may be for it, and then let our representatives try to work out, with the strength of the position of the Senate behind them, the proper place for Russian labor and Russian business in the councils of the ILO.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the distinguished acting majority leader permit me to ask a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The hour is getting late, and I think the Senator may have given some consideration to a recess, under the previous order. I have understood, from previous conversation with the Senator, that he did not intend to ask for a vote this evening on the question, and that, according to the earlier announcement by the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], when the Senate concluded its labors today, it would go over until Wednesday. So I was wondering, in order that Senators may be on notice, whether we might have a yea-and-nay vote ordered, the vote to be taken when the Senate assembles on Wednesday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays may be ordered on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it has been my purpose to make a statement supporting the position of the Senator from Montana on the joint resolution. When the Senate agreed to the amendment which was stimulated by the suggestion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], most of the argument I had intended to make has been taken care of.

The matter which the Senator from Ohio brings up is of great interest to me, and I sympathize with the sentiments he has so ably expressed, but I wish to make the RECORD clear on this point.

In my judgment, the ILO has done one of the most important international jobs since we began work of this kind. It antedates the United Nations, as the Senator from Ohio knows. I have discussed it with the Labor Department representatives, including the Secretary of Labor, and it is perfectly clear that if we take any steps which may sabotage this work entirely, we may destroy one of the best instruments we have for international understanding.

Although one can understand the natural reaction of many people who say that we should refuse to participate with Soviet bloc countries in organizations such as the ILO, I feel strongly that it would be a mistake for us to act on such an impulse. At this time, with the Russians shifting the emphasis in their tactics in the cold war, it is particularly important that we do not quit the field and give them the battle by default.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I may suggest to the Senator that that was not the import of my amendment at all.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I understand. However, I want to make it clear that I do not believe we should do anything which would in any way jeopardize the position of the ILO.

I wish also to make this point: It has been said that we are outvoted in the ILO by the Communists. Eight Soviet bloc countries are members of the ILO, and they have 4 votes apiece, or a total of 32 votes. The United States also has 4 votes—2 for our Government delegates and 1 each for our employer and worker delegates. But besides the Soviet bloc and the United States, there are 62 other members of the ILO, also with 4 votes each. Of the 284 votes in the ILO, the Soviet bloc has 32, and the free world has 252.

I have had the responsibility of being a delegate to the United Nations. The very question which the Senator from Ohio has raised today comes up all the time with regard to United Nations votes. We are in a very difficult position there, with our limited vote in the Assembly. The United States has only one vote in the Assembly. But the vast majority of the members have been loyal to the United States leadership in opposing the attempts made by the Soviet bloc to outvote us. Therefore, I have such faith in the justice of our cause as to be confident that by strong and vigorous leadership we can continue to win an overwhelming majority of the 252 non-Communist votes in the ILO.

It has also been said that the ILO is a forum for the propagation of communism. Every single day I was in attendance at the U. N. Assembly the Communists had propaganda efforts under way. Of course, the Communists attempt to use the ILO as a propaganda sounding board, just as they attempt to use every other international organization. But so far, in the ILO, they have had little success. The fact is that far from being a forum for the propagation of communism, the ILO is a forum for the exposure of communism.

Through its careful, meticulously factual studies of forced labor, the ILO has

shown up the Soviet bloc as one big concentration camp, instead of as the workers' paradise that Moscow propagandists try to picture.

At the moment, we are on top of the situation. Through its participation in the United Nations Expanded Technical Assistance Program, and through its regular activities, as well, the ILO has made a real contribution to increasing worker productivity and improving managerial skill not only in Western Europe but also in the underdeveloped countries.

This, it seems to me, is one of the most valuable services which the ILO performs, and one which redounds markedly to the interest of the United States. It is the kind of positive approach which can be extremely effective over a period of years and will help the labor situation in the United States. It is one of the reasons why our big labor organizations have been so strongly in support of the continuation of the ILO.

I regret that I was unable personally to attend as a delegate, when the Secretary of Labor asked me some time ago.

The senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] attended last year. I regret that he is not present today to relate his experience, but he has said that he was convinced of the value of the Organization and that nothing should be done to undermine its effectiveness. I am not certain that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio would result in undermining the effectiveness of the Organization, but we should think the matter through very carefully to see whether we should not give a vote of confidence to our colleagues in the ILO, and the nations supporting our point of view, and not try to tie them down by some mandate from Congress at a time when we have heretofore, in a general way, accepted our share of what the whole group decided would be the budget for the year.

I am simply suggesting this because it seems to me that if there is any implication that we do not trust our colleagues, we may lose some of the support we have had so effectively right up to this time. I believe, as the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has said—and I support his position—that it would be wise for us this year to create a new ceiling.

The resolution will not increase the amount in one big jump; it will simply place a new ceiling on the amount and will give our representatives in the ILO, and our representatives in the United Nations, who are supporting the ILO representatives, the flexibility and ability to negotiate for the kind of budget which will be decided upon for the coming years.

All the proposal really amounts to is the giving of our representatives the freedom to work with those who have worked with us before, without saying to them, "We are imposing this mandate upon you because you are not behaving yourselves. This is all you can do."

Thus, I feel it would be wise to support the proposal which has been made, by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], especially since the ceilings have been set percentagewise. A maximum of 33⅓ percent is all that we can possibly contribute; but at the same time we will be saying to our representatives, "We shall trust you to handle the matter."

So I shall support the position of the Senator from Montana in his able presentation of the case for the committee. I say at the same time to the Senator from Ohio that I think I agree with the criticisms he has made about what is going on. Nevertheless, I think we are on top of the situation; and when we are on top of it, I do not believe we should tell our partners that we do not trust them to play the game as they have played it heretofore.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROVED EFFICACY OF SALK VACCINE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I know that the entire Congress and all the people of the United States are very much interested in the degree to which we may be achieving success in wiping out poliomyelitis in this country.

Last week marked the first anniversary of the announcement of the proved efficacy of the Salk vaccine. On this anniversary Mr. Basil O'Connor, president of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, to whose valiant and successful work in this field all of us owe so much, issued a report addressed to all physicians in the United States.

That report sums up the gratifying opinion of the Foundation that paralytic polio in the United States can be cut in half in 1956 and practically eliminated in 1957. It carefully analyzes the situation with respect to our current knowledge of the production and utilization of Salk vaccine and concludes that the problem of preventing paralytic polio is no longer a problem of medical science but simply one of logistics. This being so, Mr. Basil O'Connor explains in his brief but careful and analytic report how and when we can achieve the goal of wiping out paralytic polio if all concerned with achieving this objective put forth carefully coordinated efforts in the remaining months of this year.

I believe Mr. Basil O'Connor's report is of tremendous importance to all of us, and I ask unanimous consent that it be set forth at this point in the RECORD.

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

REPORT TO PHYSICIANS—CAN PARALYTIC POLIO BE PREVENTED IN 1957?

(Statement by Basil O'Connor, president, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis)

Paralytic polio in the United States can be cut in half in the epidemic period in 1956 and can be reduced to a negligible amount in 1957 if there is a coordinated effort during the remaining months of 1956 by all concerned: the public, the public health services, the doctors, and the manufacturers. It may be properly assumed that such coordination can be had.

The primary interest of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis is to wipe out paralytic polio. Everyone joins in that wish. If it is possible to accomplish that result, all people would unquestionably be willing to do their part to bring it about. Any suggestion or plan as to how that end may be reached ought to be carefully examined and receive full consideration.

The program needed to accomplish the desired result can be divided into two time periods—from now through July 10, 1956, called the first period—and from July 10, 1956 through December 31, 1956, called the second period.

The manufacturers of Salk vaccine estimate that between March 1, 1956 and December 31, 1956, they will produce 203 million cubic centimeters of vaccine. It is estimated that 92 million of these 203 million cubic centimeters will be produced between March 1, 1956 and July 10, 1956, and 111 million cubic centimeters between July 10, 1956 and December 31, 1956.

The manufacturers have had 1 year's experience in producing vaccine. One has a right to use their estimates of production for purposes of calculation. Using their estimates, the problem of preventing paralytic polio becomes one of logistics and not one of medical science.

To reduce paralytic polio in 1957 to a negligible amount, an effort should first be made to immunize those groups which have the highest incidence rate of paralytic polio. Eighty percent of our paralytic polio is in the 0 to 19 age group and pregnant women. The first period of the plan should be devoted to immunizing these groups.

In the age group 0 to 19 inclusive there are 61 million individuals.

In the pregnant women group there are 4 million women.

These two groups make a total of 65 million individuals.

In these two groups we have 80 percent of our paralytic polio.

Assuming an 80-percent acceptance of the vaccine this would mean that 52 million of the 65 million in these 2 groups would receive the vaccine. On a 90 percent effective basis this would likewise mean preventing at least 50 percent of all paralytic polio that might otherwise occur in the epidemic season of 1956. Immunizing such a large number in the groups having the highest incidence rate of paralytic polio should have the effect of reducing paralytic polio in the nonvaccinated.

The present estimates of the manufacturers making Salk vaccine indicate that between now and July 10, 1956, there will be enough vaccine to give 2 shots to the 52 million available individuals in these 2 groups. This would require a total of 104 million cubic centimeters of vaccine.

Between April 12, 1955, and March 1, 1956, 42 million cubic centimeters of vaccine were released for use. This vaccine has either been used or is available for use within these two groups.

The manufacturers estimate that between March 1, 1956, and June 25, 1956, they will produce 92 million cubic centimeters of vaccine. The estimated monthly rate of this production is as follows:

	Cubic centimeters
March	12,811,272
April	19,242,626
May	18,930,790
June	40,821,240
Total	91,805,928

The 42 million cubic centimeters of vaccine actually released between April 12, 1955, and March 1, 1956, and the estimated production of 92 million cubic centimeters between March 1, 1956, and June 25, 1956, total 134 million cubic centimeters of vaccine available between April 12, 1955, and July 10, 1956, or enough to give 67 million people 2 shots of vaccine. This is 15 million more people than those considered available for vaccine in the 0 to 19 group and pregnant women group, which total 52 million. This indicates a safety margin of 30 million cubic centimeters, over and above the number of

cubic centimeters required for 2 shots for the available in 0 to 19 and pregnant women groups.

It seems proper to conclude that by July 10, 1956, there will have been manufactured and released for use adequate vaccine to give 2 shots to all available in the 2 groups referred to and thus reduce by at least one-half the incidence of paralytic polio in the epidemic period of 1956.

Of the 42 million cubic centimeters of vaccine already released, probably 20 million have been used to give 10 million individuals in these 2 groups 2 shots each, leaving 22 million cubic centimeters which have been used or are available for use to give 1 shot to 22 million of the 52 million in these 2 groups, leaving 20 million in this group who have not received any shots. These 20 million could be given 1 shot from the March and April production totaling 32 million cubic centimeters, leaving 12 million cubic centimeters which could be used as second shots for those in the 22 million group who had received 1 shot. This would leave 30 million yet to receive a second shot and these could be taken care of by the May production of 19 million cubic centimeters and the production of the first 2 weeks in June which totals 18 million cubic centimeters. There would still remain an excess of 30 million cubic centimeters from the production to June 25 after giving the 52 million availables in both groups 2 shots of vaccine.

With reference to the second period, July 10, 1956 to December 31, 1956, the manufacturers estimate they will produce 111 million cubic centimeters of vaccine. The estimated monthly rate of this production is as follows:

	Cubic centimeters
July	17,500,000
August	18,040,000
September	18,220,000
October	19,000,000
November	19,000,000
December	19,000,000
Total	110,760,000

If we add to the total estimated production for the last 6 months of 1956, namely 111 million cubic centimeters, the 30 million cubic centimeters not used in the period ending July 10, 1956, there is an estimated 141 million cubic centimeters available for use during the period July 10, 1956, and December 31, 1956. This would be adequate to give the third shot to the 52 million in the two groups referred to herein and two shots to approximately 45 million additional persons—or a total of at least 2 shots to 97 million individuals out of a total of 167 million in this country—or 80 percent of the population aged 0–45. Less than 2 percent of all paralytic polio is in the age groups over 45.

The job is a big one logistically, but it can be done if all those interested cooperate fully. In an effort of such public health significance we can assume—

1. That the manufacturers will make every effort to live up to their production estimates;

2. That the United States Public Health Service through the National Institutes of Health will be ready to release promptly for public use all properly manufactured vaccine presented to it;

3. That parents of children in the 0 to 19 group will have the vaccine given to their children when and as it becomes available and not wait until June when its administration to such a large group will present insuperable practical difficulties;

4. That local public health officials and doctors will let the public know promptly when vaccine is available; and

5. That doctors will not hold in reserve vaccine for second shots, but will give one shot to as many individuals as possible in the two groups referred to, relying on the second shot to be available before June 30, 1956.

There is every reason to expect that such cooperation will be gladly given in view of the importance of the result to be obtained.

To give 97 million people at least 2 shots of Salk vaccine before December 31, 1956, is not an impossibility but the logistics of such an operation must be worked out by the Public Health officials and the medical society in each State on the basis of an emergency health program.

The intelligent use in 1956 of the vaccine estimated to be available during that year would indicate that cases of paralytic polio in the United States in the year 1957 should be very few.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS FOR INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT-ELECT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce the appointment by him of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] as members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Arrangements for the Inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on January 21, 1957, authorized by Senate Concurrent Resolution 64 of the 84th Congress.

RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until Wednesday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Wednesday, April 18, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 16 (legislative day of April 9, 1956):

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Clarence G. Morse, of California, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for a term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1960. (Reappointment.)

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Harry L. Bolen, of Illinois, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, vice Egbert Alfred Smith, deceased.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be captains in the United States Coast Guard:

William L. Maloney
Ralph R. Curry
Arthur L. Dickert
Clifford R. Maclean
Henry F. Stolfi
George P. Kenney
Leonard T. Jones
Searcy J. Lowrey
Samuel L. Denty
George W. Dick
Charles B. Arrington
Charles E. Brush
Robert T. Alexander
Edward A. Eve, Jr.
Eric A. Anderson
Marion Amos
William D. Shields
Chester L. Harding
Richard E. Morell
Aden C. Unger
Victor F. Tydlacka
George I. Holt
Simon R. Sands, Jr.
Donald M. Morrison
Philip A. Ovenden
Christopher C. Knapp
Joseph E. Madacey
James B. Rucker
Henry U. Scholl
Rufus E. Mroczkowski
Oscar C. B. Wev
Harold B. Roberts
Ned W. Sprow
William I. Swanston
William E. Creedon
Henry A. Meyer
Preston B. Mavor
Quentin M. Greeley
Charles P. Murphy
Richard C. Foutter

The following named persons to be commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

Edwin B. Ing
Donald V. Reardon
Toralv A. Berg
Winslow H. Buxton
Lewis L. Whittemore
Arthur R. Hoglund
Harry C. Gifford
Edmund B. Redington
Robert W. Goehring
Wesley W. Wood
Felix S. DeSoboll
John H. Phinney
William A. McFaull
William E. Pratt
Harry L. Morgan
George S. Beck
Lee O. Moyer
Vitus G. Niebergall
John H. Cleary
Alfred W. Medcalf
John D. McCubbin
Earl C. Young
Elmer J. Bodenlos
John H. Holm
Joseph E. Mallett
Lawrence D. Connor
Ross P. Bullard
Isaac R. Boothby
Archibald H. McComb, Jr.
James B. McCarty, Jr.
Leonard E. Penso
Orvan R. Smeder
Thomas P. McMaster
Paul E. Savonis
George C. Steinman
John W. Anderson
Ernest S. Rasmussen
Victor Pfeiffer
Arthur M. Vrooman
Bertram J. Tuckey
Leonard C. Walen
William L. Morrison
George J. Monteverdi
James M. Caulk
George M. Russell
William T. Coyle
Edwin W. Wickham
David W. Sinclair
Adam A. Klein
Edward E. Dickey
Robert R. Russell
John P. Fox
Edward W. Kirkpatrick
Carl A. Anderson
Ellery H. Capen
Vincent H. Casey
Charles E. Masters, Jr.
Emilio G. Oliotti
Karl A. Bergman
James C. Campbell
William J. Willman
James N. Schrader
Harry F. Frazer
Benjamin Malloch
William J. Tracy
Viggo A. Madsen
Lester W. Raynes
Glenn W. Ellis
Charles C. Phillips
Francis J. Swan
George E. Ross
Martin Spain
George E. Holland
Warner K. Thompson, Jr.
Thomas McCusker
Maurice D. Melanphy
Martin J. Dean
William R. Riedel
Mark L. Hocking
Clement B. Cozad
James H. McDowell
Fred M. Cronan
John R. Silliman
Louis B. Kendall
John A. Fagan
Harold O. Rasmussen
Jesse E. Eastman
Gorman W. Larsen
Sylvius Pellegrini
Robert B. Scott
Charles P. McFaull
Ralph M. West
Clifford A. Anderson
Robert Murdoch
Arthur E. Wilcox
Curtis A. Alexander
Charles E. Sharp
Gilbert Hinchcliffe
George A. Butler
William C. Mahoney
John D. Hill
Julius Schuler
Lynn Parker
Louis A. Grundler
Julian J. Shingler
Ellie D. Baker
Byron I. Reynolds
Francis B. Ford
Robert J. Ernst
Robert Flockhart
Edwin J. Lautermilch
Bertrand J. Henesey
Claude G. Winstead
Thomas G. Byrne
Leslie G. Haverland
George W. Nantau
Robert H. Burtt
Peter Snyder
Gustav E. Johansen
Theodore LeBlanc
Elvin C. Hawley
Emery H. Joyce
Casimer J. Bernas
William Barkalow
Douglas R. Shambeau
William D. Brimner
James L. Thompson
Paul H. Browne
Daniel C. Dickert
John H. Wildhack
Frank McLaughlin
Donald G. Elliott
Lloyd R. Morrison
Cyril L. Heyliger
Frank F. Elliott
Paul Olson
Charles H. Freericks
Newton W. Winberg
Kenneth H. Hellweg
Herbert J. Kelly
William S. Vaughn
George W. Stedman, Jr.
Joseph Mazzotta
Jonas T. Hagglove
Lionel H. DeSanty
Ashton H. Barnes
Thomas N. Kelley
Arthur M. Davison
William R. Sayer
Joseph J. McClelland
Raymond G. Miller
John P. Latimer
Robert E. Hammond
Clyde R. Burton
Ottis T. Estes, Jr.
James F. Bills
Edwin C. Crosby
Ira H. McMullan
William C. Foster
James W. Paine
James A. Cornish
William K. Earle
Edward H. Houghtaling
William D. Strauch, Jr.
Robert F. Barber

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

George H. Lawrence
Robert E. Emerson
Hersey C. Forehand, Jr.
Sherman K. Frick
Marcus H. McGarity
John E. Day
Fletcher W. Brown, Jr.
Charles W. Scharff
Charles M. Shepard III
Francis D. Heyward
Arthur C. Hoene, Jr.
Edward F. Cotter
Paul F. Foye
Raymond J. Perry
Ephraim P. Rivard
James V. DeBergh
Thomas F. Dunham, Jr.
Francis J. Malloy
James W. Booze
Ernest R. Challender
James W. Conway
Claude W. Bailey
Andrew P. Hopewell
George W. McClure
Charles L. Turner
Stewart R. Graham
James F. Phair
Robert A. Copeland, Jr.
Walter C. Bolton
Kenneth M. Bilderback
Clinton J. Maguire
Roger B. Clark
George W. Walker
Bruce W. Clark
Sidney K. Broussard
Louis J. Glatz
Frank D. Hilditch
Arthur M. Watson
Arthur H. Sheppard
Raymond W. Siegel
Harry A. Solberg
Robert O. Bracken
John W. Hume
Herbert Krause
Errol H. Seegers
Forrest H. Willoughby
Robert D. Burkheimer
Jack E. Forrester
Lewis R. Davison
John H. Hawley
Carol L. Mason
Franklin A. Colburn
Robert S. Wilson
Charles E. MacDowell
Elmer P. Mathison
Warren C. Mitchell
Henry A. Campbell, Jr.
Armand J. Bush
Lester A. Levine
John J. Omeara
Glenn O. Thompson
Arthur F. Heffelfinger
Eugene F. Walsh
Lloyd E. Franke
Samuel E. Taylor
Richard C. Wilkie
George A. Philbrick
George J. Bodie
Henry W. Stinson, Jr.
Earl E. Broussard
John F. Fitzgerald
Emerson Hayes, Jr.
John Wilfred McCurdy
William Kesler, Jr.
William P. Williams
Edward A. Richardson
Warren F. Stevenson
Peter E. Gibney
Lewis R. Lavalley
James P. VanEtten
Joseph R. Steele
Edward M. F. Kirchner
Mitchell A. Perry
Garth H. Read
William E. Dennis
Robert J. Loforte
Owen W. Siler
Arthur Hancock
Richard A. Pasciuti
William S. Allan, Jr.
Robert B. Moore
Wallace C. Dahlgren
Harry H. Carter
Bernard E. Kolkhorst
Donald M. Reed
George W. Sohm
Carl L. Parrott
Frederick J. Hancox
Robert A. Adams
William M. Benkert
Robert A. Schulz
Warren E. Rast
Curtis J. Kelly
Austin F. Hubbard
Ward R. Emigh
William J. Zinck
Richard E. Hoover
William N. Banks
Keith Low
Daniel J. Scalabrini
Edward R. Tharp
Wilfred N. Derby, Jr.
Alden E. Lewis
Robert T. Norris
Frank B. Carter
Frank M. Fisher, Jr.
Rufus S. Drury
John J. Doherty
David L. Davies, Jr.
Donald A. Caswell
Donald J. P. Evans
Lewis F. Lovell
David C. Kierbow
Lloyd M. Logan
Albert S. Frevola
Edwin J. Brummeler
Nathan L. Fendig
Edwin S. Radford
Andrew J. Grogard
Clyde J. Miller
Alfred J. Unger
John M. Nagy
Jason S. Kobler
William H. E. Schroeder
Robert E. Foley
James D. Doyle
James E. Fleming
David R. Permar
Harry G. Kosky
Neale O. Westfall
Edward P. Sawyer
Henry E. Steel
Francis J. Mann
Norman L. Miley

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard:

Orville C. Hinnen
Byron M. Wineke
Adam Stanzak
Paul A. Berg
Olaf T. Sturdy
Thomas B. Prather
James G. Cowart
Ronald S. Krueger
Harry S. Raleigh
Leo J. A. King
Henry J. Pfeiffer
Thomas C. Pennock
Hugh E. McCullough
Alvin J. Boxwell
Francis Twarog
Willard E. Carlson
Hugh J. LeBlanc
Thurston L. Willis
Bernard B. Wood
David T. Haislip
Stanley L. Waitzfelder
Harold D. Muth
Samuel W. Branin
Jack E. Stewart
James C. Boteler
Richard L. Huxtable
John Vukic
Norman P. Weinert
James A. Emery
Owen B. Smith
Paul L. Anderson
William C. Carber
Rubin E. Young, Jr.
Fred J. Michalson
Richard C. Green
James B. Reynolds
Wesley J. Quamme
William C. Akers
Philip S. Bell
Donald D. Davison
Ivan C. McLean
Edward G. Taylor
Franklin F. Bohlk
Louis E. Price
Jerry Komorech
John W. Cherry
Vincent J. Wernig
James C. Norman
Franklin J. Miller
Russell W. Lentner
Harold A. French
William H. Yates
Sam Pisicchio
Robert D. Parkhurst
Otto F. Unsinn
Walter O. Henry
Verne D. Finks
William L. Aitkenhead
Charles F. Baker
James P. Stewart
James H. Swint
Shirl J. Stephany
George F. Rodgers
Leslie D. High
George H. P. Bursley
Frank E. Parker
Leland C. Batdorf
William F. Tighe, Jr.
Bruce H. Edwards
Roy K. Angell
Robert C. Krulish
William J. Kirkley
Edward E. Chambers
Robert W. Johnson
Charles Scot Marple
Wilfred F. Raes
Albert H. Clough
Randolph Ross, Jr.
Robert W. Smith
David E. Perkins
Robertson P. O. Dinsmore
Alfred J. Tatman
Malcolm E. Clark
Richard M. Underwood, Jr.
Charles M. Mayes
Dan Rayacich
David P. Bates, Jr.
Rudolph E. Lenczyk
William L. Faulkenberry
Donald C. Davis
John H. Bruce
James H. MacDonald
Donald R. Vaughn
Thomas W. Powers
Archibald B. How
Herbert H. Sharpe, Jr.
Michael B. Lemly
Glenn M. Loboudger
John E. V. Murray
Vincent A. Bogucki
Robert A. Lee
Lloyd W. Goddu, Jr.
Donald J. McCann
Edward D. Cassidy
John B. Hayes
Robert L. Davis, Jr.
Glenn R. Taylor
Walter F. Guy
Warren S. Petterson
Harold E. DeLong
William C. Wallace
Henry G. Cassel
Raymond M. Miller
Hardy M. Willis
Fred E. Wilson
Clarence G. Porter
Leroy Flatt
Charles R. Howell
Robert E. Bracken
William A. Mayberry
Rollin T. Young
Cornelius G. Farley
Francis L. Brittan
Philip A. Hogue
Eugene Carlson, Jr.
Paul Richard Happel
Edric S. Bates
John William Yager
Thomas W. Wolfe
Gerard J. Perron
Elliot S. Shafer
Robert E. Ogin
Samuel R. Early
Nelson W. Allen
Roger J. Dahlby
Charles A. Haley
Everett B. Kopp
Edward P. Boyle
William M. Barney
William C. Behan
Edward F. Oliver
William L. Russon, Jr.
Edwin Lee Knowles
Robert E. Wolfard
Michael J. Holland
John F. Mundy, Jr.
Frank E. McLean
Roland P. Amateis, Jr.
Roy M. Wimer
Robert F. Hornbeck
Robert H. Scarborough
Roland J. Frappier
Edward J. Geissler
Thomas L. Wakefield
John H. Hedetniemi
William C. Jefferies
John C. Parker
Edward G. Ware
Dale J. Henderson
Frederick C. Thomas
Kenneth B. Hofstra
Edward O. Wille
Robert H. Sabin
John F. O'Connell
Emmett G. McCarthy
Robert H. Werthman
Leonard M. Unterein
Edgar W. Dorr
Joseph C. Fox, Jr.
Nathaniel F. Main
Vincent J. Mitchell
Richard T. Houlette
Andrew S. Skucy
Thomas C. Duncan, Jr.
Adam S. Zabinski
William J. Brasier
Edwin Allen Schmidt
Arthur G. Taylor
Richard S. Wohlgemuth
Walter E. Johnson
Ross Lynn Moore
Harry A. Davenport III
John D. Crowley
Virgil W. Rinehart
Robert E. Dolliver
Robert S. Hall
Robert W. Durfey
Robert J. Bosnak
William P. Butler, Jr.
Luigi Colucciello
Robert F. Goebel
Edward L. Hauff
Robert A. Duin
Alfred Prunski
James B. Brook
William H. Fitzgerald, Jr.
James R. Hope
Herbert E. Lindemann
Philippe C. Gaucher
George Schmidt
Stuart S. Beckwith
Carl S. Mathews
Wayne E. Caldwell
Samuel M. Moore III
Stuart T. Scharfenstein
Bernie E. Thompson
Harry F. Gregg
Howard W. Pagel
Robert E. Walsh
Clarence R. Hallberg
Darrel W. Starr
John K. Byerlein
Joseph C. Dorsky
Thomas T. Wetmore III
Norman P. Ensrud
James T. Clune
Charles B. Hathaway
Donald M. Chapman
Leroy Reinburg, Jr.
Walter C. Ochman
Maxwell S. Charleston
Paul W. Tifft, Jr.
William R. Weadon
Henry J. Burness
Raymond C. Hertica

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

Anthony A. Alloggio
Paul T. Anderson
Warren D. Andrews
Darrell L. Babcock
Kenneth E. Barrett
Laurence O. Bates
Murray W. Boggs, Jr.
Paul H. Breed
Dan H. Briganti
Roger A. Britt
William B. Clark
Dan A. Colussy, Jr.
James H. Conrad
Edmund L. Cope
Charles L. Crane, Jr.
Calvin E. Crouch
Richard P. Cueroni
Edwin H. Daniels
Ted O. DeYoung
Richard A. Donnelly,
Vaughan W. Driggers
James R. Erwin
George Everett
Edward C. Farmer, Jr.
Rolland A. Faucher
Henry C. Fisher
Jerome V. Flanagan
Thomas J. Flood
Galloway B. Foster
Walter D. Fox
Frank A. Frauenfelder
Donald D. Garnett
Gregory C. Gaski
James E. Grabb
George K. Greiner, Jr.
Donald Grim
Ralph C. Hill
Donald C. Hintze
Roger A. Holmes
David G. Howland
Bernard A. Hoyland
Robert E. Iden
James C. Irwin
James A. Kearney
Joseph M. Kelly
Marinus F. Keyzer
William L. King
Walter W. Kohl, Jr.
William E. Lehr, Jr.
Charles W. Linn
Herbert G. Lipsett
Richard V. Littlefield
Roger L. Madson
Max S. Maire
Graeme Mann
William D. Markle, Jr.
Charles W. Matherly
Charles E. Mathieu
Charles F. Merritt
Roger W. Mowell
Edward Nelson, Jr.
Harry J. Oldford, Jr.
Hal F. Olson
Walter E. Paulsen
Harris A. Pledger, Jr.
William P. Reilly
Dean A. Ridyard
Arthur P. Roberts
Ernest E. Rowland, Jr.
William Russell
Keith B Schumacher
Thomas M. Sing
Donald W. Smith
William E. Smith
Arthur Solvang
Nathaniel C. Spadaform
Frederic C. Sponholz, Jr.
Charles G. Stadlander
Raymond L. Stevens
Albert C. Stirling
David E. Stryffeler
Norman A. Toon
Eugene F. Trainor
Alfred H. Walter
Robert E. L. West
Lloyd O. Westphal
Theodore J. Wojnar
Glenn F. Young
David T. Zurzuski, Jr.

The following-named persons to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard:

Michael Abarbanell
Ernest Charles Allen
Gilbert Lawrence Aumon
John Donat Basque
Don Stewart Bellis
Neal Hugh Bernard Benjamin
Robert Allan Biller
Richard Andrew Blackford
Lawrence Francis Bond
Robert Loring Bristol
William Jasper Brogdon, Jr.
Gilbert Edward Brown, Jr.
John Lavelle Callahan
Donald Thompson Campbell
Joseph Canzoneri
Norman Edgar Cutts
John Edward DeCarteret
Alan Charles Dempsey
William Manlove Devlin

John Richard Ehrmann
Charles Wesley Faircloth
William Murray Flanders
Donald Lee Frantz
Bruce Stephen Gathy
Robert Gillespie
Wesley Goodwin
James Arthur Granger
Basil Davis Harrington
Roger Putnam Hartgen
Lynn Neal Hein
Paul Dana Henneberry
William Gardner Hicks
Arthur Klaus Hounslea
Floyd Dore Hunter
Vernon Costen Jones
Kirk Robert Kellogg
Robert Joseph Ketchel
Bruce James Kichline
Laurence Crawford Kindbom
Thomas Wightman Kirkpatrick
Ronald Charles Kollmeyer
Richard Jay Kyte
Norman Burleigh Lynch
John Neil MacDonald
Ernest George Marsh
Robert Emmett McKew
James Irving McLeaish
Robert Garland McMahan
LeRoy Clifford Melberg, Jr.
William Firman Merlin
William Bryan Mohin
Charles Edward Moorhead, Jr.
Parker Dennis Morris
George Robert Oberholtzer
Richard Duane Olsen
Lawrence Joseph O'Pezio
Kennard Miller Palfrey, Jr.
David Clyatt Pendergrass, Jr.
Robert Ira Plattus
Donald LeRoy Prince
Edward Joseph Quinn
George Leith Rettie
James Edward Rivard, Jr.
Barry Christie Roberts
William Fitch Roland
James Joseph Rooney III
Richard Ignatius Rybacki
Richard Eugene Sardeson
Thomas Patrick Schaefer
Benjamin Keith Schaeffer
Brinton Roger Shannon
Clifton Raymond Smith
Joseph Francis Smith
Bruce Lee Solomon
John Gerard Stanley
Earl Lorain Sullivan, Jr.
David Arthur Sumi
Arnold Swagerty
Donald Melvin Taub
Paul Thomas Thevenin
Robert Richard Tutt
George Francis Viveiros, Jr.
Arthur Henry Wagner
James Weiskittel
Walter William White
Raymond Earl Womack
Joseph Henry Wubbold III

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 16 (legislative day of April 9), 1956:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Maurice E. Stans, of Illinois, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Ignatious E. Self, Decatur.
Lee J. Ledbetter, Troy.

ARKANSAS

Teddy E. Miller, McCrory.

CALIFORNIA

Raymond E. Balch, Angwin.
Alan H. Miller, Belmont.
Elmo Nicoli, Ben Lomond.
Esther M. Dauer, Biola.
William B. Evans, Bridgeport.
Jule M. Ashworth, Calistoga.
Chester G. Umberham, El Modeno.
Walter J. Wieger, Grass Valley.
Etta A. Y. Wilbanks, Lebec.
Olsen O. Wheeler, Loma Linda.
Doris L. Johnson, Madison.
James W. Bristow, Mentone.
Thelma E. Jacobs, Parker Dam.
Dick A. Willey, Pollock Pines.
Juanita A. Lombardi, Rockaway Beach.
Russell K. Bates, San Bernardino.
Lowell B. Chapman, San Pedro.
Charles E. Louk, Sierra Madre.
Alfred H. Willhoit, Templeton.
Mary Eleanor Lennie, Thousand Palms.
Axel A. Granstrom, Weed.
Robert L. Reifel, Willows.

COLORADO

Foster A. Rose, Elizabeth.
William L. Robbins, Grover.
Earl K. Downing, Littleton.
Robert A. Clark, Mead.
Ira G. Cook, Milliken.

CONNECTICUT

Leroy M. Beaujon, Canaan.
Milford L. Carson, Enfield.
Frank A. Lattanzi, New Haven.
Wesley J. Gilbert, New Preston.
Joseph P. LeVasseur, Rocky Hill.
George A. Lamb, Sharon.
Norma K. Schaefer, Weatogue.

FLORIDA

Alfred R. Dickey, Auburndale.
Ray L. Mercer, Bunnell.
Sidney Pennington Smith, Everglades.
James R. Harris, Plant City.

GEORGIA

Scott Walters, Sr., East Point.
James Harold Carlyle, Jr., Norcross.

ILLINOIS

Samuel W. Goers, Altamont.
James Haney, Arthur.
Clyde C. Norton, Cordova.
Robert W. Miller, Du Quoin.
Merle L. Miller, Fairview.
Patricia Ann Higar, German Valley.
Harvey Ellet Calame, Godfrey.
Karl Max Hoover, Lovington.
Paul O. Davis, Mason.
John R. Simpson, Park Ridge.
Milo L. Pearson, Pleasant Hill.
George Harlin Sloan, Rankin.
Paul J. Michael, Somonauk.
Frank P. Campbell, Techny.
Delbert R. Britt, Ullin.

INDIANA

Marcus O. Lane, English.

IOWA

Robert E. Shultz, Allison.
Louis E. Pfaff, Aurelia.
George L. Beeler, Bellevue.
George E. Jenison, Belmond.
Herbert G. Martin, Clermont.
Maurice M. Neal, Dexter.
Hollis E. Scott, Elkhart.
Charles E. Powers, Exira.
Charles H. Worsley, Farnhamville.
Alexander W. Mihm, Fort Atkinson.
Russell H. Oviatt, Goldfield.
Emory A. Smith, Lakota.
Donald Lyle Youngers, Le Claire.
John N. Moore, Leon.
Clark M. Sexton, Oakville.
Joseph A. Nowatzke, Panama.
Clifton Lee Schmidt, Rockford.
Doris N. Hatheway, Sabula.
Eugene M. Clark, Stockport.

KANSAS

Charles E. Brown, Glasco.
Helen G. Lacy, Humboldt.
Henry Michel, Lakin.
Elery N. Stevens, Lane.
Mabelle E. Mettling, Lewis.
Arline D. Wright, Maple Hill.
Lowell E. Sohm, Otis.
John M. Hampton, Parker.
Harold B. Vernon, Simpson.
Glen G. Shook, Virgil.

LOUISIANA

Laurence M. Carmadelle, Barataria.
Effie E. Bickham, Blanchard.
John N. F. Martin, Kenner.
Michael J. Byrne, Marrero.
Homer M. Delacroix, Jr., Plaquemine.
Carey O. Fairbanks, Sicily Island.
Homer B. Roark, West Monroe.

MAINE

Wilbur F. Moulton, Limerick.
Richmond S. Hooper, York.

MARYLAND

Gertrude E. Grabis, Byrans Road.
James F. Wallace, Jr., Easton.
Edgar Marine Belt, Hampstead.
William C. Coakley, Havre de Grace.
Samuel Ahmuty, Jr., Odenton.

MASSACHUSETTS

Norma G. Scothorne, Accord.
Beatrice M. O'Brien, Ballard, Vale.
Albert Foster, East Freetown.
Merle L. Hunt, Hudson.
Jean T. Nelson, Ocean Bluff.
John Wesley Warren, Sheffield.

MICHIGAN

Earl M. Halsey, Almont.
Jeannette J. Reider, Big Bay.
Harold W. Bobb, Genesee.
Clarence L. Meredith, Hudson.
Russell J. Strazzulla, Newport.
George P. Donner, Jr., Spring Lake.
Earl L. Gray, Williamsburg.

MISSISSIPPI

James A. Fellows, McComb.
Ethelyn B. Weldy, McLain.
Herman Alexander Smith, Ripley.

MISSOURI

Linne O. Stemmons, Avilla.
Winston H. Watt, Bosworth.
Lessie H. Bray, Clarksdale.
Harry F. Rickhoff, New Florence.
Delvan M. Mahurin, Novinger.

NEBRASKA

Wayne A. Shaneyfelt, Aurora.
Jack K. Pugh, Bradshaw.
Lloyd E. Scheer, Cook.
Eugene L. Tarr, Gothenburg.
Wilmer R. McConnell, Imperial.
Lawrence L. Valentine, McCool Junction.
Elmer E. Kasper, Prague.

NEVADA

Frank M. Compston, Jr., Yerington.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Lauretta L. Sumner, Grasmere.
Carrie S. McDonald, Harrisville.

NEW JERSEY

Elmer Stanton Holmes, Jr., Avalon.
Moses N. Strader, Newton.
Elizabeth K. Simpson, Saddle River.
Holloway W. Case, Sussex.

NEW MEXICO

Edward M. Berardinelli, Santa Fe.

NEW YORK

Howard E. Guinnip, Angelica.
Viola M. Comstock, Sodus Point.

OHIO

Helen E. Smith, Adelphi.
Richard J. Gamble, Alliance.
Earl A. Smith, Berlin Center.
John Clifton Richards, Delaware.
Robert E. Trout, Edison.
Nicholas W. Smith, Elyria.
Mary E. Ayres, Goshen.

Roland M. Dorr, Kensington.
Oliver Wolcott, Kent.
Robert J. House, Killbuck.
Ernest L. McConnell, Kirkersville.
John W. Meadows, Lucasville.
Arthur R. Miller, Madison.
Bernard W. Iffland, Metamora.
Glenn W. Duffy, Morristown.
Samuel H. Wolf, New Paris.
Albert F. Warnecke, Ottoville.
Murry N. Johnson, Pataskala.
Margaret L. Hess, Petersburg.
John F. Crawford, Sardinia.
Virgil O. Hutchison, Smithville.
William O. Ochsner, Strongville.
Richard A. Campbell, Sylvania.
William Paul Wilcoxon, Uhrichsville.
Edward J. Oswald, Unionport.
Seth W. Huntley, Vinton.
Harold D. Brenneman, Warsaw.
Clark Wickensimer, Washington Court House.
Everett J. Pearson, West Milton.

OREGON

Clarence A. Christianson, Cornelius.
Lyle B. Dannen, Halsey.
Myrtle E. Gibbs, Long Creek.
Ruth E. McLeod, Maupin.
Wayne E. Dexter, Scappoose.

PENNSYLVANIA

Francis E. Redding, McSherrystown.
Wilbur M. Hall, Montgomery.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Nellie E. Hodge, Alcolu.
John W. Stevenson, Carlisle.
Sara M. Campbell, Clio.
John M. Harrelson, Drayton.
Joseph W. Milling, Jr., Ridgeway.
B. George Price III, Walterboro.

TENNESSEE

Cordie L. Majors, Ramer.

VERMONT

Perley C. Brainerd, Bradford.
Roy H. Jarvis, Grafton.
Ralph S. Nealy, Jericho.
Kenneth H. Neill, Johnson.
Ballou L. Towne, Morrisville.
Alice P. Waterman, North Thetford.

VIRGINIA

Merrel M. Nash, Jr., Bayside.
Mary G. Arnold, Bishop.
Emerson N. Lamb, Blue Ridge.
Radford C. Montgomery, Buchanan.
Ivan L. Potts, Colonial Heights.
Daniel Jackson Kilby, Culpeper.
Ray W. Redd, Draper.
Thomas E. Caldwell, Fincastle.
Allen S. Trevvett, Glenallen.
Harry H. Kimberly, Jr., Hampton.
John H. Norris, Jr., Kinsale.
Robert H. Sipe, McGaheysville.
Elna T. Gooding, Oakton.
Fred M. Mullins, Pound.
Irving L. Wood, Ridgeway.
Nancy E. Wood, Rock Castle.
Francis A. Holdren, Vinton.

WISCONSIN

Jean E. Herschleb, Arlington.
Helen G. Klus, Armstrong Creek.
Glenn W. Meyer, Birnamwood.
Martin N. Ross, Cambria.
John A. Wimme, Nelsonville.
George W. Gessert, Plymouth.

WYOMING

Emilene A. Weisenberger, Bairoil.
Virginia C. Bennion, Cokeville.
Priscilla Butwell, Frontier.
Dale E. Howery, LaGrange.
Harry L. Estes, Thermopolis.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 16, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Myron C. Cole, D. D., First Christian Church, Portland, Oreg., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whom we live and move and have our being, grant Thy divine benediction upon us. As the builders of a great nation, we have inherited that which is truth, beauty, and goodness; therefore, impel us ever forward with the motives upon which our Nation was founded and that which will make America great.

Our Heavenly Father, forgive us where we err. Let us not indulge in pious phrases, but let us be ever bound together in the search for the truth which makes men free and we will give Thee the honor and the glory.

We pray for the leaders of our Nation. Bestow upon them honor, integrity, and all that which is of Thy nature and will bring Thy will upon the earth.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 12, 1956, 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. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On April 6, 1956:

H. R. 374. An act to authorize the adjustment and clarification of ownership to certain lands within the Stanislaus National Forest, Tuolumne County, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 1082. An act for the relief of Golda I. Stegner;

H. R. 1855. An act to amend the act approved April 24, 1950, entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes";

H. R. 2946. An act for the relief of Eugene Dus;

H. R. 3233. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to make it a criminal offense to move or travel in interstate commerce with intent to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for arson;

H. R. 5889. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the town of Savannah Beach, Tybee Island, Ga.;

H. R. 6461. An act to amend section 73 (i) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 6463. An act to ratify and confirm section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, section 1 (b), Act 12, Sessions Laws of Hawaii, 1951, and the sales of public lands consummated pursuant to the terms of said statutes;

H. R. 6574. An act to amend section 2 of title IV of the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 680), as amended;

H. R. 6625. An act to provide for the transfer of title to certain land and the improvements thereon to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo (Pueblo of Picuris), in New Mexico, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6807. An act to authorize the amendment of certain patents of Government lands containing restrictions as to use of such lands in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 6808. An act to amend section 73 (l) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 6824. An act to authorize the amendment of the restrictive covenant on land patent No. 10,410, issued to Keoshi Matsunaga, his heirs or assigns, on July 20, 1936, and covering lot 48 of Ponahawai house lots, situated in the county of Hawaii, T. H.;

H. R. 7236. An act to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to water conservation practices;

H. R. 8100. An act to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of Brazil; and

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to release reversionary right to improvements on a 3-acre tract in Orangeburg County, S. C.

On April 9, 1956:

H. R. 1892. An act for the relief of Dr. Lu Ho Tung and his wife, Ching-hsi (nee Tsao) Tung.

On April 10, 1956:

H. R. 1005. An act for the relief of Alice Duckett;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Porter;

H. R. 1667. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Boehme; and

H. R. 4039. An act for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Roldan, and Julian, Jr., Lizardo.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3481. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution requiring conference reports to be accompanied by statements signed by a majority of the managers of each House.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4909. An act relative to the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation, organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the membership corporations law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the membership corporations law of the State of New York.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10004. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 10004) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, KIRWAN, WHITTEN, PRESTON, RABAUT, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, JENSEN, and CLEVENGER.

THE ADJUDICATION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5862) to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FRAZIER, TUCK, and HILLINGS.

THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged today to extend congratulations to the Israeli people upon the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel as a free and independent nation.

Events in the intervening years have proved that the friendship between Israel and the United States has been one of the vital partnerships in the free world. On this historic day we are reminded of the fact that in a brief span of 8 years the State of Israel has made tremendous social, political, and cultural gains and is today recognized as a bulwark of democracy, and has proved to be our faithful and loyal ally in the Middle East.

The astounding progress made in this relatively short period of time has electrified the world, as it was achieved in the face of an uphill fight against what appeared to be insurmountable obstacles. The people of Israel have conclusively demonstrated their devotion to a cause demanding rigid austerity and great sacrifices.

The Government of Israel must continue to have the encouragement and help of our country. I have always derived great satisfaction in supporting legislation extending assistance to the valiant people of this young nation.

We are all aware of the fact that there is presently an alarming situation in the Middle East which affects not only the security of the United States but the peace and tranquillity of the entire free world. The security of the State of Israel and the stability of the Middle East are vital to the defense of the free world against Communist aggression and are consequently American interests of the highest priority.

I am convinced that we must take immediate preventive action to overcome the threats of war in that vital region of the world. The first and most essential step would be to permit Israel to purchase defensive arms in this country to counterbalance the delivery of Soviet arms to Egypt.

This administration should immediately consider entering into a mutual security pact with Israel and should institute a complete and immediate investigation of all aspects of our Middle East policy with a view to resisting Communist imperialism in that vital area of the world.

LOSSES FOR SALE

Mr. HUDDLESTON. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the other day one of my constituents mailed me a copy of a communication to stockholders from the chairman of the board of Botany Mills, seeking proxies for approval of a recapitalization plan for the company. Upon obtaining the necessary number of proxies, Botany's management proposed to acquire a profit-making, taxpaying company. It was anticipated that Botany's losses could then be deducted from the other company's profits so that neither would pay any taxes.

Our most important asset—

Said the chairman of Botany Mills in his request for proxies—

is our Federal tax loss carry forward of over $13 million.

The loser in this operation is the United States Treasury and the taxpayers of the Nation.

The foregoing is no isolated example of smart management or sharp lawyers taking advantage of a hitherto undisclosed loophole in the tax law. For a decade and a half, deals of this kind have been in progress. And the practice goes on. A perfectly legitimate section of the tax law designed to permit the losses of 1 year to offset the profits of preceding and succeeding years, is being perverted by speculators who have seized upon the merger device to offset the gains of one corporation with the losses of another.

The result is that the Government loses money, or the legitimate burdens of one group of taxpayers are shifted to other taxpayers already shouldering their fair share. Another consequence is that the merger movement is accelerated beyond reasonable needs. This often results in the closing of mills, creation of unemployment, demoralization of whole communities. In addition, this unwholesome practice is laying the foundation for further disrespect for the tax law. It adds to the growing feeling that our high tax rates are but a sham designed to spring the trap on the unwary and those whose taxes are withheld at the source, but to allow the well-informed schemer a loophole through which he can escape.

Lest you think that the example I cited is an isolated one, I refer you to almost any issue of the Wall Street Journal. Here are some advertisements that appeared last Monday:

Three hundred thousand tax loss carryover for sale or merger.

For sale or merger: Long-established truck and trailer parts company—good expansion potential—tax loss.

The composer of an advertisement the week before must have had his tongue in his cheek as he wrote that he would sell his large tax loss at a sacrifice:

For sale: Finest fancy grocery and liquor business. Large tax loss carryover. Sacrifice for quick sale.

The opening paragraph of an article in a commercial journal recently had this to say:

Prior to the passage of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code, businessmen and their lawyers in seeking to acquire corporate ventures were often confronted with the anomalous situation that the purchase price of a business increased in inverse proportion to its success in operation, i. e., the greater the operating losses the higher the asking price. The answer to this financial paradox quite obviously is found in the tax benefits afforded the purchaser by the loss carryover provisions of the then existing revenue laws.

Let us briefly look at the law which makes possible this deviation from normalcy. The Congress long ago recognized that there was a problem to be dealt with. For more than 15 years, the law has permitted the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to disallow any deduction, credit, or other allowance where the principal purpose of the acquisition of another corporation is the evasion or avoidance of Federal income tax. The originators of this provision thought they had licked a rapidly growing practice for avoiding wartime income and excess-profits taxes. The trouble was, however, that the courts would not agree with the Commissioner as to when the principal purpose of the acquisition was the evasion or avoidance of taxes. In the 1954 revision of the Internal Revenue Code, further steps in the tightening-up process were taken. The new law established a prima facie presumption that the principal purpose is tax evasion or avoidance where the consideration paid in acquiring a corporation or its property is substantially disproportionate to the tax basis of the property acquired plus the tax value of other benefits, such as loss carryovers. The law also denied the carryover if all of the three following factors exist: First, if 50 percent or more

of a corporation's stock changes ownership during a period of 2 years; and, second, such change occurs as a result of a purchase or redemption of stock; and, third, the corporation does not continue to carry on a trade or business substantially the same as before the stock-ownership change.

That the new law does not go far enough is amply evidenced by what I have just said and quoted. If any further proof is needed, let me cite the opening words of an address before the eighth annual Federal tax conference of the University of Chicago Law School:

Despite the sustained efforts of the Treasury Department and the Congress to prevent the use of loss corporations for tax avoidance, corporations with large operating loss carryovers continue to be sold at a premium.

It is my conviction that the Treasury and the tax-writing committees of the Congress are still not prepared to go far enough to protect the rights of the taxpayers of the Nation. Those of us who like to see independent small businesses preserved and who fear the steady rise in mergers and consolidations, look with concern on these mergers and consolidations which are inspired by the operation of the tax law. We are concerned, too, with the effect on the spirit of enterprise itself. It is, indeed, unwholesome when a company which has a bad year or two, instead of trying to work out its own problem and get back on to the black side of the ledger, turns instead to an effort to make a good deal at the expense of the Government just by selling out or merging with someone in search of a tax situation.

It is my firm conviction that income taxes should apply to all who have income. No corporation should be permitted to avoid its fair share by selling to, or buying out, another corporation just because it has a tax loss. Fair taxation involves paying taxes on profits earned by corporations; it abhors their ability to escape the payment of taxes by manipulation of capital structure. I call on the Treasury Department and the tax-writing committees of this Congress to draft a tax law which will preserve the legitimate deduction of losses by corporations which have suffered them, but will at the same time prevent tax-inspired mergers which must offend the conscience of any right-thinking man. Congress should make it impossible for any corporation to boast that our operating loss is our most important asset.

A BILLION-DOLLAR DANGER

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's most important crops, which had a total value in 1955 of $1,230,895,000, is under attack today by a small Mediterranean invader which threatens the destruction of America's alfalfa production.

I am speaking of a little insect no larger than the head of a pin, which is known as the spotted alfalfa aphid. First reported in 1954, when it is suspected the aphid was brought in as an unwelcome hitch-hiker on an American bomber flying from the Mediterranean area, the aphid caused a loss in the first year to alfalfa growers of $4 million in New Mexico, one-half million in Arizona, and one-third million dollars in California.

Apparently the condition was abated somewhat in 1955, but early reports this year from throughout the country indicate that the aphid has spread to the following States: California, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, Idaho, Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Kansas, Arkansas, Nebraska, and Louisiana.

In my own State of Oklahoma, where I met last week with State and Federal agricultural officials, alfalfa growers and feed dealers, an entomologist of the Oklahoma A. and M. College informed us that the loss in Oklahoma alone could easily reach $16 million this year, if drastic control measures are not started at once.

The tragic part of it is that the infestation is heaviest in drought hit areas, where many farmers are financially unable to pay the bill for control measures, which involve repeated spraying by airplane at heavy cost per acre.

Unless all farmers in an infested area join in control measures, spraying by a portion of the farmers is of little value because the aphid reproduces at a phenomenal rate and a crop completely cleared in 1 week may be completely reinfested by a neighboring field 8 or 10 days later.

In order to meet this danger, which experts tell us could threaten the alfalfa production of the Nation in a short time, the entire Oklahoma delegation in the House and the Senate today will introduce an emergency control bill. This bill will authorize expenditure of $15 million for control measures between now and June 30, and such additional sums as may be necessary in the new fiscal year. It also provides for $5 million to be expended on a crash-research program as to control method.

Several members of the House Agriculture Committee are joining in sponsorship of this legislation, and we earnestly hope it will receive early favorable consideration in this Congress.

WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to invite the Members of the House to participate, on Saturday, April 28, in a motor pilgrimage to Staunton, Va., the birthplace of Woodrow Wilson.

As a feature of the observance of the 100th anniversary of Mr. Wilson's birth, the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, which is a bipartisan Federal agency, will join next week in a program recalling the achievements and ideals of this great Christian statesman and educator.

On the 28th, which is the anniversary of the adoption of the League of Nations Covenant, Assistant Secretary of State Walter S. Robertson, as the personal representative of President Eisenhower, will speak on Today's Significance of the Ideals and Achievements of Woodrow Wilson.

Members of the House who desire to take the pleasant drive to Staunton, in the valley of Virginia, on that day, will be guests of the Federal and Virginia Commissions at luncheon.

The motorcade will form at 8:45 a. m. in front of the gates of Arlington National Cemetery, at the terminus of the avenue leading from the Virginia end of the Memorial Bridge.

Members of the House planning to participate should make their intentions known to Mr. Edward K. Moss, of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, Sterling 3-6969.

I should like to read the program for Wilson Week in Staunton, as follows:

STAUNTON WEEK CALENDAR APRIL 22-29

SUNDAY, APRIL 22

11: Morning worship, First Presbyterian Church, Rev. Graham G. Lacy, minister, Central Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C.

4:30 Interdenominational hymn festival, First Presbyterian Church. Choirs of area participating.

TUESDAY, APRIL 24

9-5: Tour of homes and gardens.[1] Auspices Augusta Garden Club in cooperation with Historic Garden Week, Garden Club of Virginia. Block tickets include lunch, 12 to 2. Feature attraction: Fashion Parade of a Century, 1856-1956, home of Mrs. W. J. Perry, Jr.

7:30: Trifaith panel, King Auditorium, Mary Baldwin College. Speakers: Father George B. Ford, Corpus Christi Church, New York City; Rabbi Louis L. Mann, Chicago Sinai Congregation; Rev. Ralph W. Sockman, Christ Church, New York City.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25

9-5: Tour of homes and gardens.[1] (Same program as Tuesday.)

3:30-9: Spring flower show.[1] Theme: "We Honor Woodrow Wilson." Auspices Federated Garden Clubs of Staunton, Garden Center, Gypsy Hill Park.

THURSDAY, APRIL 26

9-5: Open house, Woodrow Wilson birthplace.

10-9: Spring flower show[1] (same program as Wednesday).

10:30-4: Woodrow Wilson Institute. Chairman, Virginius Dabney, editor, Richmond Times-Dispatch. Music, Mary Baldwin College Choir.

10:30: Morning speakers: Harold W. Dodds, president of Princeton University; T. J. Wertenbaker, professor emeritus, Princeton University; Sir Leslie Munro, New Zealand Ambassador.

12:30: Intermission: luncheon for out-of-town guests. Exhibit: Woodrow Wilson documents, Memorabilia of 1856.

2:30: Afternoon speakers: Arthur Krock, New York Times; Robert C. Clothier, president emeritus, Rutgers University.

[1] Charge for admission.

FRIDAY, APRIL 27

10–9: Spring flower show[1] (same program as Wednesday).

SATURDAY, APRIL 28

Joint centennial event: United States Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission–Virginia Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission.

9–2: Open house, Woodrow Wilson Birthplace.

2: Festival parade.

3:30: Commemorative ceremony, 37th anniversary of the adoption of the League of Nations Covenant. Speaker: Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State.

8: Music for Young American Concert. National Symphony Orchestra, Howard Mitchell, conductor. College choral festival, auspices Virginia Federation of Music Clubs.

10: Festival ball.[1] Staunton Military Academy. Orchestra: V. M. I. Commanders.

SUNDAY, APRIL 29

11: Commemorative service, First Presbyterian Church, Rev. D. Elton Trueblood, Earlham College.

OMNIBUS FLOOD CONTROL BILL

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works will begin hearings on Tuesday, May 1, on projects eligible for consideration for inclusion in an omnibus flood-control bill. The hearings will start each morning at 10 o'clock and be held in room 1302, New House Office Building. The schedule for the first week in May is as follows:

May 1: Chevreuil Bayou, La., House Document No. 347; Lake Chautauqua and Chadakoin River, N. Y., Senate Document No. 103.

May 2: Eau Galle River, Wis., Senate Document No. 52; Mississippi River at Winona, Minn., House Document No. 324; Saline River, Ill., House Document No. 316.

May 3: Tombigbee River, Miss, and Ala., House Document No. 167; Milk River, Glasgow, Mont., Senate Document No. 70; Bad River, Wis., House Document No. 165.

May 4: Purgatoire River, Colo., House Document No. 325; Weber Basin, Utah, House Document No. 158.

There will be additional hearings on May 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, and 16 and the schedule of projects to be considered on those dates will be announced later. Members interested in presenting witnesses with respect to any eligible projects are asked to communicate with the chief clerk of the Committee on Public Works to facilitate the development of hearing schedules.

It is my suggestion that local interests desiring to appear on any project arrange with their Member of Congress to have one spokesman present their testimony in order to conserve the committee's time. If desired, others will be permitted to submit prepared statements for the record.

[1] Charge for admission.

NEW BARGAINING AGENT REQUESTED

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, an Associated Press news story in the Atlanta Constitution of Saturday, April 14, states that 1,500 employees of Hayes Aircraft Corp., in Birmingham, Ala., will ask the National Labor Relations Board for an election to replace the United Automobile Workers as their bargaining agent.

These aircraft workers are angered at the AFL-CIO because of its continued attempts to break down segregation in the South.

This action on the part of these Birmingham UAW members is not just an isolated instance. Resentment has been growing in many sections of the South for sometime because of the attitude of Meany, Reuther and the heads of some other union leaders on the question of segregation.

When I was at home during the Easter recess, a copy of a letter was given to me which had been written to President Walter Reuther of the UAW and signed by approximately 1,200 employees of General Motors Corp., in Atlanta, protesting the action of the UAW in using funds contributed by UAW members to assist the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in attacking segregation. The letter to Mr. Reuther signed by these UAW members is as follows:

To Walter Reuther, President, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C.

From Members, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The following resolutions have been signed by members of locals, CIO, whose names are affixed hereto:

Whereas funds collected in the form of dues by the CIO are intended solely for the necessary operating expenses of the CIO or for other purposes closely connected with the welfare of the organization and its members; and

Whereas the question of segregation of white and Negro pupils in the public schools of the several States is a political and social issue having no direct connection with the welfare of union labor; and

Whereas the membership of the CIO includes many individuals who are strenuously opposed to the mixing of the two races in the public schools; and

Whereas the public press has reported that large amounts of funds from the treasury of the CIO have been diverted to the support of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People for the purpose of forcing the mixing of the two races in the public schools:

Therefore, we, the undersigned members of locals, CIO, do hereby strenuously protest the reported diversion of these funds for a purpose having no connection with the welfare of the union labor; and

Further, we declare our position as being strongly opposed to any further diversion of the national funds of CIO to the NAACP or any other organization taking part in the controversy that has arisen over segregation in the public schools of the several States.

The action which has been taken on this subject by the heads of some unions has been taken without regard to the wishes of the rank-and-file members.

In Memphis, Tenn., recently union members vigorously resented remarks of the national representative of their union on the subject of segregation, and told this representative in no uncertain language that they would tolerate no dictation from the national headquarters on this subject.

A number of steelworkers in Atlanta recently protested vigorously the action of some of the leaders in the Steelworkers Union national headquarters, and threatened to withdraw from the Atlanta local if attacks on segregation were continued by the national officers.

The article in Saturday's Atlanta Constitution is as follows:

WORKERS QUIT UAW, SET UP DIXIE UNION

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., April 13.—A group of aircraft workers, accusing national union leaders of attempting to break down southern tradition, plans to challenge the powerful United Automobile Workers (AFL-CIO) with an independent southern union.

Spokesmen for the newly formed Southern Aircraft Workers, Inc., said they will ask for a National Labor Relations Board election in an effort to replace the UAW as bargaining representative of Hayes Aircraft Corp.'s 5,800 workers in Birmingham.

The group claims at least 1,500 signed memberships at Hayes, and says it is getting more at the rate of 50 a day. The UAW lists 3,000 members at the plant.

A number of southern union members have protested statements by AFL-CIO President George Meany and Vice President Walter Reuther which they consider attacks on the southern tradition of racial segregation. Reuther is president of the United Automobile Workers.

This, however, was believed the first, or among the very first, definite move toward a labor secession movement in the South over the bitter racial controversy.

Organizers said the independent union will not be segregated though it will be based "upon southern traditions."

"We firmly believe in the protection of the colored worker," said a spokesman, "but we do not believe in Walter Reuther's left-wing integration.

"Equal opportunity but not social equality will be a principle of the new union," he added.

Members of the group insisted the segregation question wasn't the only reason for their rebellion but was "the straw that broke the camel's back."

One of its leaders said workers became dissatisfield with the UAW-CIO last year while a new contract was being negotiated. They strongly objected to a special $20 assessment by the UAW to build a $26-million strike fund for the automobile workers.

Althought the aircraft workers paid the assessment they could not have drawn on the fund had they decided on a walkout.

Leaders plan to call a meeting of southern aircraft worker members in about 10 days to approve a constitution and elect officers. Incorporation papers already have been filed.

The UAW contract with Hayes Aircraft runs until April 30, 1957, but an attorney said this would not prevent an NLRB election from being called. He said the new group would become the bargaining agent of Hayes employees immediately if it won.

EXEMPTING FOREIGN TRAVEL FROM TRANSPORTATION TAX

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5265) to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on transportation of persons, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOPER, MILLS, GREGORY, REED of New York, and JENKINS.

AMENDING INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7247) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gain in certain railroad reorganizations, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOPER, MILLS, GREGORY, REED of New York, and JENKINS.

SALUTE TO ISRAEL

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to the Republic of Israel on the historic occasion of its eighth anniversary. Particularly on behalf of the people of the First Congressional District of Washington State and with all American citizens generally I extend best wishes to the Israeli people.

At times, Mr. Speaker, because of international pressures and the delicate political world situation, the citizens of Israel may question our motives and the extent of United States support, but I hope any such disappointments will in no way obscure from them the warm interest and friendship of the American people. Governmental omission or commission does not dim or deter the desire of the United States to support and secure the permanent military and economic survival of Israel as established by the United Nations.

The problems which more than a century and a half ago beset our own Republic in its infancy lend special significance to the observance of Israel's eighth anniversary. Also this is so because of the importance of the contribution to our culture and economic development by so many American citizens of Jewish blood. This gives Israel and the United States a close tie of interest. Finally let me say, the determination of the United States to prevent Soviet aggression and the spread of international communistic revolution, unites our two freedom loving peoples in a common bond. In this spirit America salutes Israel on this 16 day of April 1956. So it is on this historic observance for and from my constituents I express lasting friendship, support and good will.

APPROVE BILLS REGARDING CREDIT BANKS AND ASSOCIATIONS

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 received a resolution from the group directors' conference of the New York State Production Credit Associations expressing approval of a number of bills which have been introduced regarding credit banks and associations. The resolution was adopted at a meeting held in Syracuse, N. Y., on April 3, 1956. In view of the fact that these bills received the unanimous approval of the directors, who represent 17,500 New York State farmers, I am presenting this resolution for the careful consideration of all Members.

The resolution follows:

APRIL 10, 1956.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The directors of all of the production credit associations of New York State, meeting in conference in Syracuse, N. Y., on April 3, 1956, considered and unanimously approved the following resolution as presented by the committee consisting of Homer Shepard, of Cazenovia; Harold Giles, of Union Springs; Glenn Widger, of Ellicottville, and James H. Park, of Batavia:

"*Be it resolved,* That the directors herein assembled in conference representing all of the 15 production credit associations in New York State with total membership of 17,500 New York State farmers unanimously support legislative bills as proposed by the Federal Farm Credit Board known as H. R. 10285, H. R. 10286, H. R. 10315, and S. 3564; be it further

"*Resolved,* That James H. Park, secretary-treasurer of Farmers Production Credit Association of Western New York, be directed to mail copies of this resolution to Representative COOLEY, chairman of House Committee on Agriculture; Representative HOPE, of Kansas; Representative POAGE, of Texas; Senator ELLENDER, chairman of Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; all Congressmen and Senators from New York State; George Hill, secretary-treasurer, Jefferson City Production Credit Association; and others directed by the committee."

We would appreciate your favorable consideration and support.

Very truly yours,

JAMES H. PARK,
Farmers Production Credit Association of Western New York.

ILLINOIS MOTHER OF THE YEAR

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include a telegram and a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, as you well know, the Members of Congress and those in the executive branch are so busy, in this atomic and jet age, with all its tensions and problems, with our Nation's economy expanding at rapid pace, that we often fail to take the time to look back to the grassroots of our country to realize the influence and power of the spiritual and moral force of millions of humble people, whose lives and deeds go unheralded and unsung—yet, who are without doubt making the greatest contribution to the spiritual, moral, and material force of the Nation.

America, the greatest Nation in the world, rests upon, and has drawn its towering strength from millions of American homes. Millions of women in these American homes wield the first and most tremendous influence in instilling into the child the spiritual values, which have long been recognized as the most powerful strength, collectively, of the American people.

The teachings and direction of the women in the early formative years of the children, and associating them in the Sunday schools and churches, starts them on the right road for the future—all of whom continue to contribute and permeate the fabric of American life and American Government, from its base to the summit of the Government—the Presidency of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have been moved to make the above statements, and to take this time of the House today, because there has come to me a gripping story that so well illustrates the thought which, in my humble way, I am trying to present—a story I believe will be of interest to the Members of Congress—a story of womanhood at its best—a story of an humble woman born and reared in my congressional district.

The subject of this story is Mrs. Addie Crouse Carroll, 78, of Greenwich, Ill., twice widowed, mother and stepmother of 13 children, who has been given the honor of Illinois Mother of the Year, 1956.

Mrs. Carroll was selected by the American Mothers' Committee. She has honored her county, State, and Nation, and I want the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to carry this story, officially, to every congressional district in the Nation.

Governor William G. Stratton presented Mrs. Carroll a citation at fitting ceremonies on Sunday afternoon, April 15, at the Carrie T. Burritt Hall, Greenville College, Greenville, Ill. Sponsors were the president of the college, Dr. H. J. Long, Mayor Paul E. Zebb, and various groups and organizations of the committee.

Mrs. Carroll will go to New York for the selection of National Mother of the Year, May 7 to 10. Mothers from all 48 States will be contestants for the National Mother of the Year award.

For a more detailed story of the rich and fruitful life of this honored citizen, I am inserting with my remarks a very interesting and factual story written by Mrs. Carroll's neighbor, the local editor

of the Greenville Advocate, Greenville, Ill., on March 19, 1956:

GREENVILLE WOMAN IS NAMED ILLINOIS MOTHER OF THE YEAR FOR 1956—MRS. ADDIE CARROLL TO BE CONSIDERED FOR UNITED STATES TITLE—WIDOW OF METHODIST MINISTER HAS LIVED HERE SINCE 1933

Orchids to Mrs. Addie Crouse Carroll, of Greenville.

Signal honor, well deserved, came to a Greenville woman Thursday, when Mrs. Addie Crouse Carroll, 79, a resident of Greenville for the past 23 years, was named 1956 Illinois Mother of the Year, at Springfield, as briefly noted in the Advocate that day.

Mrs. Carroll, widow of the late Rev. E. T. Carroll, a Methodist minister, resides in a modest, comfortable home at 415 South Elm Street, that is when she isn't doing practical nursing or taking care of new-born babies and their mothers, or doing a baby sitting chore. Mrs. Carroll is the mother of 8 children and the stepmother of 5, but so far as the Carroll family is concerned there were no "steps" nor "halves", they were all one big family. And a big family it was, too. For many years there were 15 living in the Illinois Methodist parsonages as the Rev. Mr. Carroll was transferred from church to church. The number included the Rev. and Mrs. Carroll, their 12 children and Rev. Carroll's mother.

Ten of the Carroll children have collegiate training and 5 have degrees. The oldest son, Frank, is a retired major general of the Air Force. Eleven children are living and married and there are 21 grandchildren and 15 great grandchildren.

The children are:

Frank, a retired major general in the Air Force, Boulder, Colo.

Ben, publisher of the Reporter-Dispatch, White Plains, N. Y.

Paul, advertising manager for the American Brakeshoe Co., New York.

Stanley, Tulsa, Okla., in the aircraft industry.

Robert, Worthington, Ohio, in the aircraft industry.

Donald, farmer near Kent.

Mrs. Ella Finkenbinder, Stockton, former teacher.

Mrs. Leona Kendall, Coral Hills, Md., former teacher.

Mrs. Gladys Warren, Decatur, former teacher and now senior visitor for the Illinois Public Aid Commission.

Mrs. May Metcalf, Scarsdale, N. Y.

Mrs. Helen Finch, Cape Girardeau, Mo., former secretary.

A son, Vincent, who died in 1948, was a Greenville businessman.

Mrs. Carroll will be presented a plaque in recognition of being chosen mother of the year sometime in April with Gov. William G. Stratton coming to Greenville to make the presentation.

She was chosen by an Illinois committee consisting of the presidents of the Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs and Women's Christian Temperance Union, Federation of Home Bureaus, the American Legion auxiliaries, and the Christian Women's Association.

She was nominated for the Illinois title by members of the Atlas Sunday School class which she teaches at the First Methodist Church of this city.

Largely through the efforts of Mrs. Nina B. Bruns, home adviser of Bond County, and Mrs. Roy Finley, and members of the Atlas Sunday School class, was the activity started which resulted in the naming of Mrs. Carroll, Illinois mother of the year.

Mrs. Carroll will be considered now by the American Mothers Committee for the nationwide title.

Addie Belle, daughter of Benjamin and Mary Crouse, was born near Ingraham in Clay County, February 13, 1877, the fifth of nine children. She calls her people "not outstanding—just pioneer, hardworking, honest, Godfearing people. I'm proud of them."

Her first husband, Samuel O. Kepley, was a rural schoolmaster and her teacher whom she married in 1897. She was 20. He entered the ministry and served his first pastorate at Hagarstown, with a yearly salary of $300.

When her husband died 6 years later in January 1903 while en route to New Mexico for the benefit of his health, she had 3 children. The proceeds of an insurance policy bought a 50-acre farm which she operated with the aid of her father and brothers. Six weeks after the father died one of the little daughters died.

She married the Reverend E. T. Carroll, pastor of the Methodist church at Grayville, a widower with five children, on Thanksgiving Day in 1906. Five more children were born to them.

"We had to make sacrifices but the children did too," said Mrs. Carroll, recalling how the children were encouraged to complete college education.

The Carrolls came to Greenville in the fall of 1918 and the Reverend Mr. Carroll served the Greenville church 4 years, being sent from Greenville to Salem in 1922.

When the Reverend Mr. Carroll died at his last pastorate in Kinmundy on November 17, 1933, Mrs. Carroll returned to their own house in Greenville later that month, and took up practical nursing to support her family, which then consisted of 2 sons, 1 in high school and 1 in the grades.

Last month Mrs. Carroll was honored at a community dinner in Greenville at which nine of her children were present.

Present were many of the children she had cared for as newborn babies and their parents.

For her service to the community she was given a high-fidelity record player and a This Is Your Life booklet containing pictures of many of "her babies."

I am also including the following telegram of congratulations to Mrs. Carroll from Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois:

APRIL 13, 1956.

Mrs. ADDIE CROUSE CARROLL,
Greenville, Ill.

MY DEAR MRS. CARROLL: I know of no higher honor and no richer award that can come to any woman than to be selected as Mother of the Year for a great State like Illinois. Several things impress me about the selection. The first is that there are so many wonderful mothers who have done so much for family, community, and country, and therefore to be selected as Mother of the Year for the State carries with it high distinction. It is a reward that must be deserved as I have learned in other years and so I congratulate you most sincerely and salute you for your contribution to the well being of family life, community life, and the needs of a free country.

With warm personal wishes,

Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS FOODS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, we should be informed on what the United States Department of Agriculture is doing in the disposing of surplus foods.

They are working at the job, and the first 9 months of this fiscal year—July through March—a 65-percent increase in the distribution of surplus foods is recorded by the United States Department of Agriculture as announced on April 12, 1956. These donations of food are made to recipients in this country as well as abroad. The programs are conducted by the Agricultural Marketing Service.

Eligible recipients in this country received 42.9 percent more in the 9 months' period than they did the previous year. Gains were made in all categories of recipients. Schools, a 25.4 percent increase; donations to needy persons, 89.3 percent increase.

Eleven million schoolchildren, 1,300,000 needy persons in charitable institutions, and 2,929,000 needy persons in family units received surplus food.

Foods are being distributed to needy persons in 74 foreign countries through 19 private United States welfare agencies. A total during the 9 months of 840,300,000 pounds of food was distributed overseas, an 84-percent increase over the same period a year ago.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE: ADAMS CORPORATION, A LIVING EXAMPLE

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the blessings which have flowed to the American people as a result of the private enterprise system cannot be fully appraised. We do know that from the beginning of our greation Nation men and women, because they have been free, have put their minds and efforts to work in creating an economy that has not been matched in the history of mankind.

In my own congressional district at Beloit, Wis., there is a small but vigorous company named the Adams Corp. The ingenuity, foresight, and ability of the men behind that company has brought to the American economy a product which is rather new but yet is one that today reaches all parts of the world. I refer specifically to a variety of products packed in small cellophane bags called Adams Korn Kurls, Adams Caramel Corn, and Adams Cheese Wafers. On Friday last week in the House dining room, the Members of this great body had an opportunity to sample these products through the courtesy of Mr. Allan W. Adams, president of the corporation.

Mr. Speaker, the products of this young company is as I have indicated above, going to all parts of the world, Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America. These are tasty tidbits that our young men and women in the Armed Forces serving abroad are able to purchase in the commissaries and canteens.

It is with some pride that in the cheese wafers this firm is using dehydrated Wisconsin natural Cheddar cheese and it is

thereby helping to reduce the surplus of Cheddar cheese which is produced so extensively in our great State.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country, I am sure, are proud of the men and women who are identified with private business and private industry today. They are the ones who make the jobs which provide employment for more than 65 million people without any help from the Federal Government. These same men and women are responsible for the high standards of living we enjoy and for the unlimited opportunity of every citizen in this Republic.

EXEMPTION FROM INCOME TAX OF CERTAIN DIVIDENDS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1956, I introduced H. R. 9765, to protect farmers and other persons who are required to treat patronage dividends as income for Federal income tax purposes by providing for the collection of income tax at source on such dividends and to provide tax equity.

At the time of introducing this bill I stated:

> Finally, I would say this: There has been considerable talk about corporations paying a withholding type of tax on dividends they declare, to their stockholders. Estimates have been made indicating that in this area also there has been a loss of legal revenue to the Federal Government. This principle seems to have bearing on this present situation. With that in mind, I am preparing a bill to accomplish this further purpose and, if it seems in order that its subject matter is sufficiently similar to that set forth in this bill, I would agree to join the two bills together.

Accordingly, today I have introduced a bill to provide for the collection of income tax at source on dividends.

Here now are two bills which will raise additional revenue by closing two loopholes in our tax administration and collection. Closing loopholes not only produces more revenue but it also creates a healthier attitude of the public toward the taxes they are required to pay. Nothing undermines the public attitude toward tax payment as much as preferential treatment to one group of citizens over another.

INCOME TAX REDUCTION FOR INSTITUTIONAL CARE OF MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

Mr. CURTIS. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will allow amounts paid for the institutional care and training of mentally retarded children of a taxpayer to be deducted for Federal income tax purposes.

The problem of mental retardation is indeed national in scope. The problem is vast and its magnitude is only now commencing to make an impression upon public-minded citizens and professional leaders. We are gradually recognizing the fact that mentally retarded children can be helped.

Mental retardation has no boundaries. It may strike, and does strike, families regardless of economic or fiscal status, race, or color. It is staggering to realize the frequency of occurrence and the number of people directly involved. The National Association for Retarded Children estimates that 300 of the children born every day in the United States are destined to be mentally retarded. Mental retardation is beyond question the most extensive of the crippling conditions which affect our Nation's children. For each 100,000 persons in our population, an estimated 200 are blind, 300 are permanently crippled by polio, 350 by cerebral palsy and 700 by rheumatic heart conditions and 3,000 individuals are mentally retarded. Estimates reveal that 3 percent of our total population or approximately 4,800,000 United States citizens are retarded to some substantial handicapped degree.

These figures readily show the immensity of one of this country's most extensive health, education, and welfare problems, and I might add, probably the most neglected.

Statistics are not available to show exactly the number of retarded persons there are but on the basis of the most authoritative studies thus far, estimates show that one out of every thousand of our total population is so severely retarded as to require hourly supervision. Four in every thousand persons are capable of being trained to self-care and social adaptability. Twenty-five in every thousand can, with proper schooling, vocational and social guidance, perform useful and productive jobs in our national economy. I call attention to the fact that in each of these three categories, schooling that is specialized so as to provide the social, vocational and self-care training is most vital to the welfare of these handicapped children.

I should also like to mention that the increasing birthrate in our country, together with the longer life span of the severely retarded adds to the numbers of persons for whom provisions of all types of care and schooling is required. In our country in which we are dedicated to providing equal opportunity for all, a climate must be made available in which the individual regardless of mental or physical limitations, can realize the full development of his capabilities.

The problem of adequate schooling of the proper nature for the mentally retarded children of this country is something that is only currently and slowly gaining national attention and momentum. Public institutions provide for the care and training of some 153,000 mentally retarded and epileptics in 1953 according to the United States Public Health Service. There is no adequate statistic available to show the number of mentally retarded children in specialized private schooling facilities. However, it is estimated that the United States Public Health Service found that in 1950–51 approximately $127 million was spent in operating 91 public institutions for the mentally retarded children while the National Association for Retarded Children estimates that perhaps $150 million a year is spent for the retardation in both public and private institutions.

The immediate problem with which I am greatly concerned today is the amount of money expended by parents of mentally retarded children in their care and training in institutions and schools. The economic inroads on family incomes cannot be accurately assessed, but they, nevertheless, are real and disrupting to any family so involved. Such expenses, depending upon the institution or school, may range from several hundred dollars to several thousand dollars per year and such costs may be occasioned in both public institutions as well as private schools. From the time parents suspect something may be wrong with their child, that is, their child is not developing at a normal rate, to final acceptance of the condition, the parents have expended large sums of money and depleted their financial resources in search of competent diagnosis, counsel, and treatment. The toll upon the finances and mental health of the parents is frequently so severe as to permanently disrupt family relations. Such obstacles to family companionship and unity may affect even and often do, the normal children in the family and the experience of being the parent of a mentally retarded child is sometimes so disturbing that even religious faith is taxed. It is quite important that we not only recognize the problems that confront such parents, but that we give as much encouragement as we can to them in meeting these problems. After all, it is the parents who through love and other fine emotions keep the number of retarded children on the public assistance rolls as low as it is.

It is true that in this country there is indeed a lack of adequate training and teaching facilities, both public and private. In the great State of Missouri, this lack of adequate facilities has been superbly illustrated by a series of articles written by Mr. Morton Mintz which appeared last July and August in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. For the information of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States and for the interested public, I am inserting these articles for printing in the RECORD.

The gentleman from Rhode Island, Congressman FOGARTY, has been most helpful in the initiation of a new program for the mentally retarded children of this country. As you know, in the consideration of the bill—H. R. 9720—making appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, moneys are provided for medical research, a new education program, and items of maternal and child health for the mentally retarded.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman BOLAND, pointed out on March 5, that the immensity of the mental retardation problem is beginning to drawn upon the people of the country and with the dawning is the growing desires of our people to help solve or at least alleviate the courageous burden families are carrying. He further indicated the problem was too big and too severe for individuals or even groups to master and that the responsibility rests upon the Government to shoulder the bulk of the program.

It is my feeling and firm belief that parents who are able and willing to pay for schooling, care, and training of their children, should do so. Such care and training is directly in the nature of a medical expense in the broad sense and in this connection the existing provisions in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are not sufficiently broad that a taxpayer may deduct for income tax purposes his expenses for the school care of a mentally retarded dependent.

As pointed out earlier, many of the retarded children in such schools require hourly attention and are unable to provide themselves with even the simplest of their requirements. Others with adequate schooling and care and training can be made marginally independent. In both extremes, medical counseling and treatment is of vital importance in alleviation and mitigation of the condition.

Section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code presently allows a deduction of certain medical care expenses of the taxpayer and these are defined to mean amounts paid for diagnosis, care, mitigation, treatment, and prevention of disease. Amounts expended for such care and training designed to alleviate mental or physically handicapped are also deductible. However, amounts paid for care in a specialized school for the handicapped are not specifically included as allowable deductions for income tax purposes. I feel such expenditures for institutional care and training of a mentally retarded child should be classified as permissible deductions for Federal income tax purposes and I submit that the bill which I have introduced today will encourage, lend support, and give some measure of relief to those parents who are able to participate by the extension of schooling to their mentally retarded offspring. This bill is but a small, though important, step in the path of advancement now being made in the field of mental retardation.

EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF ISRAEL

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the eighth anniversary of the founding of the gallant little nation of Israel.

We in the United States have looked with sympathy on its aspirations. We have admired its achievements.

But today war clouds hover over Israel and its valiant sons and daughters. Many of its neighbors are looking upon Israel with hostile eyes. Some say the spur for that hostility comes from outside of the Middle East.

But no matter where the truth lies, all of the nations of the world and their leaders must be made to realize unequivocally that Israel is here to stay.

There can be no compromise on that score and as Secretary of State John Foster Dulles so clearly stated just a few weeks ago:

> The preservation of Israel is a basic tenet of American foreign policy.

I stand foursquare for that stated policy.

Peaceful cooperation is the best answer for the troubled Middle East and for all the world. Through it improved conditions of life can be achieved by both Arab and Jew.

I have confidence that that good sense of the peoples of the Middle East will in the long run bring about this cooperation for the good of all—and for the maintenance of peace in that troubled corner of the world.

It is fervently hoped that one result of Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold's present visit to the Middle East will be the creation of the atmosphere necessary for the development of this peaceful cooperation.

In the meantime, I salute Israel's birthday and wish it well with the firm conviction this gallant nation will live on forever as an important member in the world family of nations.

TRAINING OF MARINES

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, although I do not desire at this time or at any time to prejudge any action involving our military services, I have been thinking a great deal of the tragedy which occurred in the training of our marines at Parris Island last week. It is not my purpose to condemn, nor is it my purpose to justify the tragedy which occurred, but it is my purpose to try, if I may, to show the importance of exercising great caution in regard to this whole situation.

Six young men died last week at the United States Marine training camp at Parris Island. It cannot be said they died because the training was too rigorous. It cannot be said they died because of a failure in judgment. It cannot be said they died because of the system employed. It might be said that probably their tragic deaths are due almost wholly to accident. Now there is no argument about the fact that accidents generally happen because of the failure to act or because of incorrect action or because of a fault.

The finest military organization in the world today is the United States Marine Corps. Their tremendous accomplishments in time of war, their heroism, their courage, their driving force represent a mountain of evidence as to the greatness of their quality. An examination of history will disclose that never on the field of human conflict has the ability, the courage and the power of the United States Marine Corps ever been equaled.

This eminent record of achievement has not come about easily. It is the result of the terrific attention to training of each individual Marine, a training to defend himself as well as to win out in any conflict with an enemy, a training to handle himself completely, individually, or in a group, a training to make each marine completely dependent upon himself, a training with others in the form of a team. Because of this training and the great accomplishments of the Marines for the United States of America, and for the cause of freedom, there is an esprit de corps in the United States Marine Corps unequaled in the entire world.

The training is rigorous. It is tough. It is demanding. It is strenuous. It requires full employment of a young man's mental and physical qualities. The one thing that we must not forget is that because of this training when a marine is facing his enemy, he has the advantage. The marine has a better chance to survive than does his enemy because he is the better trained. Only survivors win wars. The men who die pay for them, but they do not win them.

In our thinking about this tragedy at Parris Island, let us not lose our focus upon the objective, and that is to train these young men so that they might live when they are face to face with the enemy. In our other military forces, we train pilots and men to operate all kinds of machines of war. In the training of these men deaths occur due to accidents. Because of these accidents, however, the training of the men who follow is always just a little better. So it is and will be in the Marine Corps because of these tragic deaths at Parris Island. Let us make sure, let us be certain the young men who follow in training in the Marine Corps will be better trained.

It is easy to say, "Oh, this training is too difficult." It certainly sounds difficult to the average person sitting comfortably before his television in his comfortable living room. But it is not too difficult when the rigors of modern warfare are considered. In this connection, no training is too difficult. The training of our men must be on such a basis that it will prepare them to have the advantage over the enemy in time of war. Upon this their lives depend.

This morning, it was my pleasure to have breakfast with a wonderfully fine group of boys and girls from Groton, Mass., a part of my district. As we were together, I could not refrain from thinking about the future of these fine boys sitting to my right and to my left in the

breakfast room. In this regard I want to emphasize that if any of these fine young men had to go into combat in the defense of their country I would want them to go with the best possible training and the best equipment our country could give them. In this way, I believe they not only would be of great service to their country but they would be able to defend themselves and to prevail against their enemies.

In conclusion, I should like to emphasize again that I hope the Congress and the people of America will bear in mind that our country, the United States of America, requests and demands a very high level of ability, knowledge, courage, and forceful determination from the men who wear the uniform of the United States Marine Corps. As a Nation, we expect them to do the impossible and the United States Marine Corps has never let this Nation down, for they have done the impossible time after time after time.

My plea today then is a plea of caution. Let us not be too hasty to form unwarranted conclusions. At the same time I extend to the families and loved ones of these young men my heartfelt sympathy and assure them these boys have contributed greatly to the efficiency and the quality that we respect so highly in the United States Marine Corps. Let us hold fast to the great qualities of the Marine Corps. Let us bring more and more wisdom into the training of our young men. Let us provide them with the knowledge, the ability, the assurance, together with the faith in themselves and their military service. Do not destroy that which has been nobly constructed out of the fury and fire of victory. May men continue to be proud—proud they are marines.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 380)

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

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H. R. 12, designated as the Agricultural Act of 1956.

It is with intense disappointment and regret that I must take this action. I assure you my decision has been reached only after thorough consideration and searching my mind and my conscience. Our farm families are suffering reduced incomes. They had a right to expect workable and beneficial legislation to help solve their problems. This bill does not meet their needs.

I am disappointed at the long delays which this legislation encountered. My first special request in this session of the Congress was for prompt remedial farm legislation. A sound, constructive nine-point program to this end was submitted on January 9, with an urgent request for action. It was a program that came from the grassroots. Suggestions and criticisms from large numbers of farm people, in every type of agriculture, from every section of the country, were analyzed and used. It offered no magic panacea because, we can all agree, there is none. It did strike directly at the root of the low-price low-income problem.

The problem is price-depressing surpluses. Excess stocks of certain farm commodities have mounted to market-destroying, price-depressing size as a result of wartime price incentives too long continued. Any forward-looking, sound program to meet the needs of farm people must remove the burden of these accumulations. They are depressing net farm income by many hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

H. R. 12 would not correct this situation. It would encourage more surpluses. It would do harm to every agricultural region of the country and also to the interests of consumers. Thus it fails to meet the test of being good for farmers and fair to all our people.

The bill is self-defeating. The soil-bank proposal has been incorporated. This would be constructive, had it not been encumbered by contradictory provisions. The soil bank would provide an income incentive to farmers to reduce production temporarily so that surplus stocks might be reduced. Other provisions of this bill, however, would result in an equal or greater incentive to increase production and accumulate more surplus.

Among the provisions which make this bill unacceptable are: (1) the return to wartime rigid 90 percent of parity supports for the basic commodities; (2) dual parity for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts; (3) mandatory price supports for feed grains; (4) multiple-price plans for wheat and rice. The effect of these provisions would be to increase the amount of Government control and further add to our price-depressing surpluses.

Specific objections relative to each of these provisions may be summarized as follows:

1. Price supports at wartime 90 percent of parity on basic crops were in effect in each year from 1944 through 1954. They were not responsible for the high commodity prices and high farm income of wartime and the immediate postwar years. Prices were then above support levels due to wartime inflation and the insatiable markets associated with war. Neither did 90 percent supports prevent prices from falling as postwar surplus stocks began to accumulate.

Price supports at wartime 90 percent on the 6 designated basic crops did encourage production of these crops relative to others. At the same time consumption was discouraged and the use of substitutes was stimulated. Market outlets shrank, and surplus accumulations mounted. Acreage controls had to be invoked, thereby rationing the right to produce. Wheat acreage was reduced from 79 to an allotment of 62 and then to the present 55 million acres. Cotton was cut from 25 to 20 and then on down to the present 17 million acres. These drastic reductions, forced by the application of the price-support law, penalized many farmers directly by resulting in shrunken volume and uneconomic farming operations. In addition, acreage diverted from the basic crops shifted surplus problems into many other crops and livestock. Now almost every farmer is adversely affected, regardless of what crops or livestock he raises.

If wartime rigid 90 percent supports were the answer to the problem of our farm families, there would now be no problem.

Farm incomes have declined in every year except one between 1947 and 1954, and in all these years 90 percent supports were in effect.

Farmers are not interested in price alone. What they really want for their families is more net income, which is affected by volume and costs as well as by price. The 90 percent of parity approach focuses on support price alone.

To return now to wartime 90 percent supports would be wrong. Production would be stimulated. Markets would be further destroyed, instead of expanded as must be done. More surplus would accumulate—and surpluses are price depressing. Regimentation by ever stricter production controls would be the end result.

It is inconceivable that we should ask farm families to go deeper into this self-defeating round of cause and effect.

2. The provision for dual parity would result in a permanent double standard of parity for determining price supports. Four crops would receive preferential treatment out of 160 products for which parity prices are figured. There is no justification in logic or in equity for such preferential treatment.

Particularly is this true because, under the working of the modernized parity formula enacted by the Congress, increasing the parity prices of some commodities automatically lowers the parity prices of all other commodities. If parity prices for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts are to be higher, then parity prices of the other products must be lower.

To whatever degree prices would be further artificially raised there would be a corresponding stimulus to production, more controls on farmers, reduced consumption, increased accumulations, and lower prices in the market. Such a device for parity manipulations could destroy the parity concept itself. It places a potent weapon in the hands of opponents of all price supports for farmers. We have no right to place the welfare of our farm families in such jeopardy.

3. The provision for mandatory supports on the feed grains would create more problems for farmers. The market for feed grains would shrink as livestock production would come to depend more on forage and less on grain. The flow of feed grains into Government stocks would increase and production controls would necessarily be intensified. Price relationships between feed, livestock and livestock products would be distorted. Producers of feeder cattle, feeder lambs, and feeder pigs would be faced with downward pressure on prices. An imbalance would develop between feed crops and livestock products, with all its adverse consequences.

4. The multiple-price plans for wheat and rice would have adverse effects upon producers of other crops, upon our re-

lations with friendly foreign nations, and upon our consumers.

There are other serious defects in the bill such as certain provisions found in the section dealing with the dairy industry. Still other features are administratively bad and would require the hiring of thousands of additional inspectors and enforcers.

I recognize that the restoration by H. R. 12 of wartime mandatory 90 percent price supports applies only to 1956 crops. This, in combination with other objectionable features of the bill, would put us back on the old road which has proved so harmful to farmers.

Bad as some provisions of this bill are, I would have signed it if in total it could be interpreted as sound and good for farmers and the Nation.

After the most careful analysis I conclude that the bill is contradictory and self-defeating even as an emergency relief measure and it would lead to such serious consequences in additional surpluses and production controls as to further threaten the income and the welfare of our farm people.

Because the good features of the bill are combined with so much that would be detrimental to farmers' welfare, to sign it would be to retreat rather than advance toward a brighter future for our farm families.

We now have sound and forward-looking legislation in the Agricultural Act of 1954. Neither that act, nor any other, can become fully effective so long as it is smothered under the vast surpluses that have accumulated. We imperatively need remedial legislation to remove this burden and enable the fundamentally sound program provided in the act of 1954 to become workable. Such remedial measures were proposed in my message of January 9.

I am keenly mindful that the failure of the Congress to enact a good new farm bill can have unfavorable effects on farm income in 1956, unless prompt administrative efforts to offset them are made immediately. Particularly, the failure to enact a Soil Bank before planting time this year makes such administrative efforts imperative.

Consequently, we are going to take prompt and decisive administrative action to improve farm income now. I have conferred with the Secretary of Agriculture and the administration is moving immediately on four major fronts:

1. In 1956, price supports on five of the basic crops—wheat, corn, cotton, rice and peanuts—will be set at a level of at least 82½ percent of parity. Tobacco will be supported as voted in the referendum in accordance with existing law.

Within this range of price support flexibility, the administration intends to set minimum support levels that will result in a national average of:

Wheat at $2 a bushel.

Corn at $1.50 a bushel.

Rice at $4.50 per hundred pounds.

A separate support for corn not under acreage control in the commercial corn area will be announced at an early date.

Price supports on cotton and peanuts have not yet been announced but will be at least 82½ percent of parity.

The Secretary of Agriculture will announce shortly the details of the new cotton export sales program.

2. For this year the support price of manufacturing milk will be increased to $3.25 per hundred pounds. The support price of butterfat will be increased to 58.6 cents a pound.

3. We will use Department of Agriculture funds, where assistance will be constructive, to strengthen the prices of perishable farm commodities. We will have well over $400 million for that purpose for the year beginning July 1.

These actions the administration will take immediately.

I now request Congress to pass a straight soil-bank bill as promptly as possible. It should be in operation before fall seeding for next year's crops. It is vital that we get the soil bank authorized in this session of the Congress. There is general agreement on it. I am ready to sign a sound Soil Bank Act as soon as Congress sends it to me. That can be accomplished in a very few days if the leadership in Congress will undertake the task.

This combined program of administrative action and legislative enactment will begin now to improve the income and welfare of all our farm families.

Here is a challenge for both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 16, 1956.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and without objection the bill and message will be ordered printed.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further consideration of the message be postponed until Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

DISPOSAL OF LANDS UNDER BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6815) to provide for the orderly disposition of property acquired under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL PROPERTY ACT OF 1949

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2364) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

WILLFUL DESTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT OR MOTOR VEHICLES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 319) to punish the malicious destruction of aircraft and attempts to destroy aircraft.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL MOTTO

The Clerk read the resolution (H. J. Res. 396) to establish a national motto of the United States.

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

Resolved, etc., That the national motto of the United States is hereby declared to be "In God we trust."

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.

TRANSFER OF LAND TO MUSKOGEE, OKLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7679) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Muskogee, Okla., all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of land containing approximately nine acres located north of the existing Veterans' Administration hospital reservation situate in Muskogee County, State of Oklahoma, likewise being a portion of certain lands conveyed to the United States by the city of Muskogee by warranty deed dated March 17, 1945, recorded in the office of the clerk of Muskogee County on June 23, 1945, in book 839, pages 432 to 434, the exact courses and distances of the perimeter of which shall be determined and approved by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The city of Muskogee shall pay the cost of surveys as may be required by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in determining the required legal description.

SEC. 2. There shall be reserved to the United States all minerals, including oil and gas, in the lands authorized for conveyance by section 1, and the deed of conveyance shall continue such additional terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 3. The deed of conveyance shall provide that the tract of land authorized to be conveyed by section 1 of this act shall be used by the city of Muskogee, Okla., for such purposes as will not, in the judgment of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or his designate, interfere with the care and treatment of patients in the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Muskogee, Okla., and that if such

provision is violated, title to the tract shall revert to the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "nine" and insert "eight and sixteen one-hundredths."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

LAND TRANSFERRED TO ROSEBURG, OREG.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8123) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That subject to section 2 of this act, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to quitclaim to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of land containing 125 acres, more or less, situated in the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation in that city, the exact legal description of which shall be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act (1) shall provide that the tract of land so conveyed shall be used for park purposes, and shall be available for recreational use by the patients of the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Roseburg, Oreg., under the same conditions as it may be made available to the public, so long as the property is used for the purpose conveyed, and if it shall ever cease to be used for such park purposes the title to such property shall revert to the United States, which shall have immediate right of reentry thereon, (2) shall reserve to the United States all mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the land so conveyed, and (3) may contain such additional terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Veterans' Affairs" and insert "General Services."

Page 2, line 16, strike out "Veterans' Affairs" and insert "General Services."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELLSWORTH: On page 1, line 7, after the word "and", strike out "twenty-five" and insert "sixty-three."

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

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

Mr. FORD. Is it true that the amount originally included in the bill and the amount in this bill was donated to the Federal Government by the city of Roseburg?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes, that is correct. The city of Roseburg in 1932 donated to the Federal Government 413.7 acres of land. The Veterans' Administration now find that they have no further use for the total of 163 acres of land which the city of Roseburg is ready and willing to make into a park, and the bill requires that the land, when transferred to the city, be used for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND TRANSFER TO BONHAM, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8490) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Bonham, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LAND TRANSFER TO THE CITY OF BILOXI, MISS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8674) to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the author of the bill or the chairman of the committee this question. This land, as I understand it, was originally donated to the Federal Government by the city of Biloxi; is that correct?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the distinguished gentleman that that is correct, with the exception of 3 or 4 acres. In other words, the bill authorizes the conveyance of 144 acres, 139 of which were conveyed by the city to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. FORD. The net result is that the Federal Government is transferring back a small portion of the total which was originally donated by the city of Biloxi?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is true. The Federal Government paid something for a part of this land but the land is to be used for a park in connection with the hospital. Certainly the hospital will gain something from that. Most of the land was donated by the city of Biloxi to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend the chairman of the committee. One hundred and thirty-nine acres were donated outright, out of the total of 144.

Mr. FORD. I assume that in this deed any of the ordinary rights under which the Government protects itself would be included?

Mr. COLMER. I assume so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to section 2 of this act, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall reconvey to the city of Biloxi, Miss., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of land containing 144 acres, more or less, which constitutes a portion of land heretofore given to the United States by the city of Biloxi, and is located in the Veterans' Administration reservation in that city. The exact legal description of the land to be conveyed shall be determined by the Administrator.

SEC. 2. The deed of conveyance authorized under the provisions of this act may contain such terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "reconvey" and insert "convey".

On page 1, line 7, after the word "less", insert "one hundred thirty-nine acres of".

On page 1, line 7, strike out "constitutes" and insert "constitute".

On page 1, line 11, strike the period, insert a comma, and the following, "and in the event a survey is required in order to make such determination, the city of Biloxi shall bear the expense thereof."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

AMENDING TITLE III OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9260) to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is in a way a very laudable bill and one which in all probability would pass by almost a unanimous vote in the House. However, it is opposed by the Veterans' Administration. It is a complicated bill dealing with the loan title of the GI bill of rights. It is one that in my opinion every Member of the House should be fully informed upon before it is passed and should have an opportunity to express himself on it and probably there should be a record vote. For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is not a proper bill to be considered on the Consent Calendar, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

EXPEDITING PROCESSING DIRECT LOAN APPLICATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9263) to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to remove certain im-

pediments to the processing of applications for Veterans' Administration direct loans, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

UNIFORM LAW GOVERNING PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY OR DEATH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10046) to simplify and make more nearly uniform the laws governing the payment of compensation for service-connected disability or death, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEATING. Reserving the right to object, and I do not think I will object, will the gentleman from Texas explain what this bill does?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to place in one law all the laws now on the statute books providing for payment on service-connected disabilities or for the compensation of veterans and their dependents. The bill is the result of an extensive study by the staff of the committee and representatives of the Veterans' Administration. It would not increase any rate of compensation nor would it decrease any rate of compensation. The four major veterans' organizations all approve the bill. The Veterans' Administration, the Bureau of the Budget, and the General Accounting Office all indicate their approval. There will be no additional cost involved and, perhaps, there will be some saving.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this is a very constructive measure because this will enable veterans' organizations or individual Members of the Congress to look in one place to find out what law controls as to compensation for service-connected disability or death. I commend the committee for reporting this bill. I think it is a fine measure.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I—SHORT TITLE AND STATEMENT OF POLICY

Short Title

SEC. 101. This act may be cited as the "Veterans Compensation Act of 1955."

Statement of Policy

SEC. 102. It is the intent of the Congress in enacting this legislation (a) to simplify and make more nearly uniform the extensive body of existing legislation authorizing and governing the payment of compensation for service-connected disability or death to persons who served in the military, naval, or air service of the United States during a period of war or armed conflict or during peacetime service, and to their surviving widows, children, and dependent parents; (b) to incorporate in one act, insofar as practicable, the provisions of law relating to compensation and the ancillary benefits of financial assistance for specially adapted housing and automobiles to certain disabled veterans; and (d) to repeal those provisions of law relating to such benefits which are obsolete, executed, or in conflict with the provisions of this act.

TITLE II—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 201. For the purposes of this act—

(a) The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs;

(b) The term "military, naval, or air service" means service in the United States Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard (on or after January 28, 1915), including the Reserve components thereof.

(c) The term "veteran" means a person who served in the active military, naval, or air service and who was separated therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable, or who died during such service.

(d) The term "period of war" means any of the following periods:

(1) Spanish-American War, including the Philippine Insurrection and the Boxer Rebellion: April 21, 1898, through July 4, 1902. If the veteran was serving with the United States military forces engaged in the hostilities in the Moro Province, the foregoing period shall be extended through July 15, 1903;

(2) World War I: April 6, 1917, through November 11, 1918. Where there was service after November 11, 1918, which comenced on or before that date, the war period shall be extended through July 1, 1921. If the veteran was serving with the United States military forces in Russia, the foregoing period ending November 11, 1918, shall be extended through April 1, 1920. Service prior to July 2, 1921, in a reenlistment on or after November 12, 1918, and prior to July 2, 1921, where there was prior service between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918 shall be considered World War I service;

(3) World War II: December 7, 1941, through December 31, 1946. Where there was service after December 31, 1946, which commenced on or before that date, the war period shall be extended through July 25, 1947;

(4) Korean conflict: June 27, 1950, through January 31, 1955.

(5) The period beginning with any future declaration of war by the Congress and terminating on a date fixed by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

(e) The term "widow" means a woman—

(1) who was married to the deceased veteran prior to the expiration of ten years subsequent to his separation from the period of service during which the injury or disease, on account of which claim is being filed, was incurred or aggravated, or

(2) who was married to the deceased veteran for ten or more years prior to the date of his death;

and who lived with him continuously from the date of marriage to the date of his death, except where there was a separation which was due to the misconduct of or procured by the veteran without the fault of the woman, and who has not remarried;

(f) The term "child" means a person who is unmarried, and—

(1) who is under the age of eighteen years, or

(2) who, prior to reaching the age of eighteen years, becomes or has become permanently incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect, or

(3) who, after reaching the age of 18 years and until completion of education or training (but not after reaching the age of 21 years), is or may hereafter be pursuing a course of instruction at a school, college, academy, seminary, technical institute, or university, particularly designated by him and approved by the Administrator, which shall have agreed to report to the Administrator the termination of attendance of such child, and if any such institution of learning fails to make such report promptly the approval shall be withdrawn

and who is a legitimate child; a child legally adopted; a stepchild if a member of the veteran's household; or an illegitimate child but as to the father, only if acknowledged in writing, signed by him, or if he has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to the child's support or has been, prior to his death, judicially decreed to be the putative father of such child, or if he is otherwise shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator to be the putative father of such child;

(g) (1) The term "parent" means a father, mother, father through adoption, mother through adoption, and persons who have stood in loco parentis to a veteran at any time prior to entry into active service, for a period of not less than 1 year. Not more than 1 father and 1 mother shall be recognized in any case, and preference shall be given to such father and mother who actually exercised parental relationship at the time of, or most nearly prior to, the date of entry into active service by the veteran.

(2) The dependency of a parent, which may arise either prior or subsequent to the death of the veteran, shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator: *Provided*, That the dependency of a parent shall not be denied solely because of remarriage: *Provided further*, That the dependency of a parent shall not be denied in any case where the monthly income for a mother or father, not living together, does not exceed $105, or where the monthly income for a mother and father, living together, does not exceed $175, plus, in either case, $45, for each additional member of the family whom the father or mother is under moral or legal obligation to support, as determined by the Administrator. In determining monthly income, any payments by the United States Government because of disability or death under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration shall not be considered.

(h) The term "chronic disease" includes—

Anemia, primary
Arteriosclerosis
Arthritis
Atrophy, progressive muscular
Brain hemorrhage
Brain thrombosis
Bronchiectasis
Calculi of the kidney, bladder, or gallbladder
Cardiovascular-renal disease, including hypertension
Cirrhosis of the liver
Coccidioidomycosis
Diabetes mellitus
Encephalitis lethargica residuals
Endocarditis
Endocrinopathies
Epilepsies
Hodgkin's disease
Leprosy
Leukemia
Myasthenia gravis
Myelitis
Myocarditis
Nephritis
Other organic diseases of the nervous system
Osteitis deformans (Paget's disease)
Osteomalacia
Palsy, bulbar
Paralysis agitans
Psychoses
Purpura idiopathic, hemorrhage
Raynaud's disease
Sarcoidosis
Scleroderma
Sclerosis, amyotrophic lateral
Sclerosis, multiple
Syringomyelia
Thromboangiitis obliterans (Buerger's disease)
Tuberculosis, active

Tumors, malignant, or of the brain or spinal cord or peripheral nerves
Ulcers, peptic (gastric or duodenal)

and such other chronic diseases as the Administrator may add to this list;

(i) The term "tropical disease" includes—
Amebiasis
Blackwater fever
Cholera
Dracontiasis
Dysentery
Filiariasis
Leishmaniasis, including kala-azar
Leprosy
Loiasis
Malaria
Onchocerciasis
Oroya fever
Pinta
Plague
Schistosomiasis
Yaws
Yellow fever

and such other tropical diseases as the Administrator may add to this list.

TITLE III—COMPENSATION FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY OR DEATH

Part I—Wartime disability compensation

Basic Entitlement

SEC. 301. For disability resulting from personal injury suffered or disease contracted in line of duty, or for aggravation of a preexisting injury suffered or disease contracted in line of duty, in the active military, naval, or air service, during a period of war, the United States will pay to any veteran thus disabled and who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable from the period of service in which said injury or disease was incurred, or preexisting injury or disease was aggravated, compensation as hereinafter provided in this part, but no compensation shall be paid if the disability is the result of the veteran's own willful misconduct.

Provisional Acceptance

SEC. 302. Any person, who, on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to November 12, 1918, (a) applied for enlistment or enrollment in the active military, naval, or air service and was provisionally accepted and directed or ordered to report to a place for final acceptance into such service, or (b) was drafted for military, naval, or air service and after reporting pursuant to the call of his local draft board and prior to rejection, or (c) after being called into the Federal service as a member of the National Guard but before being enrolled for the Federal service, suffered an injury or contracted a disease in line of duty and not the result of his own misconduct, will be considered to have incurred such disability in the active military, naval, or air service. Such person and his dependents will be entitled to compensation provided by this title for veterans of World War I and their dependents.

Presumptions

SEC. 303. For the purposes of section 301 hereof, every veteran shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service, except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at the time of the examination, acceptance, and enrollment, or where clear and unmistakable evidence demonstrates that the injury or disease existed prior to acceptance and enrollment and was not aggravated by such service.

SEC. 304. For the purposes of section 301 hereof, and subject to the provisions of section 305 hereof, in the case of any veteran who served for 90 days or more during a period of war—

(a) a chronic disease becoming manifest to a degree of 10 percentum or more within 1 year from the date of separation from such service;

(b) a tropical disease, and the resultant disorders or disease originating because of therapy, administered in connection with such diseases, or as a preventative thereof, becoming manifest to a degree of 10 percentum or more within 1 year from the date of separation from such service, or at a time when standard or accepted treatises indicate that the incubation period thereof commenced during such service;

(c) active tuberculous disease developing a 10 percent degree of disability or more within 3 years from the date of separation from such service;

(d) multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percentum degree of disability or more within 2 years from the date of separation from such service;

shall be considered to have been incurred in or aggravated by such service, notwithstanding there is no record of evidence of such disease during the period of service.

SEC. 305. (a) Where there is affirmative evidence to the contrary, or evidence to establish that an intercurrent injury or disease which is a recognized cause of any of the diseases within the purview of section 304 hereof, has been suffered between the date of separation from service and the onset of any of such diseases, or the disability is due to the veteran's own misconduct, service connection pursuant to section 304 hereof will not be in order.

(b) Nothing in section 304 or subsection (a) of this section shall be construed to prevent the granting of service connection for any disease or disorder otherwise shown by sound judgment to have been incurred in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service.

Rates

SEC. 306. For the purposes of section 301 of this act—

(a) if and while the disability is rated 10 percentum the monthly compensation shall be $17;

(b) if and while the disability is rated 20 percentum the monthly compensation shall be $33;

(c) if and while the disability is rated 30 percentum the monthly compensation shall be $50;

(d) if and while the disability is rated 40 percentum the monthly compensation shall be $66;

(e) if and while the disability is rated 50 percentum the monthly compensation shall be $91;

(f) if and while the disability is rated 60 percentum the monthly compensation shall be $109;

(g) if and while the disability is rated 70 percentum the monthly compensation shall be $127;

(h) if and while the disability is rated 80 percentum the monthly compensation shall be $145;

(i) if and while the disability is rated 90 percentum the monthly compensation shall be $163;

(j) if and while the disability is rated as total the monthly compensation shall be $181;

(k) if the veteran, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of a creative organ, or one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, the rate of compensation therefor shall be $47 per month independent of any other compensation provided in subsections (a) through (j) of this section; and in the event of anatomical loss or loss of use of a creative organ, or one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, in addition to the requirement for any of the rates specified in subsections (l) through (n) of this section, the rate of compensation shall be increased by $47 per month for each such loss or loss of use, but in no event to exceed $420 per month;

(l) if the veteran, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or of one hand and one foot, or is blind in both eyes, with 5/200 visual acuity or less, or is permanently bedridden or so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly compensation shall be $279;

(m) if the veteran, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of two extremities at a level, or with complications, preventing natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place, or has suffered blindness in both eyes, rendering him so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly compensation shall be $329;

(n) if the veteran, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss of two extremities so near the shoulder or hip as to prevent the use of a prosthetic appliance or has suffered the anatomical loss of both eyes, the monthly compensation shall be $371;

(o) if the veteran, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered disability under conditions which would entitle him to two or more of the rates provided in one or more of subsections (l) through (n) of section 306, no condition being considered twice in the determination, or has suffered total deafness in combination with total blindness with 5/200 visual acuity or less, the monthly compensation shall be $420;

(p) in the event the veteran's service-incurred disabilities exceeded the requirements for any of the rates prescribed herein, the Administrator, in his discretion, may allow the next higher rate or an intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of $420; and

(q) if the veteran is shown to have had a service-incurred disability resulting from an active tuberculous disease, which disease in the judgment of the Administrator has reached a condition of complete arrest, the monthly compensation shall be not less than $67.

SEC. 307. (a) Any veteran entitled to compensation at the rates provided in section 306 of this Act, and whose disability is rated not less than 50 percentum, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following monthly amounts:

(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

(a) has a wife but no child living, $21;

(b) has a wife and one child living, $35;

(c) has a wife and two children living, $45.50;

(d) has a wife and three or more children living, $56;

(e) has no wife but one child living, $14;

(f) has no wife but two children living, $24.50;

(g) has no wife but three or more children living, $35; and

(h) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $17.50 for each parent so dependent.

(2) If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 50 percentum, in an amount having the same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to total disability.

(b) The additional compensation for a dependent or dependents provided by this section shall not be payable to any veteran during any period he is in receipt of an increased rate of subsistence allowance or education and training allowance on account of a dependent or dependents under any other law administered by the Veterans' Administration.

The veteran may elect to receive whichever is the greater.

Part II—Wartime death compensation

Basic Entitlement

SEC. 311. The surviving widow, child or children, and dependent parent or parents of any veteran who died as the result of injury

or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service in line of duty during a period of war, shall be entitled to receive compensation at the monthly rates specified in section 312.

Rates

SEC. 312. The monthly rates of death compensation shall be as follows:

(a) Widow but no child, $87;

(b) Widow with one child, $121 (with $29 for each additional child);

(c) No widow but one child, $67;

(d) No widow but two children, $94 (equally divided);

(e) No widow but three children, $122 (equally divided) (with $23 for each additional child, total amount to be equally divided);

(f) Dependent mother or father, $75;

(g) Dependent mother and father, $40 each.

Part III—Peacetime disability compensation

Basic Entitlement

SEC. 321. For disability resulting from personal injury suffered or disease contracted in line of duty, or for aggravation of a preexisting injury suffered or disease contracted in line of duty in the active military, naval, or air service during other than a period of war, the United States will pay to any veteran thus disabled and who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable from the period of service in which said injury or disease was incurred, or preexisting injury or disease was aggravated, compensation as hereinafter provided in this part, but no compensation shall be paid if the disability is the result of the veteran's own willful misconduct.

Provisional Acceptance

SEC. 322. Any person who, on or after August 27, 1940, and prior to January 1, 1947, or during the Korean conflict period (a) applied for enlistment or enrollment in the active military, naval, or air service and was provisionally accepted and directed or ordered to report to a place for final acceptance into such service, (b) was selected for military, naval, or air service and after reporting pursuant to the call of his local draft board and prior to rejection, or (c) after being called into the Federal service as a member of the National Guard but before being enrolled for the Federal service, suffered an injury or contracted a disease in line of duty and not the result of his own misconduct, will be considered to have incurred such disability in the active military, naval, or air service. Such person and his dependents will be entitled to compensation provided by this title for veterans of service during other than a period of war and their dependents. If the disability was incurred on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to January 1, 1947, or during the Korean conflict period, the applicable rates of compensation provided by parts I and II hereof shall be payable.

Presumptions

SEC. 323. For the purposes of section 321 hereof, every person employed in the active military, naval, or air service for 6 months or more shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service, except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at the time of the examination, acceptance, and enrollment, or where evidence or medical judgment is such as to warrant a finding that the disease or injury existed prior to acceptance and enrollment.

SEC. 324. (a) For the purposes of section 321, and subject to the provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of this section, any veteran who served for 6 months or more and contracts a tropical disease or a resultant disorder or disease originating because of therapy administered in connection with a tropical disease, or as a preventative thereof, shall be deemed to have incurred such disability in the active military, naval, or air service when it is shown to exist within 1 year after separation from active service, or at a time when standard and accepted treatises indicate that the incubation period thereof commenced during active service.

(b) Service connection shall not be granted pursuant to subsection (a), in any case where the disease or disorder is shown by clear and unmistakable evidence to have had its inception prior or subsequent to active service.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the granting of service connection for any disease or disorder otherwise shown by sound judgment to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service.

Rates

SEC. 325. For the purposes of section 321 of this act, the compensation payable for the disability shall be equal to 80 percentum of the compensation now or hereafter payable for such disability under section 306 of this act, adjusted upward or downward to the nearest dollar.

SEC. 326. Any veteran entitled to compensation at the rates provided in section 325 of this act, and whose disability is rated not less than 50 percentum, shall be entitled to additional monthly compensation for dependents equal to 80 percentum of the additional compensation for dependents provided in section 307, and subject to the limitations thereof.

SEC. 327. Any veteran otherwise entitled to compensation under the provisions of this part shall be entitled to receive the rate of compensation provided in sections 306 and 307 of this act, if the disability of such veteran resulted from an injury or disease received in line of duty (1) as a direct result of armed conflict, (2) while engaged in extrahazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war, or (3) on or after January 1, 1947, and prior to July 26, 1947.

Part IV—Peacetime death compensation

Basic Entitlement

SEC. 331. The surviving widow, child or children, and dependent parent or parents of any veteran who died as the result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service, in line of duty, during other than a period of war, shall be entitled to receive compensation as hereinafter provided in this part.

Rates

SEC. 332. For the purposes of section 331 of this act, the death compensation payable shall be equal to 80 percentum of the compensation now of hereafter payable under section 312 of this act.

SEC. 333. The dependents of any deceased veteran otherwise entitled to compensation under the provisions of this part shall be entitled to receive the rate of compensation provided in section 312 of this act, if the death of such veteran resulted from an injury or disease received in line of duty (1) as a direct result of armed conflict, (2) while engaged in extrahazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war, or (3) on or after January 1, 1947, and prior to July 26, 1947, or (4) while the United States was engaged in any war prior to April 21, 1898.

Part V—General compensation provisions

Persons Heretofore Having a Compensable Status

SEC. 341. The death and disability benefits of title III of this act shall, notwithstanding the service requirements of said title, be granted to persons heretofore recognized by law as having a compensable status, including persons whose claims are based on war or peacetime service rendered prior to April 21, 1898.

Philippine Army and Philippine Scouts

SEC. 342. (a) For the purposes of this title, service in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, while such forces were in the service of the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States dated July 26, 1941, and prior to July 1, 1946, shall be deemed to be active military, naval, or air service: *Provided*, That payments of disability or death compensation based upon such service shall be paid at the rate of 1 Philippine peso for each dollar authorized to be paid under this title.

(b) Payments of disability or death compensation based upon service in the Philippine Scouts, under the provisions of section 14 of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 543), as amended (10 U. S. C. 637), shall be paid at the rate of 1 Philippine peso for each dollar authorized to be paid under this title.

Provisions for Filing Claims

SEC. 343. A specific claim for benefits under this title must be filed with the Veterans' Administration, on a form prescribed by the Administrator, by a claimant who is not already on the compensation or pension rolls of the Veterans' Administration.

Certain Bars To Benefits

SEC. 344. (a) The discharge or dismissal by reason of the sentence of a general court-martial of any person from the military, naval, or air service, or the discharge of any such person on the ground that he was a conscientious objector who refused to perform military duty or refused to wear the uniform or otherwise to comply with lawful orders of competent military authority, or as a deserter, or of an officer by the acceptance of his resignation for the good of the service, shall bar all rights of such person, based upon the period of service from which he is so discharged or dismissed, under this act: *Provided*, That in the case of any such person, if it be established to the satisfaction of the Administrator that at the time of the commission of the offense such person was insane, he shall not be precluded from benefits to which he is otherwise entitled under this act.

(b) The discharge or dismissal of any person from the military, naval, or air service on the grounds that he was guilty of mutiny, treason, spying, or any offense involving moral turpitude, or willful and persistent misconduct of which he was found guilty by a court-martial, or that he was an alien, or a deserter, shall bar all rights to any compensation under this title: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to an alien who volunteered or who was drafted into or who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to July 2, 1921, who was discharged subsequent to November 11, 1918, or who was not discharged from the service on or prior to November 11, 1918, on his own application or solicitation, by reason of his being an alien, and whose service was honest and faithful: *Provided further*, That in case any person has been discharged or dismissed from the military, naval, or air service as a result of a court-martial trial, and it is thereafter established to the satisfaction of the Administrator that at the time of the commission of the offense resulting in such court-martial trial and discharge such person was insane, such person shall be entitled to compensation under title III hereof: *Provided further*, That discharge or dismissal or finding of guilt for any of the offenses specified in this subsection shall not affect the payment of compensation for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by service in any prior or subsequent enlistment: *And provided further*, That no compensation shall be payable for death inflicted as a lawful punishment for crime or military offense, except when inflicted by the enemy.

(c) Any person shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator to be guilty of

mutiny, treason, sabotage, or rendering assistance to an enemy of the United States or of its allies shall forfeit all accrued or future benefits under this Act: *Provided*, That the Administrator, in his discretion, may apportion and pay any part of such benefits to the dependents of such person not exceeding the amount to which each dependent would be entitled if such person were dead.

Line of Duty and Misconduct

SEC. 345. An injury or disease incurred during military, naval, or air service will be deemed to have been incurred in line of duty and not the result of the veteran's own misconduct when the person on whose account benefits are claimed was, at the time the injury was suffered or disease contracted, in active military, naval, or air service, whether on active duty or on authorized leave, unless such injury or disease was the result of his own willful misconduct: *Provided*, That venereal disease shall not be presumed to be due to willful misconduct if the person in service complies with the regulations of the appropriate service department requiring him to report and receive treatment for such disease: *Provided further*, That the requirement for line of duty will not be met if it appears that at the time the injury was suffered or disease contracted the person on whose account benefits are claimed (1) was avoiding duty by deserting the service, or by absenting himself without leave materially interfering with the performance of military duties; or (2) was confined under sentence of court-martial or civil court: *Provided, however*, That disease, injury, or death incurred without willful misconduct on the part of the service person shall be deemed to have been incurred in line of duty if the sentence of the court-martial did not involved an unremitted dishonorable discharge or if the offense for which convicted by civil court did not involve a felony as defined under the laws of the jurisdiction where the service person was convicted by such civil court.

Aggravation

SEC. 346. A preexisting injury or disease will be considered to have been aggravated by active military, naval, or air service, where there is an increase in disability during active service, unless there is a specific finding that the increase in disability is due to the natural progress of the disease.

Consideration To Be Accorded Time, Place, and Circumstances of Service

SEC. 347. (a) The Administrator is authorized and directed to include in the regulations pertaining to service-connection of disabilities, additional provisions in effect requiring that in each case where a veteran is seeking service-connection for any disability due consideration shall be given to the places, types, and circumstances of his service as shown by his service record, the official history of each organization in which he served, his medical records, and all pertinent medical and lay evidence.

(b) In the case of any veteran who engaged in combat with the enemy in active service with a military, naval, or air organization of the United States during a period of war, campaign, or expedition, the Administrator is authorized and directed to accept as sufficient proof of service connection of any disease or injury alleged to have been incurred in or aggravated by such service satisfactory lay or other evidence of service incurrence or aggravation of such injury or disease, if consistent with the circumstances, conditions, or hardships of such service, notwithstanding the fact that there is no official record of such incurrence or aggravation in such service, and, to that end, shall resolve every reasonable doubt in favor of the veteran. Service connection of such injury or disease may be rebutted by clear and convincing evidence to the contrary. The reasons for granting or denying service connection in each case shall be recorded in full.

Authority for Schedule for Rating Disabilities

SEC. 348. The Administrator is authorized and directed to adopt and apply a schedule of ratings of reductions in earning capacity from specific injuries or combination of injuries. The ratings shall be based, as far as practicable, upon the average impairments of earning capacity resulting from such injuries in civil occupations. The schedule shall be constructed so as to provide ten grades of disability and no more, upon which payments of compensation shall be based, namely, 10 percentum, 20 percentum, 30 percentum, 40 percentum, 50 percentum, 60 percentum, 70 percentum, 80 percentum, 90 percentum, and total, 100 percentum. The Administrator shall from time to time readjust this schedule of ratings in accordance with experience.

Minimum Rating for Arrested Tuberculosis

SEC. 349. Any veteran shown to have active tuberculosis which is compensable under this title, who in the judgment of the Administrator has reached a condition of complete arrest, shall be rated as totally disabled for a period of 2 years following such date of arrest, as 50 percentum disabled for an additional period of 4 years, and 30 percentum for a further 5 years. Following far advanced active lesions the permanent rating shall be 30 percentum, and following moderately advanced lesions, the permanent rating, after 11 years, shall be 20 percentum, provided there is continued disability, dyspnea on exertion, impairment of health, and so forth; otherwise the rating shall be zero percentum. The total disability rating herein provided for the 2 years following a complete rest may be reduced to 50 percentum for failure to follow prescribed treatment or to submit to examination when requested. This section shall not be construed as requiring a reduction of compensation authorized under any other provision of this title.

Combination of Certain Ratings

SEC. 350. The Administrator is authorized and directed to provide for the combination of ratings and to pay compensation at the rates prescribed in part I of this title to those veterans who served during a period of war and during any other time, who have suffered disability in line of duty in each period of service.

Permanent Ratings

SEC. 351. A rating of total disability which has been made for compensation purposes under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and which has been continuously in force for 20 or more years shall not be reduced thereafter, except upon a showing that such rating was based on fraud.

Effective Dates of Awards

SEC. 352. The effective date of an award of compensation under this title shall be fixed in accordance with the facts found, except that—

(a) subject to the provisions of subsections (a) (1), (2), and (3) hereof, no award of disability or death compensation shall be effective prior to the date of the veteran's separation from service, date of the veteran's death, date of happening of the contingency upon which disability or death compensation is allowed, or the date of receipt of application therefor, whichever is the later date—

(1) disability compensation shall be payable from the date of discharge of the veteran if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from discharge;

(2) death compensation shall be payable as of the day following the date of death of the veteran if claim therefor is filed within 1 year after the death of the veteran;

(3) where a report or a finding of death of any person in the active military, naval, or air service has been made by the Secretary of the Department concerned, the effective date of an award of death compensation shall be the day following the date fixed by the Secretary as the date of death in such report or finding: *Provided*, That claim be filed prior to 1 year after report or finding of death is made: *And provided further*, That death compensation shall not be payable to any dependent for any period for which such dependent has received, or is entitled to receive, an allowance, allotment, or service pay of the deceased;

(b) in the event the claimant's application is not complete at the time of original submission, the Veterans' Administration will notify the claimant of the evidence necessary to complete the application, and if such evidence is not received within 1 year from the date of request therefor, compensation may not be paid by virtue of that application; and

(c) where a claim has been finally disallowed, a subsequent claim on the same factual basis, if supported by new and material evidence, shall have the attributes of a new claim, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph II, part II, of Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a).

SEC. 353. (a) The effective date of an award of increased compensation under this title shall be fixed in accordance with the facts found, except that no award of increased compensation may be effective for any period prior to the date of receipt of the evidence showing entitlement thereto.

(b) For the purposes of this section, an award of increased compensation shall mean any award of compensation, amending, reopening, or supplementing a previous award, authorizing any payments not theretofore authorized to the particular individual involved.

SEC. 354. The effective date of reduction or discontinuance of compensation under this title shall be fixed in accordance with the facts found, except that—

(a) where disability or death compensation has been awarded, and a reduction or discontinuance is thereafter effected as to rates, such reduction or discontinuance shall be effective the last day of the month in which the reduction or discontinuance is approved;

(b) reductions or discontinuances because of the death of a disabled person receiving compensation shall be effective as of the date of death;

(c) discontinuance of compensation because of remarriage or death of a widow shall be effective the date next preceding the date of her remarriage, or upon the date of her death;

(d) discontinuance or reduction of compensation to or because of a child reaching the age of 18 years, or being married, or dying, shall be effective the date next preceding the 18th birthday or next preceding the date of marriage or upon the date of death;

(e) where there is fraud shown to have been committed by the person receiving compensation, or with his or her knowledge, the effective date of discontinuance shall be as of the effective date of the award to such person; and

(f) discontinuance of compensation because of the receipt of active service or retirement pay shall be effective as of the date next preceding the date of commencement of such pay.

Election of Benefits

SEC. 355. Any person who is receiving pay pursuant to any provision of law relating to the retirement of persons in the regular military, naval, or air service, or pursuant to any provision of law relating to the retirement for disability of persons in other than the regular military, naval, or air service, and who would be eligible to receive compensation under this title if he were not receiving such retired pay shall be entitled to receive such compensation upon the filing by such person

with the department by which such retired pay is paid of a waiver of so much of his retired pay and allowances as is equal in amount to such compensation. To prevent duplication of payments, the department with which any such waiver is filed shall notify the Veterans' Administration of the receipt of such waiver, the amount waived, and the effective date of the reduction in retired pay.

Concurrent Payment of Benefits

SEC. 356. (a) Except to the extent that retirement pay is waived under other laws, compensation under this title, based on the claimant's own service, shall not be payable concurrently with pension, or retirement pay, based on his own service. The receipt of compensation under this title by a widow, child, or parent on account of the death of any person, or receipt by any person of compensation under this title on account of his own service, shall not bar the payment of compensation under this title on account of the death or disability of any other person.

(b) Compensation under this title on account of his own service shall not be paid while the person is in receipt of active service pay.

Renouncement of Benefits

SEC. 357. Any person entitled to compensation under this title may renounce his right thereto. The application renouncing the right shall be in writing over the person's signature and, upon filing of such application, payment of such benefits and the right thereto shall be terminated and he shall be denied any and all rights thereto from date of receipt of such application by the Veterans' Administration. The renouncement provided for herein shall not preclude the person from filing a new application for compensation at a future date but such application shall have the attributes of an original application and no payment will be made for any period prior to the date thereof.

Disappearance

SEC. 358. Where an incompetent veteran receiving compensation under this title disappears, the Administrator, in his discretion, may pay to the dependents of such veteran the applicable amount of compensation provided by section 312 or 332 of this act for the dependents of such veterans: *Provided*, That in no event shall payments under this section in any claim exceed the amount of compensation payable at the time of disappearance.

Accrued Benefits

SEC. 359. (a) Compensation authorized under this title, to which a person was entitled prior to the date of his death, and not paid during his lifetime, and due and unpaid for a period not to exceed 1 year prior to the death under existing ratings or decisions, or those based on evidence in the file at date of death, shall, upon the death of such person, be paid as hereinafter set forth:

(1) Upon the death of a person receiving an apportioned share of the veteran's compensation, all or any part of such unpaid amount, to the veteran or to any other dependent or dependents as may be determined by the Administrator;

(2) Upon the death of a veteran, to the surviving spouse; or if there be no surviving spouse, to the child or children, dependent mother or father in the order named;

(3) Upon the death of a widow, to the veteran's child or children;

(4) Upon the death of a child, to the surviving child or children of the veteran, entitled to death compensation;

(5) In all other cases, only so much of the unpaid compensation may be paid as may be necessary to reimburse a person who bore the expense of last sickness and burial: *Provided*, That no part of any of the accrued compensation shall be used to reimburse any political subdivision of the United States for expense incurred in the last sickness or burial of such person; and

(6) Payment of the benefits authorized by this section will not be made unless claim therefor be received in the Veterans' Administration within 1 year from the date of death of the beneficiary, and such claim is perfected by the submission of the necessary evidence within 1 year from the date of the request therefor by the Veterans' Administration. A claim for compensation by an apportionee, widow, child, or dependent parent shall be deemed to include claim for any accrued benefits.

(b) A check received by a payee in payment of compensation shall, in the event of the death of the payee on or after the last day of the period covered by such check and unless negotiated by the payee or the duly appointed representative of his estate, be returned to the Veterans' Administration and canceled. The amount represented by any check returned and canceled pursuant to the foregoing or any amount recovered by reason of improper negotiation of any such check shall constitute accrued benefits payable pursuant to the provisions of subsection 359 (a) of this act: *Provided*, That the 1-year limitations of subsection 359 (a) shall not apply: *And provided further*, That any amount not so paid shall be paid upon settlement by the General Accounting Office to the estate of the deceased payee, if such estate will not escheat.

TITLE IV—SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING FOR DISABLED VETERANS

SEC. 401. The Administrator is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to assist any veteran, who is entitled to compensation under title III of this act, based on service on or after April 21, 1898, for permanent and total service-connected disability due to the loss, or loss of use, by reason of amputation, ankylosis, progressive muscular dystrophies, or paralysis, of both lower extremities, such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or a wheel chair, in acquiring a suitable housing unit with special fixtures or movable facilities made necessary by the nature of the veteran's disability, and necessary land therefor. The regulations of the Administrator shall include, but not be limited to, provisions requiring findings that (a) it is medically feasible for such veteran to reside in the proposed housing unit and in the proposed locality; (b) the proposed housing unit bears a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses; and (c) the nature and condition of the proposed housing unit are such as to be suitable to the veteran's needs for dwelling purposes.

SEC. 402. The assistance authorized by section 401 shall be limited in the case of any veteran to 1 housing unit and necessary land therefor, and shall be afforded under 1 of the following plans, at the option of the veteran, but shall not exceed $10,000 in any one case—

(a) where the veteran elects to construct a housing unit on land to be acquired by him, the Administrator shall pay not to exceed 50 percentum of the total cost to the veteran of (1) the housing unit and (2) the necessary land upon which it is to be situated;

(b) where the veteran elects to construct a housing unit on land acquired by him prior to application for assistance under this title, the Administrator shall pay not to exceed the smaller of the following sums: (1) 50 percentum of the total cost to the veteran of the housing unit and the land necessary for such housing unit, or (2) 50 percentum of the cost to the veteran of the housing unit plus the full amount of the unpaid balance, if any, of the cost to the veteran of the land necessary for such housing unit;

(c) where the veteran elects to remodel a dwelling, which is not adapted to the requirements of his disability, acquired by him prior to application for assistance under this title, the Administrator shall pay not to exceed the total of (1) 50 percentum of the cost to the veteran of such remodeling, plus (2) the smaller of the following sums: (A) 50 percentum of the cost to the veteran of such dwelling and the necessary land upon which it is situated, or (B) the full amount of the unpaid balance, if any, of the cost to the it is situated, or (B) the full amount of the unpaid balance, if any, of the cost to the veteran of such dwelling and the necessary land upon which it is situated; and

(d) where the veteran has acquired a suitable housing unit, the Administrator shall pay not to exceed the smaller of the following sums: (1) 50 percentum of the cost to the veteran of such housing unit and the necessary land upon which it is situated, or (2) the full amount of the unpaid balance, if any, of the cost to the veteran of such housing unit and the necessary land upon which it is situated.

SEC. 403. The Administrator is authorized to furnish to veterans eligible for assistance under this title, without cost to the veterans, model plans and specifications of suitable housing units.

SEC. 404. Any veteran who accepts the benefits of this title shall not by reason thereof be denied the benefits of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

SEC. 405. The Government of the United States shall have no liability in connection with any housing unit, or necessary land therefor, acquired under the provisions of this title.

SEC. 406. The assistance authorized by this title shall not be available to any veteran who has received financial assistance under part IX of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a).

SEC. 407. Any amounts heretofore appropriated for the Veterans' Administration for payments authorized by part IX of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) are hereby made available for expenditures necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts as may be necessary therefor.

TITLE V—AUTOMOBILES FOR DISABLED VETERANS

SEC. 501. Subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth in this title, the Administrator is authorized and directed, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, to provide or assist in providing an automobile or other conveyance by paying not to exceed $1,600 on the purchase price, including equipment with such special attachments and devices as the Administrator may deem necessary, for each veteran who is entitled to compensation under title III of this act for any of the following due to disability incurred in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service during the period of World War II or the Korean conflict period:

(a) Loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet;

(b) Loss or permanent loss of use of one or both hands;

(c) Permanent impairment of vision of both eyes of the following status: Central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye, with corrective glasses, or central visual acuity of more than 20/200 if there is a field defect in which the peripheral field has contracted to such an extent that the widest diameter of visual field subtends an angular distance no greater than 20 degrees in the better eye.

SEC. 502. No payment shall be made under this title for the repair, maintenance, or replacement of any such automobile or other conveyance and no veteran shall be given an automobile or other conveyance until it

is established to the satisfaction of the Administrator that such veteran will be able to operate such automobile or other conveyance in a manner consistent with his own safety and the safety of others and will be licensed to operate such automobile or other conveyance by the State of his residence or other proper licensing authority: *Provided*, That a veteran who served who cannot qualify to operate a vehicle shall nevertheless be entitled to the payment of not to exceed $1,600 on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance, as provided in section 501, to be operated for him by another person, provided such veteran meets the other eligibility requirements set forth in this title.

SEC. 503. The furnishing of such automobile or other conveyance, or the assisting therein, shall be accomplished by the Administrator paying the total purchase price, if not in excess of $1,600, or the amount of $1,600, if the total purchase price is in excess of $1,600, to the seller from whom the veteran is purchasing under sales agreement between the seller and the veteran.

SEC. 504. No veteran shall be entitled to receive more than one automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this title and no veteran who has received or who hereafter receives an automobile or other conveyance under (a) the provisions of the paragraph under the heading "Veterans' Administration" in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947, as extended, (b) the act of September 21, 1950 (64 Stat. 894), or (c) the act of October 20, 1951 (65 Stat. 574), shall be entitled to receive an automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this title.

SEC. 505. The benefits provided in this title shall not be available to any veteran who has not made application for such benefits to the Administrator within 3 years after October 20, 1951, or within 3 years after the date of the veteran's discharge or release from active service if the veteran is not discharged or released until on or after October 20, 1951.

SEC. 506. (a) Any amounts heretofore appropriated for the Veterans' Administration under the heading "Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans" are hereby made available for expenditures necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts as may be necessary therefor.

(b) Notwithstanding the repeal by section 802 of this act of any laws relating to automobiles or other conveyances for disabled veterans, any amount heretofore appropriated for the purposes of such acts, and which have been obligated but not expended, shall remain available until expended.

TITLE VI—PENALTIES AND FORFEITURES

SEC. 601. Whoever, in any claim for benefits under this act, makes any sworn statement of a material fact knowing it to be false, shall be guilty of perjury and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

SEC. 602. If any person entitled to payment of compensation under title III of this act, whose right to payment thereunder ceases upon the happening of any contingency, thereafter fraudulently accepts any such payment, he shall be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 603. Whoever shall obtain or receive any money, check, or compensation under this act, without being entitled to the same, and with intent to defraud the United States or any beneficiary of the United States, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 604. Any person who shall knowingly make or cause to be made, or conspire, combine, aid, or assist in, agree to, arrange for, or in any way procure the making or presentation of a false or fraudulent affidavit, declaration, certificate, statement, voucher, or paper, or writing purporting to be such, concerning any claim for benefits under this act, shall forfeit all rights, claims, and benefits under this act, and benefits (other than contracts of insurance) under any other law administered by the Veterans' Administration, and, in addition to any and all other penalties imposed by law, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 605. When disability compensation based upon service-connected disability has been forfeited by a veteran, under section 504 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924 (43 Stat. 1312), as amended (38 U. S. C. 555), section 15 of the act of March 20, 1933 (48 Stat. 11; 38 U. S. C. 715), or section 604 of this act compensation payable except for the forfeiture, from and after the date of suspension of payments to the veteran, shall be paid to his wife, child, or children, and/or dependent parents, such payments not to exceed the amount payable in case such veteran had died from such service-connected disability: *Provided*, That no compensation shall be paid to any dependent who has participated in the fraud for which the forfeiture was imposed.

TITLE VII—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe, promulgate, and publish such rules and regulations as are consistent with the provisions of this act, and necessary to carry out its purposes.

SEC. 702. The Administrator is authorized in carrying out the provisions of this act to delegate authority to render decisions to such person or persons as he may find necessary. Within the limitations of such delegations, any decisions rendered by such person or persons shall have the same force and effect as though rendered by the Administrator.

SEC. 703. There shall be no recovery of payments made under this act from any person who, in the judgment of the Administrator, is without fault on his part and where, in the judgment of the Administrator, such recovery would defeat the purpose of benefits otherwise authorized or would be against equity and good conscience. No disbursing officer or certifying officer shall be held liable for any amount paid to any person where the recovery of such amount is waived under this section.

TITLE VIII—AMENDMENTS AND REPEALS

Amendments

SEC. 801. (a) Paragraph II, part IV, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), is hereby amended by deleting the language "a pension under part I or part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof the language "compensation under the Veterans Compensation Act of 1955."

(b) Subparagraphs I (c) and (d), part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, are hereby amended by deleting "part I" in each subparagraph and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph I, Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended."

(c) Section 212 (b) of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 406), as amended (5 U. S. C. 59a), is hereby amended by deleting the language "during an enlistment or employment as provided in Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part I, paragraph I." and inserting in lieu thereof the language "during a period of war as defined in section 201 of the Veterans Compensation Act of 1955."

(d) Section 31 of the act of March 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 526; 38 U. S. C. 501a), is hereby amended by deleting the language "of Public Law No. 78, and of this title" and inserting in lieu thereof the language "and of title III of the Veterans Compensation Act of 1955."

(e) Section 2 of the act of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 609; 38 U. S. C. 556a), is hereby amended by deleting the language "the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act, as amended, the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, the pension laws in effect prior to March 20, 1933, Public Law No. 2, 73d Congress, as amended, Public Law No. 484, 73d Congress, or under any act or acts amendatory of such acts," and inserting in lieu thereof the language "any laws now or hereafter administered by the Veterans' Administration."

(f) The second paragraph of section 9 of the act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1196; 38 U. S. C. 555a), is hereby amended by inserting immediately after "Public Law No. 2, 73d Congress" the language "or section 604 of the Veterans Compensation Act of 1955."

(g) Section 12 of the act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1197; 38 U. S. C. 501a–1), is hereby amended by substituting a comma for the period following "March 28, 1934" and inserting the language "as now or hereafter amended."

(h) The act of December 28, 1950 (64 Stat. 1121), as amended (38 U. S. C. 701a), is is hereby amended by deleting the language "part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended" and inserting in lieu thereof the language "part I of title II of the Veterans' Compensation Act of 1955."

(i) Section 15 of the act of March 20, 1933 (38 U. S. C. 715), is amended by inserting before the words "and, in addition", the words "and under the Veterans' Compensation Act of 1955."

Repeals

SEC. 802. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(1) In the Revised Statutes, as amended: Sections 4692 (38 U. S. C. 151); 4693 (38 U. S. C. 152); 4694 (38 U. S. C. 155); 4695 (38 U. S. C. 153); 4696 (38 U. S. C. 154); 4697 (38 U. S. C. 155a); 4698 (38 U. S. C. 156); 4698½ (38 U. S. C. 53); 4699 (38 U. S. C. 177); 4702 (38 U. S. C. 191); 4703 (38 U. S. C. 193); 4705 (38 U. S. C. 198); 4706 (38 U. S. C. 200); 4707 (38 U. S. C. 203, 204); 4712 (38 U. S. C. 21); 4713 (38 U. S. C. 95); 4722 (38 U. S. C. 23); 4728 (38 U. S. C. 221); 4729 (38 U. S. C. 223); 4735 (38 U. S. C. 201); and 4776 (38 U. S. C. 74).

(2) Act of June 18, 1874 (18 Stat. 78; 38 U. S. C. 157).

(3) Act of February 28, 1877 (19 Stat. 264; 38 U. S. C. 164).

(4) Act of March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 403; 38 U. S. C. 222).

(5) Act of June 17, 1878 (20 Stat. 144; 38 U. S. C. 159).

(6) Act of June 18, 1878 (20 Stat. 166; 38 U. S. C. 153).

(7) Act of January 25, 1879 (20 Stat. 265; 38 U. S. C. 91).

(8) Section 2 of the act of March 3, 1879 (20 Stat. 470; 38 U. S. C. 92, 93).

(9) Act of March 3, 1879 (20 Stat. 484; 38 U. S. C. 159).

(10) The proviso to the first sentence of section 3 of the act of June 21, 1879 (21 Stat. 30 ; 38 U. S. C. 58).

(11) Act of June 16, 1880 (21 Stat. 281; 38 U. S. C. 153).

(12) Act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 453; 38 U. S. C. 165, 169, 179).

(13) Act of March 3, 1885 (23 Stat. 437).

(14) The second proviso to the third paragraph of the act of March 3, 1885 (23 Stat. 362; 38 U. S. C. 24).

(15) Act of March 19, 1886 (24 Stat. 5; 38 U. S. C. 195, 196).

(16) Act of August 4, 1886 (24 Stat. 220; 38 U. S. C. 166).

(17) The second proviso to the second paragraph of the act of June 7, 1888 (25 Stat. 173; 38 U. S. C. 94).

(18) Act of August 27, 1888 (25 Stat. 449; 38 U. S. C. 171, 173).

(19) Act of February 12, 1889 (25 Stat. 659; 38 U. S. C. 163).

(20) Act of March 4, 1890 (26 Stat. 16; 38 U. S. C. 174).

(21) Section 1 of the act of June 27, 1890 (26 Stat. 182; 38 U. S. C. 203).

(22) Act of July 14, 1892 (27 Stat. 149; 38 U. S. C. 175).

(23) The last two provisos of the third paragraph of the act of March 2, 1895 (28 Stat. 704; 38 U. S. C. 176).

(24) Act of January 15, 1903 (32 Stat. 773; 38 U. S. C. 172).

(25) Act of March 2, 1903 (32 Stat. 944; 38 U. S. C. 162, 167).

(26) Act of April 8, 1904 (33 Stat. 163; 38 U. S. C. 160).

(27) The third proviso of the second paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1406; 38 U. S. C. 178).

(28) The last sentence, sixth paragraph under the heading "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts", of the act of March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 940), as amended (38 U. S. C. 179).

(29) Section 313 of the act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 408), as amended (38 U. S. C. 502).

(30) Sections 3 and 5 of the act of May 1, 1920 (41 Stat. 586, 587; 38 U. S. C. 168, 312, 314).

(31) Section 3 of the act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 982; 38 U. S. C. 161, 168).

(32) Section 3 of the act of September 1, 1922 (42 Stat. 835; 38 U. S. C. 354).

(33) In the World War Veterans Act, 1924 (act of June 7, 1924; 43 Stat. 607): Sections 200, as amended (38 U. S. C. 471); 201, as amended (38 U. S. C. 472); 202, as amended (38 U. S. C. 473–480, 482–491); 203, as amended (38 U. S. C. 492); 204 (38 U. S. C. 493); 205 (38 U. S. C. 494); 207 (38 U. S. C. 496); 210, as amended (38 U. S. C. 499); 211 (38 U. S. C. 500); 212, as amended (38 U. S. C. 422); 213 (38 U. S. C. 501); and 214, as added by section 21, act of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 1000), as amended (38 U. S. C. 501b).

(34) Act of May 5, 1926 (44 Stat. 396; 38 U. S. C. 168b).

(35) Section 1 of the act of February 11, 1927 (44 Stat. 1085; 38 U. S. C. 168a).

(36) Act of April 27, 1928 (45 Stat. 466; 38 U. S. C. 232).

(37) Sections 1 and 2 of the act of July 2, 1930 (46 Stat. 847; 38 U. S. C. 238, 238 (a)).

(38) In the act of March 20, 1933 (48 Stat. 8): Subsections 1 (a) and 1 (c) (38 U. S. C. 701); 1 (g), as added by section 1 of the Act of June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 500), as amended (38 U. S. C. 701); sections 2, 3, and 4 (38 U. S. C. 702–704); and 38 (U. S. C. 719).

(39) In the Veterans Regulations, as amended (38 U. S. C. ch. 12A)—

(a) parts I. II, VI, IX, and paragraph I of part IV of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a);

(b) subparagraph III (a) of part I, and part III of Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a);

(c) Veterans Regulation No. 3 (a);

(d) Veterans Regulation No. 4;

(e) paragraphs VIII, XII, XV, and XVIII of Veterans Regulation No. 10; and

(f) Veterans Regulation No. 12.

(40) The first, third, and fourth paragraphs of section 20 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1934 (48 Stat. 309), as amended (38 U. S. C. 722).

(41) Section 4 of the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 508).

(42) Sections 26, 27, and 34 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1935 (48 Stat. 524, 526; 38 U. S. C. 473a, 471a, 723).

(43) Section 2 of the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat 869; 38 U. S. C. 724).

(44) Act of June 24, 1936 (49 Stat. 1910; 38 U. S. C. 703a).

(45) Section 400 of the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2034; 38 U. S. C. 472a).

(46) Sections 3 and 8 of the act of August 16, 1937 (50 Stat. 660, 662; 38 U. S. C. 472b, 472e).

(47) Act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1214; 38 U. S. C. 35).

(48) Act of July 19, 1939 (53 Stat. 1067), as amended (38 U. S. C. 703b, 703c).

(49) Section 5 of the act of July 19, 1939 (53 Stat. 1070), as amended (38 U. S. C. 472b).

(50) Act of June 6, 1940 (54 Stat. 237).

(51) Sections 6 and 8 and the first paragraph of section 9 of the act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1196; 38 U. S. C. 473, 703b, note, 555a).

(52) Section 1 of the act of July 30, 1941 (55 Stat. 608; 38 U. S. C. 725).

(53) Section 1 of the act of August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 665; 38 U. S. C. 357b).

(54) Sections 2 and 3 of the act of December 19, 1941 (55 Stat. 844).

(55) Act of December 20, 1941 (55 Stat. 847; 38 U. S. C. 726).

(56) Section 10 of the act of July 11, 1942 (56 Stat. 659; 38 U. S. C. 472b–1).

(57) Act of July 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 731).

(58) Sections 14 and 17 of the act of July 13, 1943 (57 Stat. 558, 560), as amended (38 U. S. C. 731, 732).

(59) Section 1 of the act of May 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 229; 38 U. S. C. 471a–1).

(60) Act of September 7, 1944 (58 Stat. 728; 38 U. S. C. 733).

(61) Act of December 7, 1944 (58 Stat. 797; 38 U. S. C. 471a–2).

(62) Act of June 27, 1946 (60 Stat. 319; 38 U. S. C. 736–738).

(63) Section 2 of the act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 910; 38 U. S. C. 471a–3).

(64) The paragraph following the heading "Veterans' Administration" in section 101, title I, First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 915; 38 U. S. C. 252).

(65) The second paragraph following the heading "Veterans' Administration" in section 1 of the Emergency Appropriation Act, 1948 (61 Stat. 244; 38 U. S. C. 252, note).

(66) The second paragraph following the heading "Veterans' Administration," in section 101 of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948 (62 Stat. 1035; 38 U. S. C. 252, note).

(67) Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1219; 38 U. S. C. 740–743).

(68) Act of August 1, 1949 (63 Stat. 484; 38 U. S. C. 744).

(69) Sections 1 and 2 of the act of October 10, 1949 (63 Stat. 731, 732; 38 U. S. C. 722, 740, 741).

(70) The paragraph following the heading "Veterans' Administration" in section 101 of the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949 (63 Stat. 744; 38 U. S. C. 252, note).

(71) Act of October 29, 1949 (63 Stat. 1026; 38 U. S. C. 471a–4, 471a–4 note).

(72) Act of September 21, 1950 (64 Stat. 894; 38 U. S. C. 252).

(73) Act of October 20, 1951 (65 Stat. 574; 38 U. S. C. 252a–252e, 252a note.)

(74 Section 1 of the act of May 23, 1952 (66 Stat. 90; 38 U .S. C. 4a–5).

(75) Subsections (B) through (E) of section 1 and sections 3 through 6 of the act of June 30, 1952 (66 Stat. 295, 296; 38 U. S. C., ch. 12A, 473, 473 note, 478, 480).

(76) Section 2 of the act of June 30, 1954 (Public Law 463, 83d Cong., 68 Stat. 360).

(77) The act of August 28, 1954 (68 Stat. 915; 38 U. S. C. 748, 749).

TITLE IX—SAVINGS PROVISIONS AND EFFECTIVE DATE

Savings Provisions

SEC. 901. A claim for compensation which is pending in the Veterans' Administration on the effective date of this act, shall be adjudicated under the laws in effect on the day preceding the effective date of this act with respect to the period prior to that date and, except as provided in subsection 902 (b), under this act thereafter. If a disallowance is required under such laws but entitlement is shown under this act, the pending claim shall be considered a claim under this act. A claim for assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing or an automobile or other conveyance which is pending in the Veterans' Administration on the effective date of this act shall be considered a claim for such assistance under this act.

SEC. 902. (a) Any person who is receiving compensation on the day prior to the effective date of this act at a rate equal to or less than that to which he would be entitled under the provisions of this act shall, except where there was fraud, clear and unmistakable error as to conclusions of fact or law, or misrepresentation of material facts, be paid compensation under this act beginning with the effective date of this act.

(b) Any person who is receiving compensation on the day prior to the effective date of this act under the laws in effect on that day and who is not entitled to compensation under this act, or who is entitled to compensation at a higher rate under such laws than that to which he would be entitled under this act, shall, except where there was fraud, clear and unmistakable error as to conclusion of fact or law, or misrepresentation of material facts, continue to be paid the rate of compensation payable on the day prior to the effective date of this act, so long as the conditions warranting such payment under those laws continue. In the event there is a change in such conditions, the entitlement thereafter of such person to compensation will be determined, except as to service connection, without regard to the laws repealed by section 802 of this act. The provisions of this subsection shall apply to those claims within the purview of section 901 of this act in which it is determined on or after the effective date of this act that compensation is payable for the day prior to the effective date of this act.

SEC. 903. A claim for disability compensation filed on or after the effective date of this act and within 1 year from the date of the veteran's separation during the year immediately preceding such effective date from active military, naval, or air service, or a claim for death compensation filed on or after the effective date of this act and within 1 year from the date of the veteran's death occurring in the year immediately preceding such effective date will be adjudicated under title III of this act and the laws in effect on the day preceding such effective date. If entitlement is established, compensation will be paid under such laws for the appropriate period prior to the effective date of this act and under this act thereafter.

SEC. 904. All offenses committed and all penalties or forfeiture incurred under the laws repealed by section 802 of this act may be prosecuted and punished in the same manner and with the same effect as if said repeal had not been made and any person who forfeited rights to benefits under any such laws shall not be entitled to any benefits under this act.

Effective Date

SEC. 905. This act shall take effect on the 1st day of the 13th calendar month following the date of enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 7, strike out "1955" and insert "1956."

On page 2, line 11, strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)."

On page 47, line 13, strike out "1955" and insert "1956."

On page 47, line 25, strike out "1955" and insert "1956."

On page 48, line 5, strike out "1955" and insert "1956."

On page 48, line 22, strike out "1955" and insert "1956."

On page 49, line 8, strike out "1955" and insert "1956."

On page 49, line 12, strike out "1955" and insert "1956."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZING SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO PALM SPRINGS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6084) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, to the Palm Springs Unified School District.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, with the consent of the tribal council of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to sell to the Palm Springs Unified School District of the State of California, in consideration of the payment by such school district of an amount agreed to by such tribal council, the Secretary of the Interior, and such school district all of the right, title, and interest of the United States and of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians in and to that tract of land containing 10 acres, and more particularly described as follows: Southwest quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter, section 14, township 4 south, range 4 east, San Bernardino base and meridian.

SEC. 2. The proceeds of such sale shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, strike the word "Indians." and insert in lieu thereof the words "Indians, and such proceeds, when distributed to individual members of said band, shall not be subject to Federal income tax."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

AMENDING SECTION 406 OF THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7732) to amend section 406 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (Public Law 717, 75th Cong.), as amended.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 406 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (Public Law 717, 75th Cong.) (52 Stat. 1049), as amended, be, and the same is hereby amended by adding after subsection (b) of section 406 a new subsection as follows:

"SEC. 406. (c) The Secretary shall promulgate regulations providing for the lifting of coal tar color for use in the coloring of the outside of oranges meeting the standards of maturity and grade of the United States of America and the respective States where used and which are safe in the manner in which used and suitable for such use, and for the certification of batches of such color, with or without diluents which are not unsafe in the manner in which used.

"The coal tar color designated as FD & C Red No. 32 shall be included in the above category and shall continue to be listed until a color or colors which is or are more acceptable on the basis of standards set up by the Secretary may be listed and made available for use."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That paragraph (c) of section 402 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided further*, That this paragraph shall not apply to oranges meeting minimum maturity standards established by or under the laws of the States in which the oranges were grown and not intended for processing (other than oranges designated by the trade as "packing house elimination"), the skins of which have been colored at any time prior to March 1, 1959, with the coal-tar color certified prior to the enactment of this proviso as FD&C Red 32, or certified after such enactment as External D&C Red 14 in accordance with 21 Code of Federal Regulations, part 9: *And provided further*, That the preceding proviso shall have no further effect if prior to March 1, 1959, another coal-tar color suitable for coloring oranges is listed under section 406'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 402 (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with respect to the coloring of oranges."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF A PORTION OF FORMER PRISONER OF WAR CAMP NEAR DOUGLAS, CONVERSE COUNTY, WYO., TO THE STATE OF WYOMING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8404) to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former prisoner of war camp, near Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed, upon certification to him by the Secretary of Defense and the Governor of Wyoming that the property described in section 2 of this act is needed for the training or support of the National Guard of Wyoming, to convey the property to the State of Wyoming, by quitclaim deed, without monetary consideration therefor, upon such terms and conditions as the Administrator determines to be necessary to properly protest the interests of the United States: *Provided, however*, That such deed of conveyance by express term shall—

(a) reserve to the United States all mineral rights including gas and oil;

(b) reserve to the United States right of exclusive use without charge therefor of such property together with any improvements thereon during any period of national emergency; and

(c) specify that said property shall be used for the training of the National Guard or for other military purposes, and in the event of nonuse for such purpose, shall, in its then existing condition together with any improvements thereon, at the option of the United States as determined and exercised by the Secretary of Defense, revert to the United States.

SEC. 2. The real property to be conveyed to the State of Wyoming is described as follows:

All the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7, township 32 north, range 71 west, except seventy-four one-hundredths acre in the southwest corner of said northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7, such excepted portion being more particularly described as follows: Beginning at a point on the west line of said northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7, bearing north 60 degrees 53 minutes east a distance of 1,504.2 feet; thence south 29 degrees 10 minutes east on present fence line a distance of 124 feet; thence south no degrees 21 minutes east on present fence line to the south boundary of the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7; thence south 89 degrees 28 minutes west on present fence line a distance of 58.33 feet to a point on the west line of the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7; thence north no degrees 28 minutes west on said west line of the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of said section 7, a distance of 590 feet to the point of beginning; and containing in all thirty-nine and twenty-six one-hundredths acres, more or less, subject to aneasement granted to the town of Douglas, Converse County, Wyoming, for a pipeline for transportation of water, together with the right of ingress and egress, said pipeline running parallel with and distant 27 feet west of the centerline of the LePrele County Road.

SEC. 3. The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the State of Wyoming.

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

AMENDING PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2587) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 216 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 217) is amended to read as follows:

"USE OF SERVICE IN TIME OF WAR OR EMERGENCY

"SEC. 16. In time of war, or of emergency proclaimed by the President, he may utilize the Service to such extent and in such manner as shall in his judgment promote the public interest. In time of war, or of emergency involving the national defense proclaimed by the President, he may by Executive order declare the commissioned corps of the Service to be a military service. Upon such declaration, and during the period of such war or such emergency or such part thereof as the President shall prescribe, the commissioned corps (a) shall constitute a branch of the land and naval forces of the United States, (b) shall, to the extent prescribed by regulations of the President, be subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and (c) shall continue to operate as part of the Service except to the extent

that the President may direct as Commander in Chief."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 213 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 214) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 213. An allowance of $250 for uniforms and equipment is authorized to be paid to each commissioned officer of the Service on active duty when required by directive of the Surgeon General to wear a uniform, if at such time the officer is receiving the pay of the junior assistant, assistant, or senior assistant grade; except that no officer who has received such an allowance from the Service shall at any time thereafter be entitled to any further allowance."

(b) Section 707 of the Act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 713), so renumbered by section 5 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049; 42 U. S. C. 214, note), is repealed.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 201 (a) (1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 209 (a) (1)) is amended by striking out the words "subsection (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsections (b) and (e)."

(b) Section 207 of such act (42 U. S. C. 209) is amended by redesignating subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (f), (g), (h), and (i) respectively and by adding immediately following section (d) a new subsection (e) as follows:

"(e) (1) A former officer of the Regular Corps may, if application for appointment is made within 2 years after the date of the termination of his prior commission in the Regular Corps, be reappointed to the Regular Corps without examination, except as the Surgeon General may otherwise prescribe, and without regard to the numerical limitations of subsection (b).

"(2) Reappointments pursuant to this subsection may be made to the permanent grade held by the former officer at the time of the termination of his prior commission, or to the next higher grade if such officer meets the eligibility requirements prescribed by regulation for original appointment to such higher grade. For purposes of pay, promotion, and seniority in grade, such reappointed officer shall receive the credits for service to which he would be entitled if such appointment were an original appointment, but in no event less than the credits he held at the time his prior commission was terminated, except that if such officer is reappointed to the next higher grade he shall receive no credit for seniority in grade.

"(3) No former officer shall be reappointed pursuant to this subsection unless he shall meet such standards as the Secretary may prescribe."

(c) (1) Section 207 (a) (2) of such act (42 U. S. C. 209 (a) (2)) is amended by striking out "a period of not more than 5 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "an indefinite period."

(2) The enactment of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not affect the term of the commission of any officer in the Reserve Corps in effect on the date of such enactment unless such officer consents in writing to the extension of his commission for an indefinite period, in which event his commission shall be so extended without the necessity of a new appointment.

SEC. 4. (a) Section 210 (d) (2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 211 (a) (2)) is amended by striking out "pay period and for purposes of."

SEC. 5. (a) The first sentence of section 211 (a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 212 (a)) is amended by striking out "active commissioned service" and inserting in lieu thereof "active commissioned or noncommissioned service."

(b) Section 211 (b) (1) of such act (42 U. S. C. 212 (b) (1)) is amended by striking out "active commissioned service, including any such service in the Army, Navy, or Coast Guard" and inserting in lieu thereof "active commissioned or noncommissioned service in the Service including any active commissioned service in the Armed Forces."

(c) Section 211 (c) of such act (42 U. S. C. 212 (c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) A commissioned officer who has been retired under the provisions of this section may, (1) if an officer of the Regular Corps, be involuntarily recalled to active duty during such times as the Corps may constitute a branch of the land and naval forces of the United States, and (2) if an officer of either the Regular Corps or the Reserve Corps, be recalled to active duty at any time with his consent."

(d) The proviso of the paragraph headed "Retired Pay of Commissioned Officers," in chapter 296, 67 Statutes at Large 245, which appears at page 254 (42 U. S. C. 212b) and which reads as follows: "*Provided*, That hereafter a commissioned officer of the Public Health Service who has been retired may be recalled to active duty, other than in time of war, with his consent," is repealed.

(e) Section 706 of the act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 713), so renumbered by section 5 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049), as amended (42 U. S. C. 230), is repealed.

SEC. 6. (a) Section 218 (a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 218a (a)) is amended (1) by striking out the words "in the Regular Corps," and (2) by striking out the words "any educational institution" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any Federal or non-Federal educational institution or training program."

(b) Section 218 (b) of such act (42 U. S. C. 218a (b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any officer whose tuition and fees are paid pursuant to subsection (a) while attending an educational institution or training program for a period in excess of 30 days shall be obligated to reimburse the Service for such tuition and fees if thereafter he voluntarily leaves the service within whichever of the following periods of active service is the greater: (1) 6 months, or (2) twice the period of such attendance but in no event more than 2 years. Such subsequent period of service shall commence upon the cessation of such attendance and of any for other continuous period of training duty for which no tuition and fees are paid by the service and which is part of the officer's prescribed formal training program, whether such further training is at a service facility or otherwise. The Surgeon General may waive, in whole or in part, any reimbursement which may be required by this subsection upon a determination that such reimbursement would be inequitable or would not be in the public interest."

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

AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING EXCHANGES OF SALES OF PUBLIC LANDS WITHIN OR ADJACENT TO DISTRICT OF PUNA, T. H.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7891) to authorize and direct the exchanges and sales of public lands within or adjacent to the district of Puna, county of Hawaii, T. H., for the relief of persons whose lands were destroyed by volcanic activity.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii is authorized and directed to exchange public lands within or adjacent to the district of Puna, county of Hawaii, T. H., for lands destroyed by volcanic activity occurring during March and April 1955. The Territory may not convey lands exceeding 40 acres in area or $5,000 in value. For the purposes of the exchange the destroyed lands are to be appraised at the market value just prior to the time of destruction, but the value of improvements such as crops and buildings shall be excluded therefrom.

SEC. 2. After the limits of exchange have been exhausted the Commissioner is authorized to sell to those who have been unable to replace all the lands destroyed public lands not exceeding 80 acres in area, or the area of destroyed land, whichever is less, deducting therefrom the area conveyed by the Territory by exchange as provided in section 1. Such a sale shall be made without public auction, drawing or lot or the approval of the board of public lands.

SEC. 3. If the lessor of any destroyed lands should fail to exchange or purchase lands to replace his destroyed lands, his lessee may purchase under the provisions of this act public lands not exceeding 80 acres in area or the area of destroyed land leased by him, whichever is less.

SEC. 4. In order to come within the provisions of this act, persons must file applications showing the area and approximate value of lands, owned or leased by them, which were destroyed by volcanic activity, within 2 years of the date of approval of this act.

SEC. 5. Except as changed herein, all applicable provisions of the Organic Act of Hawaii remain in force.

SEC. 6. This act shall take effect on and after the date of its approval.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, following the word "lands" insert the words "within the county of Hawaii."

Page 2, line 7, following the word "lands" insert the words "within or adjacent to the district of Puna, county of Hawaii, T. H."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

FORMER PRISONER OF WAR CAMP NEAR DOUGLAS, CONVERSE COUNTY, WYO.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby the bill (H. R. 8404) to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former prisoner of war camp, near Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes, was passed, were vacated.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8404) to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former prisoner of war camp, near Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed, upon certification to him by the Secretary of Defense and the Governor of Wyoming that the property described in section 2 of this act is needed for the training or support of the National Guard of Wyoming, to convey the property to the State of Wyoming, by quitclaim deed, without monetary consideration therefor, upon such terms and conditions as the Administrator determines

to be necessary to properly protect the interests of the United States: *Provided, however,* That such deed of conveyance by express term shall—

(a) reserve to the United States all mineral rights including gas and oil;

(b) reserve to the United States right of exclusive use without charge therefor of such property together with any improvements thereon during any period of national emergency; and

(c) specify that said property shall be used for the training of the National Guard or for other military purposes, and in the event of nonuse for such purpose, shall, in its then existing condition together with any improvements thereon, at the option of the United States as determined and exercised by the Secretary of Defense, revert to the United States.

SEC. 2. The real property to be conveyed to the State of Wyoming is described as follows:

All the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7, township 32 north, range 71 west, except seventy-four one-hundredths acre in the southwest corner of said northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7, such excepted portion being more particularly described as follows: Beginning at a point on the west line of said northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7, bearing north 60 degrees, 53 minutes east a distance of 1,504.2 feet; thence south 29 degrees 10 minutes east on present fence line a distance of 124 feet; thence south no degrees 21 minutes east on present fence line to the south boundary of the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7; thence south 89 degrees 28 minutes west on present fence line a distance of 58.33 feet to a point on the west line of the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7; thence north no degrees 28 minutes west on said west line of the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of said section 7, a distance of 590 feet to the point of beginning; and containing in all thirty-nine and twenty-six one-hundreds acres, more or less, subject to an easement granted to the town of Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., for a pipeline for transportation of water, together with the right of ingress and egress, said pipeline running parallel with and distant 27 feet west of the centerline of the LaPrele County Road.

SEC. 3. The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized shall be borne by the State of Wyoming.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS of Texas: On page 2, line 1, strike out the word "protest" and insert "protect."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

RATIFYING AND CONFIRMING ACT 249 OF THE SESSION LAWS OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7426) to ratify and confirm Act 249 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, as amended, and to authorize the issuance of certain highway revenue bonds by the Territory of Hawaii.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Territory of Hawaii, any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act or any other act of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, is authorized and empowered to issue highway revenue bonds in a sum not to exceed $50 million payable from funds derived from highway vehicle fuel taxes, for the purpose of providing for the construction and maintenance of highways in the Territory. The issuance of such revenue bonds shall not constiute the incurrence of an indebtedness within the meaning of the Hawaiian Organic Act, and shall not require the approval of the President of the United States.

SEC. 2. All bonds issued under authority of section 1 shall be issued pursuant to legislation enacted by the legislature of the Territory which shall provide (1) that, so long as any of the bonds are outstanding, highway vehicle fuel taxes shall be levied and collected in amounts at least sufficient, to provide for the payment of the principal of the bonds and the interest thereon, as such principal and interest become due (except that interest due upon any such bonds during the first year after their date of issuance may be paid from the proceeds of sale of the bonds), and that Federal aid funds may also be used for payments of the principal of the bonds and interest thereon; (2) that the superintendent of public works of the Territory, or any officer or agency succeeding to his powers and duties in respect to highways, shall have the power to issue and sell the bonds and to expend the proceeds and provide for the repayment thereof, in accordance with standards and pursuant to provisions which shall be set forth in such legislation; and (3) that the office of the superintendent of public works, or an office or agency succeeding to the powers and duties of that office in respect of highways, shall be continued in existence and shall retain the powers and duties set forth in such legislation, so long as any of the bonds are outstanding.

SEC. 3. As used in this act, the term "highway vehicle fuel taxes" means taxes in respect of the fuel used on, or to be used on the highways, but in the event the legislation providing for such tax levies the same in respect of other fuel and does not provide for the segregation of the taxes in respect of the fuel used on, or to be used on the highways, then the term "highway vehicle fuel taxes" includes as well all such taxes in respect to fuel as are commingled with the taxes in respect of the fuel used, or to be used on the highways.

SEC. 4. Act 249 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, is hereby amended to the extent of inserting section 5961 therein set forth the public law number as may be assigned to this bill upon its enactment.

SEC. 5. Act 249 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, as amended by section 4 above is hereby approved and ratified.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike the words "and maintenance."

Page 2, lines 8 and 9, strike the words "sufficient, to" and insert the words "sufficient to."

Page 2, line 13, change the comma to a semicolon and strike the words "and that Federal-aid funds may also be used for payments of the principal of the bonds and interest thereon."

Page 3, line 3, strike all of section 3 and insert the following new sections 3 and 4:

"SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to prevent the application of Federal-aid highway funds to aid in the retirement of said bonds, to the extent now or hereafter permitted by the acts of Congress relating to the use of such funds.

"SEC. 4. As used in this act, the term "highway vehicle fuel taxes" means taxes in respect to the fuel for operating a motor vehicle or motor vehicles upon the highways, as defined and imposed by the laws of the Territory of Hawaii, but in the event the legislation providing for such tax levies the same in respect to other fuel and does not provide for the segregation of the taxes in respect to the fuel for operating a motor vehicle or motor vehicles upon the highways, then the term "highway vehicle fuel taxes" includes as well all such taxes in respect to fuel as are commingled with the taxes in respect to the fuel for operating a motor vehicle or motor vehicles upon the highways."

Page 3, line 13, Renumber "Sec. 4." to read "Sec. 5."

Page 3, line 14, Following the word "inserting" insert the word "in."

Page 3, line 17, Renumber "Sec. 5." to read "Sec. 6."

Page 3, line 18, strike the numeral "4" and insert the numeral "5."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

DESIGNATING RESERVOIR ABOVE THE MONTICELLO DAM IN CALIFORNIA AS LAKE BERRYESSA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7858) to designate the reservoir above the Monticello Dam in California as Lake Berryessa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute a similar Senate bill (S. 2755).

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, S. 2755, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the reservoir located above the Monticello Dam in Napa County, Calif., shall hereafter be known as Lake Berryessa, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such reservoir is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such reservoir under and by the name of Lake Berryessa.

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

A similar House bill, H. R. 7858, was laid on the table.

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT BONDS FOR SCHOOLS IN HONOLULU AND THE COUNTY OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9768) relating to general obligation bonds of the Territory of Hawaii amending Public Laws 640 and 643 of the 83d Congress (68 Stat. 782, ch. 889 and 68 Stat. 785, ch. 892), and ratifying certain provisions of Act 273, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, which authorizes issuance of public improvement bonds for schools in the city and county of Honolulu and the county of Hawaii.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 640 of the 83d Congress, approved August 24, 1954 (68 Stat. 782, ch. 889), is hereby amended by deleting the proviso from the

first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided, however,* That the total indebtedness of such Territory shall not exceed $95 million or the amount of total indebtedness authorized by the Hawaiian Organic Act, whichever is the higher."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of Public Law 643 of the 83d Congress, approved August 24, 1954 (68 Stat. 785, ch. 892) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. During the years 1954 to 1959, inclusive, the Territory of Hawaii is authorized to issue, any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act or any other act of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, public improvement bonds in such amounts as will not cause the total indebtedness of such Territory to exceed $95 million or the amount of total indebtedness authorized by the Hawaiian Organic Act, whichever is the higher.

"In applying the Territory's debt limitation, whether prescribed by this or other specific act of Congress or by the Hawaiian Organic Act, the computation of the amount to which the total indebtedness of the Territory may be extended at any time shall include all general obligation bonds, whether for public improvements or for other purposes for which general obligation bonds are or may be authorized to be issued by the Congress: *Provided,* That during the year 1960 and thereafter if the Territory's debt limitation prescribed by the Hawaiian Organic Act shall be less than $95 million there shall be added to the Territory's debt limitation so prescribed by the Hawaiian Organic Act such amount as represents the outstanding indebtedness incurred for the purposes authorized by Public Law 640, 83d Congress, as amended, but such addition shall not cause the total indebtedness of the Territory to exceed $95 million.

"Nothing herein shall be deemed to preclude the issuance of bonds after 1959 under Public Law 640 of the 83d Congress, as amended, in accordance with the authorization therein set forth."

SEC. 3. Section 5, subsections (a) to (e), inclusive, and section 6 subsections (a) to (e), inclusive, of Act 273 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, being an act relating to public improvements and for other purposes, are hereby ratified and confirmed, subject to the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 643, 83d Congress, as amended. The bonds so authorized, when issued in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 643, 83d Congress, as amended, shall be valid notwithstanding any other provision of law as to debt limitations.

All bonds issued pursuant to this section shall be serial bonds payable in substantially equal annual installments, with the first such installment maturing not later than 5 years from the date of issue and the last such installment maturing not later than 30 years from such date.

Such bonds may be issued without the approval of the President of the United States.

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

TO AUTHORIZE THE CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU TO ISSUE GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9769) to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue general obligation bonds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act, or any law of the Territory of Hawaii, or any Act of the Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, Acts 145, 199, 210, and 223 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, authorizing the issuance of general obligation bonds by the city and county of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, are hereby ratified and confirmed, subject to the provisions of this act, such authorization to be over and above any limitations on the amount of the bonded debt of the city and county of Honolulu and on the amount of the debt which may be incurred by said city and county in any one year imposed by the Hawaiian Organic Act, and such authorization shall also be in addition to all other issues authorized by the Congress: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to prohibit the amendment of said acts of said Territory by the legislature thereof, from time to time, to provide for changes in the improvements authorized by said acts.

SEC. 2. Any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act or any other act of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, the Territory of Hawaii may authorize the city and county of Honolulu to issue general obligation bonds for public improvements in an amount not exceeding $14 million, in any single calendar year: *Provided,* That the total indebtedness of said city and county shall not exceed $70 million, at any one time: *Provided further,* That any indebtedness incurred pursuant to specific authorization of the Congress, including indebtedness incurred pursuant to section 1 hereof, shall be included in computing such total indebtedness.

SEC. 3. The bonds issued under authority of this act may be serial bonds payable in substantially equal annual installments, the first installment to mature not later than 5 years and the last installment to mature not later than 30 years from the date of such issue. Such bonds may be issued without the approval of the President of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 15, strike out "$14,000,000," and insert "2 percentum of the assessed valuation of the real estate or $14,000,000, whichever is the greater";

Page 2, line 19, strike "$70,000,000" and insert "10 percentum of the assessed valuation of the real estate of $70,000,000, whichever is the greater."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

ANNUITIES UNDER THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1287) to make certain increases in the annuities of the annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1869)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1287) to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the annuity of an annuitant under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system pursuant to the Act of May 24, 1924 (43 Stat. 140), as amended, or the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999), as amended, shall be increased the first day of the second month following enactment of this Act in accordance with the following rules:

"If the annuitant was formerly a participant in the system, the annuity to which he is entitled shall be increased $324, provided he retired before July 1, 1949.

"SEC. 2. In the case of an officer who retired before July 1, 1949, and elected a reduced annuity at time of retirement, and who availed himself of the restoration clause in section 821 (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, such officer shall be entitled to receive the increase provided by the first section of this Act.

"SEC. 3. If the annuitant is receiving an annuity on the effective date of this Act as the survivor of a former participant in the system who retired before July 1, 1949, the annuity shall be increased in the amount of $324 or in such larger amount as may be necessary to make the total annuity equal to $1,200; except that in no event shall such annuity be increased by any amount in excess of $324 if such increase would result in a total annuity greater than the annuity which such survivor would have been entitled to receive (as determined by the Secretary of State, taking into consideration any generally applicable pay increases but not any in-class increases or possible additional years of service) immediately prior to the effective date of this Act is such former participant had retired on November 13, 1950 (the date specified in Public Law 348, Eighty-second Congress).

"SEC. 4. If the wife of a Foreign Service officer who retired prior to July 1, 1949, becomes an annuitant subsequent to the effective date of this Act, as a result of the election made by the officer at time of retirement, such widow's annuity shall be increased in the amount of $324.

"SEC. 5. In any case where a participant under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system died before August 29, 1954, leaving a widow who is not entitled to receive an annuity under the system; the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to grant such widow an annuity of not to exceed $1,200 per annum, if he finds that such widow (whether remarried or not) is in actual need and without other adequate means of support.

"SEC. 6. In no case shall an annuity increased under this Act exceed the maximum annuity payable under section 821 (a) or (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

"SEC. 7. No annuity currently payable to any annuitant under the Foreign Service

retirement and disability system shall be reduced as a result of the provisions of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

JAS. P. RICHARDS,
ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, Jr.,
JOHN M. VORYS,
ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1287) to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference has agreed to a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. Except for clarifying, clerical, and necessary conforming changes, the differences between the House amendment and the substitute amendment are noted below:

ADJUSTMENT FOR WIDOW ANNUITANTS

Section 3 takes care of seven widows whose husbands retired from the Foreign Service before July 1, 1949. Five of them will receive $324 plus such additional amount as is necessary to give them an annuity of $1,200. The conferees agreed upon the language in this section as a device that would provide a measure of relief for windows now getting a small annuity and permit them to receive a maximum of $1,200. It was not the intention of the conferees, however, to make an adjustment that would give to these widows a higher annuity than that received by a widow whose husband remained in service long enough to benefit by the several pay increases received by Foreign Service officers that would be reflected in his annuity. Only two widows are covered by this provision. One will receive $329 instead of $324, the other will receive only the $324.

The language of this section is a substitute for the House language which would have permitted the Secretary of State to make loans or grants to enable these seven widows to receive up to $1,200 per year.

POSSIBLE BENEFITS TO WIDOWS NOT NOW ELIGIBLE

Section 5 is a substitute for the House language to take care of those widows who are not now eligible to receive an annuity. The conferees deleted any reference to loans or grants to assist them and substituted a provision for an annuity. Under the language agreed upon no widow covered by this section may receive more than $1,200 per year. As in the House amendment, the Secretary of State must find that a widow must be in actual need and without other adequate means of support. It is not expected that intensive inquiries of a social casework nature will be required in order to make any determination. Estimates supplied the committee when this section was under consideration indicate that about six widows may benefit from this provision.

JAS. P. RICHARDS,
ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, Jr.,
JOHN M. VORYS,
ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is to accompany S. 1287, a bill to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the foreign service retirement and disability system.

On January 13, 1955, I introduced H. R. 2097 for the same purpose. This bill was reported out by the Foreign Affairs Committee on July 26 and passed the House on August 1 with amendments. The proceedings were then vacated and S. 1287, with the amended text of H. R. 2097, was passed in lieu thereof.

The conference committee agreed to a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment as contained in its report of March 12, 1956. I will explain the differences later on after giving a brief résumé of the bill itself.

The basic purpose of this legislation is to adjust the annuities of foreign service officers who retired prior to July 1, 1949, and the widows of such officers. Not more than 250 officers and widows are affected thereby and they receive an approximate annual increase of $324.

It should be pointed out that, under the Foreign Service Act of 1946, foreign services officers who retire at the present time have their annuities computed on the higher salaries that are paid as a result of various salary increases over the last 10 years. Such increases have not been available to those who retired prior to 1946 or shortly thereafter.

The figure of $324 which was not contained in the original language of the bill was adopted as an amendment in committee since it paralleled the increase granted by Congress in 1952 to those civil service employees receiving low annuities. The committee felt that this across-the-board increase would be easier to justify to the Congress than would other increases based on percentages and which, in some cases, resulted in disproportionate raises of annuities.

On the basis of about 250 officers and widows receiving an annual increase of $324, this legislation would result in an initial annual cost of about $81,000. However, because of the advanced age of most of the beneficiaries, this annual cost would decrease very rapidly and should not extend much beyond a 20-year period.

I want to emphasize that even this small sum represents no cost to the Government since payments would be made from the foreign service retirement and disability fund. As of June 30, 1955, the fund contained an amount in excess of $16.5 million.

Now as to the action in conference. This consisted of amendments to sections 3 and 5 which relate to a handful of widows, 7 of whom are presently receiving annuities, and a few others who are now not eligible for annuities. In respect to the first category, their annuities are increased to an extent which will permit them to receive up to $1,200 per year and the second group, numbering about half a dozen needy widows, will receive an annuity not to exceed that amount.

In brief, Mr. Speaker, what we have tried to do here is to pass legislation which would give modest increases, at no cost to the Government, to certain foreign service officers and their widows. These are, without exception, persons who devoted many years of faithful service to the Government, often under extreme conditions of hardship. They are people who have been retired for at least 7 years and whose annuities are definitely inferior to those of their younger colleagues. They are persons who, for the most part, find it difficult to live even modestly on their present annuity scales. And, finally, they are, also for the most part, persons in the later years of their lives. In the 3 years that I have been trying to get this legislation through the Congress, several of them have passed away.

I feel sure that the House will approve the adoption of this conference report on the basis of the facts as I have stated them.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES CONCERNING CERTAIN INTERNATIONAL INJUSTICES IN THE WORLD

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. Res. 370) as amended.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas, in the world today, grave injustices to many peoples and countries still remain uncorrected; and

Whereas the United States Government and the American people must not, by any sanction or seeming accession, help to perpetuate these wrongs; and

Whereas the present oppressive divisions of the German, Korean, and Vietnamese people constitute unjust and oppressive denials of the desire of these people for, and their inalienable right to, reunification of these respective countries under terms and conditions which guarantee political freedom, self-determination, and independence; and

Whereas the exclusion of Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Repubuic of Vietnam by the Soviet Union from membership in the United Nations constitutes an arbitrary and inequitable act contrary to the best interests of Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of Vietnam as well as the United Nations in view of the fact that Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of Vietnam are fully qualified for membership therein; and

Whereas millions of people still exist in bondage under Soviet and Chinese Communist tyranny; and

Whereas such conditions threaten the achievement of international peace and security toward which the policy of this Government and the entire free world is directed; and

Whereas this Government has a duty to keep these injustices in the forefront of human consciousness; and

Whereas this Government seeks to maintain the pressure of world opinion to right these vast wrongs in the interest both of justice and a secure peace: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that it shall continue to be the policy of the United States Government to exercise its leadership and moral strength to bring about the reunification of the peoples of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam under conditions which guarantee political freedom, self-determination, and independence.

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the House of Representatives that it shall continue to

be the policy of the United States Government to exercise its leadership and moral strength to bring about the entrance of Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of Vietnam into the United Nations.

SEC. 3. It is further the sense of the House of Representatives that it shall continue to be the policy of the United States Government to exercise its leadership and moral strength in support of the peaceful achievement of freedom and independence by the peoples now under Soviet and Chinese Communist bondage.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the bill, but in order to have a hearing I demand a second.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] for 20 minutes.

The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support House Resolution 370, which expresses the sense of the House that it should be the policy of the United States to exert its effort respecting certain grave international injustices which exist in the world.

House Resolution 370 expresses the sense of Congress on three things:

First, it states the policy of the United States Government to exercise its leadership and moral strength to bring about reunification of the peoples of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam;

Second, it affirms the policy of the United States Government to bring Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of Vietnam into the United Nations; and

Third, it emphasizes the policy of the United States Government to exercise its leadership and moral strength in support of peaceful achievement of freedom and independence by peoples now under Soviet and Communist bondage.

At present the German people remain divided. So are the Korean people. And the same is true of the Vietnamese. These divisions are unnatural and contrary to the best interests of these peoples. However, we all want the right kind of reunification to take place—a fair and just reunification, and not one under Communist domination. Thus, section 1 of the resolution expresses the sense of this House that our Government shall continue its policy of exercising leadership, both material and spiritual, in helping bring about the reunification of these peoples. But this is to be accomplished, in the language of the resolution, "under conditions which guarantee political freedom, self-determination, and independence."

The next injustice covered by the resolution concerns the Soviet Union's arbitrary exclusion from membership in the United Nations of Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of Vietnam. The Soviet Union has been consistent in its abuse of the veto power in order to keep these three countries out of the United Nations. In all, the Soviet Union has exercised the veto power 7 times with respect to these 3 countries. The resolution in section 2 expresses the sense of the House that United States policy shall be continued to bring about the entrance of these three countries into the United Nations.

The resolution in its last section expresses the sense of the House that United States policy shall continue to support the peaceful achievement of freedom and independence by the peoples now under Soviet and Chinese Communist enslavement. This House has on many occasions expressed its sentiment with respect to continuing in the hearts and minds of these enslaved peoples their hope for ultimate freedom and independence. We must continue to nurture this hope in every possible way through expressions by the executive branch, through expressions by the Congress, and through public expressions.

This resolution deserves the full support of every Member of this House. It is a resolution, in the truest sense, in the American tradition of fairness and justice. It will give notice that we in the United States are essentially a moral and spiritual people and that we cannot sit idly by while serious international injustices continue.

May our leadership play a significant part in bringing about the end of such injustices for the good of mankind.

This resolution is very ably authored by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], to whom I now yield the floor, reserving the balance of my time.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself in the very pleasant although perhaps somewhat unique position of being down here in the well today urging the House to pass foreign-policy legislation which I think will support the administration at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 370, which I introduced on January 12 and which was unanimously reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee on March 13, is designed to lend the support of the House of Representatives to President Eisenhower and the administraiton in certain respects of this Government's foreign policy. As the State Department said:

> The Department is in complete agreement with the premises from which the resolution proceeds, and with the aims expressed in its operative paragraphs. These are indeed the policies of the United States Government, in the formulation and implementation of which the Department of State has been largely concerned. Adoption of the resolution would support the Department in its firm intention to promote these policies by all practicable means.

In his state of the Union message on January 5, President Eisenhower made the following remarks which form the basis for House Resolution 370:

> In all things, change is the inexorable law of life. In much of the world the ferment of change is working strongly; but grave injustices are still uncorrected. We must not, by any sanction of ours, help to perpetuate these wrongs. I have particularly in mind the oppressive division of the German people, the bondage of millions elsewhere, and the exclusion of Japan from United Nations membership.
>
> We shall keep these injustices in the forefront of human consciousness and seek to maintain the pressure of world opinion to right these vast wrongs in the interest both of justice and secure peace.

I should now like to discuss the three specific international injustices to which House Resolution 370 refers. First of all, the "oppressive divisions of the German, Korean, and Vietnamese people."

The President's message only referred to the division of the German people. The House will recall that when the four heads of government from the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union met at Geneva last summer, there was an expression of agreement that Germany should be reunified by means of free elections. This was put in the form of a directive to the foreign ministers for the October meeting at Geneva and at that time we, the British, and the French, put forth specific plans which would provide for the reunification of Germany in a framework of European security and by means of free elections in both West and East Germany.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the House will also recall that the Soviets refused to provide for free elections in East Germany since they feared that their East German satellite government would be overthrown. It is the Soviet Union, therefore, that is directly standing in the way of a unified Germany today. However, the pressure of world opinion may yet force a change in the Soviet resistance. If we focus and continue to focus public attention on this question, as the President did and as House Resolution 370 does, the Soviets may eventually be unwilling to shoulder the responsibility for continuing to keep Germany divided.

The language of House Resolution 370 also points to the division of the Korean and Vietnamese people which, in my opinion, is no less a grave international injustice than in the case of Germany. The United Nations itself has consistently supported the objective of a unified Korea. In 1947 this Government proposed the holding of free elections throughout Korea under U. N. supervision, a proposal which was then adopted by the General Assembly and which has been endorsed repeatedly. However, the Communists have rejected this idea, very likely for the same reason as in Germany. Again it must be our stated policy to focus world public opinion on this grave injustice. At the recent 10th General Assembly, a United States resolution was adpoted in reaffirmation to these objectives and Soviet opposition thereto was overwhelmingly defeated. In Korea, no less than in Germany, we must continue to show the principles for which we stand and how they are being prevented and thwarted by Soviet obstructionism and Communist reluctance to see their satellite regimes take their own chances in a free election.

The present division of the Vietnamese people was effected through the 1954 Geneva conference to which the United States was not a party. The House will recall that the accords reached at that time envisioned the eventual reunification of Vietnam through free and secret elections conducted throughout that country. It has become plainly evident, However, that in Vietnam, as in Germany and Korea, the Communists have no intention of permitting free elections in that part of the country which they control. Again it must be shown that we stand for the right of peoples everywhere to a free choice of their own political institutions, just as it must be shown that in each case it is the Communists who continue to deny that right of free choice. I hope that the passage of House Resolution 370 will serve to reemphasize this fact before the eyes of the world.

The second international wrong covered under this resolution is the exclusion by the Soviet Union from membership in the United Nations of Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of Vietnam. This is of course, through the use, or the misuse, of the veto power. The President's remarks only referred to Japan and the original language of the resolution was drafted accordingly. However, the committee felt that South Korea and South Vietnam are equally qualified for membership in the U. N. and that their exclusion by Soviet vetoes was no less of an arbitrary injustice than in the case of Japan.

The House will recall that the Soviet Union vetoed the admission of South Korea in April of 1949 and December of 1955. The admission of Vietnam in September of 1952 and December of 1955 and the admission of Japan in September of 1952 and twice in December of 1955. This Government has, of course, fully espoused and endorsed the admission of these three countries to United Nation's membership and the attention of the world should again be directed to the fact that they are being blocked only through Soviet intransigence. This is yet another objective of House Resolution 370.

The third injustice mentioned in this resolution the continued existence of millions of people under Communist bondage is one which has many times been brought to the attention of the House and of the Congress. Yet I believe its reemphasis is important at this time. This Government has repeatedly condemned the suppression of human rights and political freedoms among peoples who were formerly free and independent. It raised the matter with the Soviet Union last summer at Geneva and again in October at the Foreign Minister's Conference. No satisfaction was gained but the anxiety and concern reflected in the Soviet reaction gave ground for much speculation concerning the true conditions among the captive peoples.

Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that, when President Eisenhower sent a message of encouragement to the captive peoples last Christmas, Mr. Khrushchev protested violently against what he termed "internal interference" in the affairs of the satellite states. The House will recall that Mr. Hagerty in reply issued the statement that the peaceful liberation of the captive peoples is and remains a goal of United States foreign policy.

In the midst of the developments, both political and ideological, which are taking place today within the Soviet Union, developments whose effects could conceivably be felt among the captive peoples, it is important that we again reassure them that our hope and belief in their peaceful liberation and political freedom remains constant and unchanging. In view of what has occurred in the past, it is also important to remind them that this Government will make no agreement which would in the slightest degree tend to confirm their present temporary state of captivity and slavery. The fact that we consider this captivity as one of the great international wrongs existing in the world today was clearly stated by the President last January 5 and deserves to be repeated by the House today. It is so important, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, to convince these people of our hope and concern for their freedom that we cannot repeat these sentiments too often.

In retrospect, therefore, the adoption of House Resolution 370 today by the House will signify the following:

That we recognize that there are in this modern world grave injustices to many peoples and many countries which still remain uncorrected. That we are convinced that the United States Government and the American people, whose Representatives we are, must not, by any sanction of seeming accession, help to perpetuate these wrongs.

It will mean that we believe that the present oppressive divisions of the German, Korean and Vietnamese people constitute unjust and oppressive denials of the desire of these people for, and their inalienable right to, reunification of these respective countries under terms and conditions which guarantee political freedom, self-determination and independence for all. Free election, for example, should be a prerequisite.

It will mean that we believe that the exclusion of Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of Vietnam by the Soviet Union from membership in the United Nations constitutes an arbitrary and inequitable act which is contrary to the best interests of these three countries as well as the United Nations itself. The three countries mentioned here are fully qualified for membership in the United Nations and I believe they are not only more qualified than countries such as Communist Poland and Communist Czechoslovakia, for example, but I believe they are better qualified for membership than is the Soviet Union itself.

It will mean that we recognize the fact that there are millions of people throughout the world who still exist in bondage under Soviet and Chinese Communist tyranny. It will mean that we believe that such conditions as all of the foregoing threaten the achievement of international peace and security toward which the policy of this Government and the entire free world is directed. It will mean that we believe that this Government has a duty to keep these injustices in the forefront of human consciousness. And it will mean that we support this Government in seeking to maintain the pressure of world opinion to right these vast wrongs in the interest both of justice and a secure peace.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge it to be the sense of the House of Representatives that it shall continue to be the policy of the United States Government to exercise its leadership and moral strength in the righting of these international wrongs and injustices that still exist in the world today.

In closing, I would like to express my thanks to the distinguished chairman of my committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, whom we shall sorely miss here after this year, as well as to the leadership on both sides, for their kindness and cooperation in permitting me to bring this resolution to the floor of the House today. I have sometimes heard it expressed that in matters dealing with foreign policy, the House of Representatives tends to find itself overlooked or by-passed. I think that the passage of this resolution today will show that the House is also aware of its responsibility in this important field and that it is in support of President Eisenhower in his announced intention to keep these wrongs before the conscience of world opinion and to seek to ally the pressure of world opinion to right these wrongs. I urge, Mr. Speaker, the adoption of House Resolution 370.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor of the bill) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To continue the policy of the United States concerning the reunification of certain peoples, the admission of Japan, Korea, and Vietnam into the United Nations, and regarding Communist enslavement."

AMENDING THE CLAYTON ACT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 9424) to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 7 and 15 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 731 and 736, as amended, 15 U. S. C. 18 and 25) are amended as follows:

SECTION 1. That section 7 of said act is amended by striking the first, second, and third paragraphs, and inserting in lieu thereof the following new paragraphs:

"No corporation shall acquire, direct or indirectly, the whole or any part of the stock or other share capital and no corporation subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission and no bank, banking association, or trust company shall acquire, directly or indirectly, the whole or any part of the assets of one or more corporations engaged in commerce, where in any line of commerce in any section of the

country the effect of such acquisition of such stock or assets, or the use of such stock by the voting or granting of proxies or otherwise, may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly.

"No corporation subject to the provisions of this act shall acquire, directly or indirectly, the whole or any part of the stock, other share capital or assets of one or more corporations engaged in commerce, where the combined capital, surplus, and undivided profits of the acquiring and the acquired corporations are in excess of $10 million until 90 days after delivery to the Commission or Board vested with jurisdiction under the first paragraph of section 11 of this act and to the Attorney General of notice of the proposed acquisition. Such notice shall set forth the names and addresses, nature of business, products or services sold or distributed, total assets, net sales, and trading areas of both the acquiring and the acquired corporations. The parties shall furnish within 30 days after request therefor, such additional relevant information as may be required by the Commission or Board vested with jurisdiction under section 11 of this act or by the Attorney General. Any corporation willfully failing to give the notice or to furnish the required information shall be subject to a penalty of not less than $5,000 or more than $50,000, which may be recovered in a civil action brought by the Attorney General. Failure by the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General or other appropriate agency to interpose objection to such acquisition within the 90-day period shall not bar the institution at any time of any action or proceeding with respect to such acquisition under any provision of law. The Commission or Board vested with jurisdiction under section 11 of this act, after consultation with and upon approval of the Attorney General, may establish procedures for the waiver of all or part of the waiting requirement in appropriate cases.

"The preceding paragraph shall not apply to corporations purchasing stock solely for investment when the stock acquired or held does not exceed 5 per centum of the outstanding stock or other share capital of the corporation in which the investment is made; nor to the acquisition by one corporation of the assets of any other corporation if such assets do not equal more than the sum of $5 million or more than 5 percent of the capital, surplus, and undivided profits of either the acquired or the acquiring corporation, whichever is less. The term 'assets' as used in this paragraph shall not include stock in trade sold or held for sale by a corporation in the ordinary course of its business.

"Except for the provisions of the two preceding paragraphs this section shall not apply to corporations purchasing stock solely for investment and not using the same by voting or otherwise to bring about, or in attempting to bring about, the substantial lessening of competition. Nor shall anything contained in this section prevent a corporation engaged in commerce from causing the formation of subsidiary corporations for the actual carrying on of their immediate lawful business, or the natural and legitimate branches or extensions thereof, or from owning and holding all or a part of the stock of such subsidiary corporations, when the effect of such formation is not to substantially lessen competition."

SEC. 2. That section 15 of said act is amended by inserting after the first paragraph thereof the following paragraph:

"Whenever the Federal Trade Commission has reason to believe—

"(1) that any corporation subject to its jurisdiction is acquiring or has acquired stock or assets of another corporation in violation of the provisions of section 7 of this act; and

"(2) that the enjoining of such acquisition or the maintenance of the status quo after acquisition pending the issuance of a complaint or the completion of proceedings pursuant to a complaint by the Commission under this section and until such complaint is dismissed by the Commission or set aside by the court on review, would be to the interest of the public,

the Commission, by any of its attorneys designated by it for such purpose, may bring suit in a district court of the United States to prevent and restrain violation of section 7 of this act or to require maintenance of the status quo. Any such suit may be brought in any district in which the acquiring or the acquired corporation resides or transacts business. Upon proper showing, a temporary injunction or restraining order shall be granted without bond. In any case where injunction or restraining order is granted under this paragraph, the Federal Trade Commission shall proceed as soon as may be to the issuance of the complaint and to the hearing and determination of the case."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would amend the Clayton Act by requiring prior notification of certain corporate mergers, and by authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to seek a preliminary court injunction restraining the consummation of mergers pending final Commission action.

We have all observed the alarming rate at which corporate mergers have been taking place recently. In the year just ended, for example, the number of mergers set a 25-year record and proceeded at a rate four times that of 1949. What is more, since 1951 over 3,000 independent concerns have disappeared through merger activity, which has played a most important part in hastening the reduction of competition in many areas and promoting a growing concentration of economic power.

Members will recall that the Congress in December 1950 enacted the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act, to amend the Clayton Act and to strengthen the provisions of the antitrust laws governing mergers. Five years' experience in administering the Antimerger Act has demonstrated the basic need for the present legislation, which is strongly supported by the President, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Trade Commission. The President had this to say in his economic report submitted to the Congress in January 1956:

Nevertheless, mergers have become more numerous of late and an eye, at once vigilant and discriminating, must be kept on such developments. Many mergers have a solid economic justification and serve the general interest by increasing competition; others have neutral effects; while still others place obstacles in the path of effective competition. Over the years Americans have wisely viewed excessive business concentration, or any other undue concentration of economic power, with uneasiness. To serve the basic American desire for an economy in which business opportunities are increasing and in which economic control is widely diffused, it is desirable to strengthen our antitrust laws and provide larger appropriations for their enforcement.

Toward this end, the following revisions of antitrust legislation are recommended. First, all firms of significant size that are engaging in interstate commerce and plan to merge should be required to give advance notice of the proposed merger to the antitrust agencies, and to supply the information needed to assess its probable impact on competition.

That is exactly what we do in this bill. We require that where there is a proposed merger of two or more companies in an unregulated industry and the combined capital structure of the companies is $10 million or more, then notice must be given 90 days prior to the merger's consummation to the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. When the merger involves companies in a regulated industry, notice must be given to the appropriate Federal commission and the Attorney General. Air carriers proposing to merge, for example, would notify the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Attorney General. If the merger involves railroads, notice must be given to the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Attorney General.

There is a provision for a 90-day waiting period. In other words, the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, and the regulatory agencies would have 90 days to consider the proposed merger.

There is a civil penalty ranging from $5,000 to $50,000 in the event that corporations seeking to merge willfully fail to give due notice in pursuance of the act, to the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Justice, or the appropriate regulatory body.

What is behind the President's recommendation in addition to what I have indicated? Many of these mergers occur in secret which means that the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission are unable to get any information about them. And in other instances these agencies have to rely on trade journals, newspaper clippings, financial periodicals to get information as to a proposed merger. This haphazard method is very unsatisfactory. Also it places a most difficult burden upon the Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission.

This bill would require corporations that propose to merge to give appropriate notice to the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. It may be noted that even if the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission does not take legal action within 90 days, they are not barred from proceeding thereafter in the event the merger constitutes a violation of the antitrust laws.

In addition, the bill grants to the Federal Trade Commission power to seek a preliminary court injunction against any proposed merger. The Department of Justice has that right now; in fact, the Federal Trade Commission

has the right to proceed by way of preliminary injunction in a certain limited field under section 13 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. We expand that field now so that in the event of a proposed merger, the Federal Trade Commission can step in and endeavor to prevent a merger.

Why do we ask that? Because in many instances the Federal Trade Commission is presented with a merger which is a fait accompli. In many instances the acquired corporation is swallowed up and its identity is lost. This makes it impossible thereafter for the Commission to unscramble the eggs. Under the bill the Federal Trade Commission will be armed with sufficient authority to prevent the merger from taking place until there has been a determination of its legality.

In light of the fact that the President, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Department of Justice have asked for the bill—there has only been inconsequential opposition to it—I do, indeed, hope that we suspend the rules and pass H. R. 9424.

ORDER OF BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House that the first order of business on Wednesday next will be the consideration of, and the vote on, the veto message of the President in relation to the farm bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H. R. 9424.

This bill would amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to require corporations proposing to merge to notify the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission 90 days in advance of the transaction. Within 30 days after the notice is given, the companies would have to furnish the enforcement agencies such additional information as may be needed to assess the merger's probable impact on competition. These provisions apply only to mergers where the combined assets of the merging companies exceed $10 million. Willful failure to submit the notification or furnish the required information would subject the offender to a civil penalty of from $5,000 to $50,000.

This bill would also amend section 15 of the Clayton Act to provide the Federal Trade Commission with authority to seek a preliminary court injunction to restrain completion of a merger until adjudication of its legality.

Mr. Speaker, the need for this legislation has been emphasized in recent years by the almost alarming tendency toward the merging of corporations in this country. Our American traditions of fair play and protection of the small-business man demand that we scrutinize such developments carefully. As President Eisenhower stated in his Economic Report of January 24, 1956, we must be "at once vigilant and discriminating" in our approach to the problem of mergers today.

I fully recognize that many mergers are entirely feasible and desirable from the viewpoint of the good of the national economy, since they may tend to increase competition. On the other hand, it is equally obvious that vicious monopolistic tactics, which may tend to lessen competition, are inherent in some mergers.

The bill we are considering today provides the Government with a means of effectively judging how to tiptoe along that tightrope line which must be drawn between a corporate consolidation which is good for the economy and one which has harmful effects. It is my feeling that this measure, H. R. 9424, gives the Government the vigilant, yet discriminating means of alleviating the traditional uneasiness with which Americans view excessive business concentration. To that end we must strengthen our antitrust laws and provide more adequately for their enforcement.

The idea of requiring notice of proposed corporate action which might infringe upon legislative policy is not a new one. Both the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 contain comparable provisions. Under these laws a registration statement relating to the issuance of a new security must be filed with the Securities Exchange Commission 20 days before its effective date and the Commission has the power to issue a stop order within that period. Similar proceedings are also practiced with respect to the publication of railway rates.

Five years of experience in the administering of the provisions of the antimerger law of 1950 have demonstrated the need for some sort of legislation to provide for premerger notification. At present the necessity for advance study of mergers is met in a most inefficient manner which imposes needless burdens on the Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission. Under existing statutes, staffs of these agencies must scan a wide variety of periodicals, trade journals, and other publications to learn of proposed or pending consolidations. Such procedures are made doubly unsatisfactory by the fact that many mergers may be consummated without adequate or timely notice in the press and because the agencies involved have to compile economic data concerning the contemplated merger in order to determine whether a full-scale economic investigation should be undertaken.

The measure before us today would correct this situation. At the same time it will not constitute a hardship on the companies involved since the data needed by the agencies can be supplied by those involved without undue difficulty.

There is also the additional consideration that premerger notification will benefit the business community itself. A number of lawyers representing merging companies have stated that disruption of business plans is lessened by Department action before merger consummation. Furthermore, with this requirement incorporated in the statute, the company which tries to obey the law and seeks advance clearance from the Federal Trade Commission and Justice Department will no longer have to stand by and watch its competitor, who chooses to remain silent, carry out a merger. In many of these cases, those who would circumvent the law rely on the natural indisposition of the enforcement agency to unscramble the commingled assets, and in the meantime pile up huge profits.

There has been some complaint about the inequity in enforcement authority of section 15 of the Clayton Act, which now exists between the FTC and Justice Department. Since the Commission has concurrent responsibility with the Attorney General to enforce that act, it should follow that the Commission has the same authority to invoke injunctions to prevent and restrain violators. In fact, the Commission right now even lacks the authority which private parties have to petition a Federal district court to enjoin the consummation of what may be an illegal merger causing irreparable injury.

Logic and the demands of sound policy dictate that this serious loophole in the Antimerger Act be closed, as this bill provides. Passage of H. R. 9424 will give the FTC coexistent authority to invoke the injunctive powers of a district court upon an appropriate show of necessity.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to bear in mind that not all mergers are covered by the notification and reporting requirements of the present bill. To avoid any burden upon small-business consolidations, advance notification is required only where the combined capital structure of the merging corporations exceeds $10 million. This figure will probably cover most mergers that have a significant economic effect and at the same time will relieve from the notification requirements a large number of transactions which have no particular significance from an antitrust standpoint.

The measure under consideration is supported in principle by the President, the Attorney General, and the Federal Trade Commission. It is similar to a number of bills introduced by other Members including myself. Its passage will relieve the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission of cumbersome and unnecessary burdens and at the same time apportion enforcement authority more equitably.

The Clayton Act has come to be regarded as one of the bulwarks of our free economy. Its provisions represent a mighty weapon in our arsenal to prevent this country from going down the road toward socialism. In order to bring the Clayton Act up to date and alter it to meet the challenges of present-day business practices, while at the same time preserving our proud heritage of free opportunity and enterprise, we should act swiftly and favorably on H. R. 9424.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I am wondering whether there would be danger here, if you had to have a premerger filing, of a sort of raid by minority stockholders such as we have seen at times, where sort of nuisance attacks are made on the whole business. Has the committee considered that possibility?

Mr. KEATING. The committee did discuss that, among other things in con-

sidering this bill, and considered it very fully. I point out to the gentleman that there is a 90-day period which elapses between the time when the notice is given and the merger is to be consummated. Some business concerns raised the point that that might cause a delay and might give an opportunity for minority elements or other disgruntled elements to raise some such question.

There has been put in the bill a provision which permits the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission to set up a system of waiving the 90-day requirement so that in the case of a merger of not too great consequence which is not going to have an adverse effect in their judgment on restraint of trade they would be able to waive that period and allow the merger to go through right away. I do not think that the fear which the gentleman has voiced is likely to be serious in this bill.

Mr. VORYS. If the gentleman will yield further, I am sure he will agree with me that there is nothing necessarily evil in the attempts of minority stockholders or others to investigate and prevent a merger if it injures them.

Mr. KEATING. I entirely agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. It strikes me that it might be possible to make it difficult to prevent some sort of mental or other form of restraint until it can be determined what the purpose is of the one who is using the technicalities to attempt to defeat a merger when it is obvious that his purpose is for revenue only.

Mr. KEATING. I think that should be taken care of by the enforcement agencies who ought to be in a position to appraise the merits of his position and allow the merger to go through if the objections are totally lacking in merit.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

IN SUPPORT OF THE CELLER ANTIMERGER BILL, H. R. 9424

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly in support of H. R. 9424 which would amend the antimerger law. Specifically, the bill amends section 7 of the Clayton Act, as previously amended. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is to be congratulated for introducing this bill and giving us an opportunity to consider it. It should be passed promptly.

I think I could not illustrate my long-standing sympathy and support of the provisions of this bill better than to point out that almost 10 months ago, on June 9 of last year, I introduced a somewhat more comprehensive bill on the same subject. This is H. R. 6748, which I believe was a forerunner of the several bills to improve the antimerger law, which have been introduced in this Congress.

H. R. 9424 WILL NOT EXCUSE MERGERS MADE IN GOOD FAITH

Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, prohibits the acquisition of the stock or assets of 1 corporation by another corporation, under 1 crucial circumstance. This circumstance is—and I quote the statute—"where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly."

That seems to me to be a modest and reasonable check on a monopolistic activity. I am highly gratified, therefore, that this single test of the law, which makes corporate mergers illegal if the effect may be substantially to lessen competition and tend to create a monopoly, is not to be saddled with an added good-faith defense which would make it legal for corporations to go ahead and merge in good faith, even though the effect of the merger is to substantially lessen competition or create a monopoly. If the Government's hands were to be tied so that it could neither prevent a merger nor bring about the dissolution of a merger which creates monopoly by reason of the fact that the merger was consummated in good faith, we would, of course, have an absurd law, and an extremely ineffective instrument for preventing monopoly.

Another section of the Clayton Act which deals with an equally important—and perhaps more important—monopolistic practice has indeed been saddled with this very absurdity. I refer, of course, to section 2 of the Clayton antitrust law, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. This section of the law contains the prohibition against discriminating in price.

The original prohibition on this monopolistic practice was drafted in the Clayton antitrust bill of 1914, but before that bill passed it was amended to contain a proviso which justified price discriminations made in good faith to meet competition. Twenty-two years of practical experience with that law provided a superabundance of proof that the good-faith defense rendered the law a practical nullity. Consequently, in 1936, when we amended the price-discrimination law by passage of the Robinson-Patman Act, it was intended to make a sharp contraction of the good-faith loophole, and to rewrite the good-faith defense so as to put it on a reasonable and workable basis.

In a closely divided opinion in the Standard Oil of Indiana case, however, the Supreme Court, in 1951, put the good-faith defense back into the law on price discrimination about as it was before the Robinson-Patman Act was passed. The majority opinion of the Court went even further and defined one business circumstance in which good faith would always prevail, and in doing so the Court made one of the most intriguing pronouncements of all times. The nub of the Court's pronouncement is that one seller's obeying the law completely justifies his competitors in breaking the law.

I do not think I need elaborate on the practical effects of this decision. I only point out that over the years past there appears to have been an extreme reluctance on the part of the Committee on the Judiciary to recommend removal of the "good faith" absurdity from the law on price discrimination.

In point of fact, the Committee on the Judiciary has had before it, since the opening of the last session of this Congress, a bill which would modify the "good faith" absurdity to this extent: It would adopt precisely the same language which describes an illegal merger and make this same language describe an illegal price discrimination. This language is set out in H. R. 11. It would make a price discrimination illegal where the effect of the discrimination "may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly."

Under H. R. 11, there would be no further qualification in the law as to good faith, or bad faith, or any other kind of faith with which the discriminatory practice is carried on. I hope that before this session of Congress ends we will have an opportunity to consider H. R. 11 and then vote on the question whether price discriminations should be justified by good faith even when they substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

The need for improving the antimerger law, is I think, obvious. The country is witnessing a great wave of corporate mergers which if not checked will soon lead us to a definitive state of monopoly capitalism. I should like to point out, however, that the failure of the present merger law has not been due entirely to the inadequacy of the present law nor would the best antimerger law conceivably solve the basic problems underlying the merger movement.

THE FAILURE HAS BEEN IN ENFORCEMENT

The utter failure which the antimerger law has met with to date, is in no way a measure of the inadequacy of the law. The failure has been in enforcement. The great wave of corporate mergers and consolidations which has been taking place during the past 3 years, and continuing now, has elicited from the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission not even a wholehearted pretense at enforcing the law. No matter how much the law might be improved therefore, the practical effect will be inconsequential so long as the enforcement agencies refuse to enforce it.

No antimerger law would get at the root causes of the present wave of mergers, even if the enforcement agencies were devoted and skillful in their assigned tasks. These causes lie in the realm of finance, and it is absurd to think that the Federal Government can adopt a set of economic policies, then hold back the tide of inevitable consequences of those policies by passing an antitrust law.

TAX POLICIES ARE PRINCIPAL CAUSE OF MERGERS

The principal impetus for the merger movement is coming from the fact that today the lion's share of the investment funds are being channeled to the giant industrial corporations. These corporations have been given the function of investment bankers. This has resulted, for the most part, from the 1953 and 1954 changes in the tax laws which shifted the income shares to favor big corporations and high-income families. The administration sponsored these changes on the theory that they would stimulate investment in new productive capacity. The effect has been to stimulate the big corporations to an orgy of buying up previously existing capacity.

The effect has also been, conversely, to create a necessity for many small firms to sell out. The tax changes, particularly removal of the excess-profits tax, which were supposed to stimulate investment in new capacity have also provided the monopoly industries with an incentive for raising prices and taking more profits. Faced with a continuous inflation in big business prices and profits, the administration has maintained the overall buying power of the dollar by bringing about rapid deflation in the more competitive segments of the economy—namely, the small business and farm segments. This has left less savings among small investors, and has left small business even more capital starved than before.

More than that, the administration's technique for combating inflation is principally that of contracting the money supply, by Federal Reserve actions to contract commercial bank credit. And unfortunately it is principally the commercial banks that small business must depend upon, both for operating funds and long-term capital.

We are now being swept along a current which, if not checked, will end with a few giant corporations owning all of the wealth of the country. The economic bust for which we are rapidly heading will not check this trend. When the wave of bankruptcies starts, it will be the smaller businesses that go bankrupt, and the concentration of productive wealth into the hands of the corporate giants will continue.

CORRECTIONS NEEDED IN TAXES AND FINANCE

If we are serious about checking the merger movement, as well as other movements which are concentrating business, then I think we must do two things.

First, we must make substantial changes in the corporate tax rates. Specifically, I would recommend reducing the normal tax rate from the present 30 percent to a rate of not more than 22 percent. Then to retain present levels of revenue, I would recommend that the surtax be moderately graduated throughout the whole size range of corporate incomes, so that progressively larger incomes will be subject to progressively higher tax rates. In short, I am recommending an end to the insane tax policy which takes the same percentage of the income of a corporation receiving an income of, say a million dollars, as one receiving $2 billion—or one which is 2,000 times as big. I have introduced a bill, H. R. 9067 which incorporates these recommendations, and I hope that we will have an opportunity to consider and pass that bill during this session.

In addition, there are several less important, but quite direct incentives to merger built into our present law. These too should be corrected.

The second thing we must do to check the amalgamation of wealth into the giant corporations is to help create an organization which will make accessible to small- and medium-sized firms a larger share of the funds which are available for long-term-business investment. The country does not now have such an organization, either private or public. The problem is not to create more money; the problem is to create a market place, as it were, where funds which are available for investment will come together with the small- and medium-size businesses seeking such funds.

These two things would, I think, solve most of the merger problem, as well as some of the deeper problems of which mergers are only a symptom.

ANTIMERGER LAW NEEDS IMPROVEMENT

Even if all of the incentives to merger are removed from our tax laws however, and even if the follies of our other economic policies are correct, we would of course still need an antimerger law. We would still have the old problem of some mergers being generated from on substantial cause except that competition will be lessened and corporate profits enhanced.

For this purpose, the law should be improved.

MERGERS ARE NOT REPORTED

Perhaps the simplest and clearest way of showing why H. R. 9424 is needed is first to outline the enforcement procedures now being followed, and then explain how I believe these procedures would be amended by the bill.

Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, makes it illegal for one corporation to acquire the stock or assets of another corporation where the effect is a substantial lessening of competition or a tendency to monopoly. There is, however, no requirement that merging corporations make the merger known to the enforcement agencies, either before a merger is consummated or after a merger is consummated. There is moreover, no penalty for making an illegal merger, except possibly the losses which may be incurred in disposing of assets, should there later be an order of divestiture. But as I shall show in a moment, there will be situations where the purpose of an illegal merger can be fully accomplished even should there later be an order of divestiture.

The Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice have concurrent jurisdiction. The Federal Trade Commission has no power to stop a merger before it takes place. The Department of Justice has injunctive power, but this is effective only where the Department learns of a proposed merger in sufficient time, and is able to gather sufficient market information to show the probable effects of the merger, before the merger is consummated.

Let us consider then what the major procedural steps are in the Federal Trade Commission.

First, the FTC has to ascertain that a merger has taken place. For this purpose it has a staff of several people engaged full time in screening newspapers, trade journals, such commercial references as Moody's Industrial Manual, and other sources of public information, just making up lists of the names of companies which are reported to have merged.

DELAYING AND WITHHOLDING INFORMATION

The second step is, then, to gather up enough information about the companies and the products involved to make a preliminary determination as to whether the merger is an inconsequential matter, or whether a thorough investigation should be made. This involves finding a mailing address for the companies in question and sending them a brief questionnaire. Where the merger has already taken place, the companies in question are of course in no hurry to answer the questionnaire; nor are they particularly desirous to answer it fully. Collecting these questionnaires also involves a great loss of time as well as Government expense which should be unnecessary.

Third, in the case of mergers which look as though they may run counter to the law, on the basis of abbreviated information, there is the problem of making a more complete investigation. This involves collecting information as to the companies' production or operations, the markets in which they operate, the proportion of the market affected, the patents that might be involved, and a variety of other matters. Here again a major part, and a vital part of the information must come from the companies themselves. And here again the companies are in no hurry to supply the information; and they are under no compulsion to supply the information in a form which is most revealing on the question whether competition will be adversely affected. On the contrary, they have every incentive to delay and evade. Certainly they have no incentive to gather or organize original data which they are in the best position to supply, and which perhaps only they can supply. In other words, the merger has already taken place, and the companies in question are certainly not anxious to help build a case against themselves.

PROLONGING THE LITIGATION

Next, there is the problem of litigation. Here again companies which have already merged have good reason to delay and drag out the proceedings, and these proceedings are lengthy at best.

Look, for example, at the first case brought under the new law. The Pillsbury mergers took place in June of 1951. After a year of investigation, the Federal Trade Commission issued a complaint, in June of 1952. Shortly thereafter hearings started before an FTC hearing examiner, and these hearings are still going on. In other words, the mergers took place almost 5 years ago, litigation has been going on for 4 years, and the end of the litigation is nowhere in sight.

I do not, of course, want to argue the merits of the Pillsbury case; and I do not want to say anything which could be taken as an expression of my attitude on the merits of that case. I simply make this point: If the presumption on which the FTC brought that case is correct, then the public interest has been injured—competition has been lessened. Is it not absurd then, that the public should be denied the benefits of competition for almost 5 years, when the issue could have been settled before the mergers took place?

Certainly this experience indicates that merger litigations can be kept going almost indefinitely. And it should be obvious that when large corporations are

involved in these litigations, where tens or hundreds of millions of dollars of sales are at stake, the simple expedient is to put a small legal staff on the payroll and treat the matter as a more or less permanent cost of doing business.

In any event, the longer the matter is delayed the less likely it is that the Federal Trade Commission will issue a dissolution order, and the less likely it is that the courts will sustain a dissolution order. As we know, antitrust issues quickly become moot in the eyes of the courts. As a practical matter, the courts are not willing to try to undo things which have occurred in what they regard as the remote past.

Allow me to sum up my points so far: Present procedures are unnecessarily costly to the Government, which fact dilutes the effectiveness of the enforcement dollar; these procedures result in protracted delays while the public interest suffers; they yield less complete and satisfactory market facts on which to base finding and dissolution decrees; and they result in untimely decrees which are unlikely to be sustained, assuming that under present procedures effective dissolution decrees can be drawn. This brings me to the next problem.

COMPETITION CANNOT BE RE-CREATED

Actually our courts and our enforcement agencies have had little experience in trying to draw dissolution orders. As yet they have had no experience in trying to draw an order under the Celler-Kefauver antimerger law. As for that matter, there have been relatively few dissolution decrees under the Sherman Act during the 65 years that law has been on the books. But experience under the Sherman Act has demonstrated that it is about as difficult to unscramble the assets of a corporation as it is to unscramble an egg. In addition to this difficulty, however, there is a vital weakness in the law which attempts to undo mergers rather than to prevent mergers. The law is not concerned with assets as such. Its purpose is to maintain competition. Yet the remedy in the law deals in fact with assets, and not with attaining the purpose of the law. In short, the law contains powers for ordering the divestiture of assets but there are no powers for re-creating competition or even recreating a competitor. There are no powers for saying to whom the assets shall be sold or for what purpose they shall be used. Let me illustrate with two cases in which the Federal Trade Commission is now involved.

It is generally agreed that Pillsbury's purpose in acquiring the Ballard Co. was to acquire a readymade market for its flour in the southeastern United States. Ballard had an established market in this section, its brand name enjoyed wide consumer acceptance, and Ballard's sales organization had long enjoyed the confidence and good will of the wholesale and retail merchants. Ballard's principal assets, insofar as Pillsbury was concerned, were its sales organization and the consumer acceptance which its brand name enjoyed.

Of course, Pillsbury might have used other methods to attain volume sales in the Southeastern States. It might have reduced its prices, for the benefit of consumers, or put on advertising campaigns, or done a variety of legitimate things to try to take business away from Ballard. This would have been competition, which is what we want to maintain.

ASSETS ARE FREQUENTLY NOT TRANSFERABLE

Now let us assume that the FTC ultimately tries to write an order requiring Pillsbury to divest itself of Ballard.

One fact is, I am told, that Pillsbury has now added its own brand name along with Ballard's brand name on the cartons in which its flour is sold. Pillsbury's name has now acquired the popularity and the consumer acceptance which formerly attached to Ballard's trade name.

A second fact is, I am also told, that Ballard's salesmen and other personnel are now absorbed into the Pillsbury organization.

How then can an order be written which will take away the consumer acceptance which Pillsbury's brand name has now acquired and invest that consumer acceptance in a competitor. And how can an order be written which would, contrary to our constitutional limitations on involuntary servitude, transfer Ballard's old salesmen to some new competitor? In short, what are the assets which the Government could order Pillsbury to divest itself of that would restore a competitor?

Now consider the Farm Journal-Country Gentlemen-Better Farming merger. Here we had two competing magazines where we now have one magazine. The magazines themselves have been merged into a single publication. The new publication has an identity and character of its own, and there is now a single subscription list. This merger took place more than 9 months ago, and we can expect many months more to pass before litigation is completed and a decision is rendered. I would assume that after a year's time, certainly, even the advertising contracts will have expired and new contracts will have been entered into. Furthermore, there is the same problem of people—writers, editors, makeup people, and so forth—as we have in the Pillsbury matter.

What then are the assets that could be unscrambled? There may or may not be some printing equipment which could be sold for printing operations of one kind or another. I am told that there is no printing equipment and the acquired magazines hired their printing done. But in any event, I can conceive of no order of divestiture which would create two magazines where there is now one.

H. R. 9424 REQUIRES ADVANCE NOTICE OF MERGER

As I understand the main features of H. R. 9424, they would go a long way toward overcoming the procedural difficulties I have described. First of all, the bill would require certain corporations otherwise subject to the provisions of the act to notify the enforcement authorities of their proposed merger 90 days prior to the date on which the merger could be consummated. Those corporations which will be required to file such advance notification are those whose combined capital, surplus, and undivided profits are in excess of $10 million.

Personally I would prefer the limitation of my bill on this subject, which would require advance notice where the combined capital, surplus, and undivided profits are in excess of $1 million. I think this more inclusive standard would be better and would not put an undue burden on business firms. It is manifest however that, as a rule, it is the mergers of larger corporations that are more likely to bring about a substantial lessening of competition, and I shall be content to see if the standard set forth in H. R. 9424 will accomplish substantially all that is needed on this point. As I understand this provision, it is to serve merely as an aid to the enforcement authorities in learning properly about proposed mergers, and this provision in no way changes the standard set forth in the present law as to what constitutes an illegal merger.

I hope that it is understood and clearly understood, that by adopting $10 million or more of combined assets as a requirement for advance notification, the courts and the enforcement agencies will in no way take this to mean that mergers of lesser corporations are not fully subject to all of the other provisions and limitations of the bill. In plain words, insofar as I am concerned, the congressional intent in passing this bill—if it does pass—is clearly not that mergers of lesser corporations are unimportant; on the contrary, it is my understanding that mergers of lesser corporations may well result in a substantial lessening of competition or a tendency to create monopoly, in which case such mergers will violate the prohibitions of the bill.

MERGING CORPORATIONS MUST SUPPLY PERTINENT INFORMATION

A second major feature of the bill is that it would require corporations proposing to merge to furnish such additional and relevant information as the enforcement agencies may require, within 30 days after the request for such information is made. This is to be, as I understand it, the kind of information which the enforcement agencies will need in order to appraise the competitive effects of the proposed merger, and thus to reach a decision before the merger is made whether or not the merger will contravene the statute.

Unfortunately the bill appears to contain no provisions for compelling the submission of such information, except that the enforcement agency may seek an injunction in a Federal district court on the ground that the required information has not been furnished.

Here again I prefer the provisions of the bill I introduced, which provisions are of such a nature to serve as an estoppel against the merger until such time as the requested information is furnished.

The provision of H. R. 9424 on this point appears however to be a considerable improvement over present law, and I shall be content to see how it works out in practice.

ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES MAY SEEK INJUNCTIONS

Under the present law the Attorney General may seek an injunction in a Federal court to restrain and prevent the consummation of a proposed merger. The bill would give such authority also to the Federal Trade Commission, as well as to the Federal Reserve Board with reference to mergers of financial institutions under its peculiar jurisdiction.

Here again I would prefer the provision of the bill I introduced. That provision is of such a nature that the institution of litigation by an enforcement agency would itself serve as an injunction against consummation of the merger, until such time as the litigation is completed. In my view moreover, a provision of this kind would be highly preferable to the provision of H. R. 9424. It is no easy matter to persuade the Federal courts to grant injunctions; and to do so places upon the enforcement agencies, prematurely, substantially the same burden as proving a violation of the statute. The provisions of H. R. 9424 make a substantial improvement over present law however, and I am for the bill.

THE LAW WOULD APPLY TO BANKS

Finally, H. R. 9424 will make one important substantive change in law, in that the scope of the law will be widened to cover banking institutions. Bank mergers were of course subject to the original section 7 of the Clayton Act which prohibited the acquisition of one corporation's stock by that of another. But the amendment to the act of 1950 which runs against acquisitions of assets as well as acquisitions of stock was not written to cover banks. This improvement offered by H. R. 9424 is badly needed and long overdue. I am for it.

I have not presumed of course to try to give a definitive interpretation of H. R. 9424. Such explanation and definitive interpretation must come from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, who is author of the bill. I have tried only to describe the gist of the bill, as I understand it. I recognize that the bill contains a number of limitations and refinements which I have not touched upon. These appear to me however to be reasonable and adequate. I am for the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include related statements and material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, the principle of premerger notification is sound. It is not a threat to any segment of our business economy. On the contrary, I firmly believe that prior notice of a contemplated merger is in the public interest. If there is a fault in our antimonopoly laws it lies in their failure to "nip monopoly in the bud." Just as grievous is the failure over the past 15 years to provide the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission with adequate enforcement funds. The importance of the Celler premerger notification measure lies in the fact that the history of American business indicates the place to halt monopoly is at the merger level.

In considering a prior notice provision for our antimonopoly laws, I think that we should keep in mind just what it is we set out to do. The basis of the American economic system is the belief in free private competition. Our goal is an economy that places its chief reliance on individual initiative and decision. As a people we have from time to time permitted the Government to step in and limit the area in which individual economic decision can operate. But in the main we strive to maintain the freedom of the individual to decide for himself.

The American dream, in economic terms, pictures a way of life in which individuals are free to enter business ventures of their own choice and workers are at liberty to shift from job to job as they see fit. We have tried to translate this dream into a system that says, in essence, that the distribution of workers and capital is best determined by the consumer's desires. The prime mover in all this is, of course, price competition.

Monopolies have generally come about through the human tendency to combine in order to place restraints on competition. Combinations may have had other motives at their beginning, but as they have grown bigger they have sought to take advantage of their power and drive their rivals from the marketplace. Bitter experience has taught us that the danger of monopoly lies in this kind of bigness. Experience has also shown us that bigness in itself is not necessarily an evil. What is it then we fear? It is the bigness that begets the lust for power. When that lust takes hold, every goal of our free private competitive system is threatened.

I do not overlook the fact that we live in an age of bigness. It is big government, big labor unions, big farms, big business. Whether it is big government or big business we ought to be wary of the potential danger, for bigness is close to monopoly wherever it is found. Western Europe is a living witness to the results of monopoly power—whether it be in government or in business cartels. Industrialists and economists agree that America has the world's highest standard of living largely because we have avoided the depressing results of monopoly.

Our interest in mergers stems from the ever growing threat of monopolistic control in our economy. I am well aware that mergers per se are not necessarily bad, but I am even more aware of their latent danger where the motive is part and parcel of the lust for power.

The Democrat Party politicians and the members of the ADA now engaged in hot primary fights and a skillful propaganda game are accusing the Republican Party of being the tool of big business at the expense of the little man. The cold facts of history give the lie to this kind of talk. The antitrust laws were born under a Republican administration. The first big drive against the trusts and monopolies was under a Republican President, "Teddy" Roosevelt. When did these giant monopolies get so big? Just since 1953? Of course not. The Democrat Party had 20 years to do something about them. It did nothing. In fact all it did by way of controls and regulations was to make it financially impossible for the little man to compete against the giant industries.

I mentioned a moment ago that failure to provide adequate enforcement funds to the FTC and the Department of Justice for the past 15 or more years has been a primary factor in the recent merger move. The Democrat Party had control of these funds over most of these years.

What the Celler premerger notification bill sets out to do is to halt mergers where the prime motive is the desire for monopoly. I am in accord with this aim. But I do not believe the Celler bill goes far enough. It charts a course that is worthy, but one that is totally unrealistic in view of the magnitude of current mergers.

The Celler bill ought to reach farther down the scale and include corporations with a combined capital, surplus, and undivided profit of $5 million or more. I think, too, the Celler bill fails in not requiring a premerger notification from the corporation engaged in commerce which contemplates the acquistion of intrastate concerns.

The Celler amendments to the Clayton Act are most remiss in the penalty provisions. I believe that any corporation willfully failing to give notice or to furnish the required premerger information should be subject to a penalty of not less than $5,000 or more than $500,000. The provisions controlling the acquisition of stock solely for investment should also be changed to a sum more in keeping with the magnitude of the merger danger. I would have the Celler bill changed at this point and place the asset exemption at $500,000.

I have included these proposed changes in a bill, H. R. 9968, which was duly introduced by me. I am enough of a realist to know that my bill is not likely to be before the Members this session. But the threat of monopoly in the present mad race to merge is so great, that I believe a bill as inadequate as the one now under consideration is better than no action by this Congress.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOVIET SEAMEN'S REDEFECTION CALLS FOR POSITIVE ACTION BY UNITED STATES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may

extend his 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. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the redefection to the Soviet Union on April 8 of five Soviet seamen who had previously elected to stay in this country dramatizes the problem facing this country in fulfilling the hopes of refugees from Communist countries. The recent study by the Donovan Commission of the International Rescue Committee, which I referred to in the RECORD of March 29, 1956, pointed out that more than 1,000 such persons have returned to their countries of origin in a recent 13-month period. The most recent redefections will be of inestimable propaganda value to the Communists but perhaps also of some value to us in underlining the deficiencies in our handling of such people. Gen. William J. Donovan, the former OSS Chief, announced yesterday the formation of a national committee to combat redefection campaigns. I commend this enterprise.

It should be recognized that governmental and private agencies which encourage defections by Communist citizens assume the risk that redefection may take place later on, and they should therefore recognize their obligation to exert every effort consistent with a free society to avoid such redefections. American agencies, however laudable their intentions, should not manufacture propaganda for the Communists by unwittingly setting the stage for redefections and failing to prevent them.

The number of Federal agencies involved in the reception and resettlement of refugees from communism is considerable, ranging from the President's special escapee program to the International Cooperation Administration, the Department of State, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Doubtless, too, our Central Intelligence Agency plays a considerable role in such matters. As the Donovan Commission of the International Rescue Committee pointed out, the Health, Education, and Welfare Department could also play an important part in assisting refugees to become more quickly adjusted to life in our country.

A successful program of receiving and holding the allegiance of such refugees clearly requires the sound coordination of many agencies. In addition to governmental bodies, private religious and nationality welfare groups also make a very important contribution. Yet, when the five Soviet sailors left for the Soviet Union on April 8, the United States Immigration officials held a brief hearing at which the only counsel available to the redefectors was supplied by the Soviet Embassy. The private agency which had shared in assisting the seamen in this country, was, apparently, given short shrift by the immigration officials. Neither the State Department nor the Justice Department have added any light to the question of why the redefections took place. If this matter was conducted in accordance with a coordinated Federal policy, surely that policy could be better explained to the American public than has been done to date.

On the other hand, if the redefection of the Soviet seamen represents a failure of United States policy, as it clearly seems to do on the evidence available at this time, the Federal agencies which might have helped to avoid this deplorable incident should reconsider their conduct in the matter. If the Central Intelligence Agency, for example, shared in the responsibility for integrating these unfortunate refugees into American life, then this surely illustrates the need for a check on that Agency in addition to the Presidential one.

Perhaps this unfortunate incident reflects not only mismanagement by the administration but also is indicative of the somewhat callous attitudes toward refugees which animates some of our laws in this area. The rigid health and job requirements for entrance into this country under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 and the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 have disillusioned most of the 220,000 fugitives from Eastern Europe who still live in squalid camps on the edge of the Iron Curtain, thereby blunting the substantial accomplishments of these laws. Congress should not remain indifferent to the fate of these remaining victims of Communist tyranny. The Refugee Relief Act should not be allowed to expire without compensatory immigration opportunities being provided for these special cases. Unless this is done and done quickly, can we reasonably expect that the rate of Communist propaganda victories, such as the redefection of these five Soviet seamen, will decrease rather than increase?

I include as part of my remarks the text of two letters which I have just received from Msgr. Edward E. Swanstrom, the executive director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and Roland Elliott, director of the immigration services of Church World Service, Inc., of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE,
April 9, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: It was very kind and thoughtful of you to send me sufficient copies of your remarks of March 28 on the redefection problem for distribution to the members of our refugee relief committee. I am sure they will be just as interested in what you had to say as I was. You are to be highly congratulated for taking this further opportunity to point up the problem.

It is unfortunate that the Refugee Relief Act program has not brought the relief to refugees that was expected of it, and we are naturally very hopeful that by amendment for its extension, Congress will give us a further opportunity to make better use of it. I am going to have your remarks reviewed by our committee, and I will see that any comments they have to make will be forwarded to you shortly.

I wish to assure you again of our very deep appreciation of your great interest and cooperation in our attempts to help resolve some of the problems with which the poor refugees are still struggling.

With every best wish, I am,
Sincerely yours,
(Rt. Rev. Msgr.) EDWARD E. SWANSTROM,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U. S. A.,
CHURCH WORLD SERVICE, INC.,
April 13, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Your letter to Monsignor Swanstrom acknowledging our joint agency letter of February 16, 1956, to the President is deeply appreciated by us in Church World Service.

Your remarks, in my judgment, based on our intimate experience with escapees and refugees in recent years, are most pertinent and urgently important. Our experience last week with five redefecting Russian sailors is but one case in point which demonstrates the urgency of our strengthening our policies and procedure to deal more adequately with this problem.

At the moment, it would seem that budget pressures are endangering the work of the United States escapee program; I hope you can look into this.

With high regard, I am,
Cordially yours,
ROLAND ELLIOTT,
Director, Immigration Services.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the conference report on the bill, S. 1287, and also on House Resolution 370 at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I supported House Resolution 370, introduced by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY]. The able chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has given a most explicit explanation of the purposes of House Resolution 370. He has pointed out that the purpose of this resolution is to make clear the policy of the United States with respect to Germany, Korea, and Vietnam, and the basic policy of our Government toward all people who are today denied human freedom and the right to national independence.

Germany, Korea, and Vietnam all stand as victims of a crude experiment in Russian surgery. Each of these nations has been divided by Russian military action and Communist aggression. Germany was divided during the twilight sleep of the West when the Russians were posing as our allies and when it was believed that a defeated enemy could only be controlled by four-power occupation. The Western Powers many years back recognized that the German people had demonstrated a fine capacity for democratic self-government and that there was no further reason to maintain occupation forces in that country. But the cunning Russians who seek neither a democratic Germany nor a representative government in Germany, have continued to occupy a part of Germany and have even set up a stooge government in the part of Germany they occupy for the purpose of carrying out subversive and other illegal activities against free Germany. Thus the Russian Communists

alone are responsible for an unnatural and unjust division of the German people.

In Korea we find practically the same set of circumstances applying as those which brought about the division of Germany. The Russians were granted military jurisdiction of Korea north of the 38th parallel until such time as a treaty of peace was arranged with Japan and stability established in the Far East.

Moscow used this advantage granted by the West in order to launch a war of aggression against free Korea and in particular, against its former allies, the United States, Great Britain, and France. The Communist war of aggression in Korea brought great suffering and hardship to the Korean people. We Americans will never forget that thousands of our youth died a hero's death in the defense of freedom on the cold battlefields of Korea. It is with sadness that we recall to memory the fact that a precarious truce which was arranged in 1953 still recognizes the cruel handiwork of the Russian Communists which continues the division of the Korean nation.

In Vietnam the agents of Moscow got control of the national independence movement which opposed French colonial rule and ultimately brought about a state of war. The same Russian agents were supplied with arms, ammunition, tanks, and soldiers by the Communist Chinese, and their Russian bosses. This same unholy trio brought about a Geneva Conference in which the French Government ceded part of Vietnam to Communist occupation. In the southern part of Vietnam, which remained in French hands, there has lately arisen a great and patriotic leader of the people who is completely dedicated to democratic principles and to government of the people, by the people, and for the people. This new leader, President Diem, is dedicated to the goal of a free, independent, and united Vietnam.

The people of Germany, the people of Korea, and the people of Vietnam seek the common goals of political freedom, self-determination and independence. It is in this spirit that they seek reunification of their homelands now divided by the tyranny of Russian surgery.

I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] that the people of Germany, Korea, Vietnam, and Japan should, and of right ought to be represented in the councils of the United Nations. The Russian efforts to deny the German people, the Korean people, the Vietnamese people, and the Japanese people this right deserves the condemnation of all mankind.

This resolution reaffirms the long-standing policy of the United States Government in support of all people who seek freedom and independence from Russian and Chinese Communist bondage. The now famous McCormack resolution, which Congress passed unanimously last year, stated, in unmistakable terms, the rights of all people and nations to freedom, self-determination, and independence. House resolution 370 gives specific application to the principles of the McCormack resolution to the people of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam. These are time-honored principles in support of which the people of the United States have shed their blood here at home and on foreign battlefields, and our unwavering support of which have brought us the approbation and prayerful thanks of people everywhere in the world.

The distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], has summarized the compelling purposes of this resolution by stating that we must continue to nurture in the hearts and minds of the enslaved peoples their hopes for freedom and independence and that this can best be done through expressions of the executive branch, through expressions of Congress, and through public expressions. Our colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] points out that passage of this resolution has served notice on the world, at a time when a massive effort is being made to bury the long and cruel record of Communist crimes against humanity, that we continue to recognize that there are in this modern world grave injustices which remain uncorrected. He emphasizes that we, as a Nation and people, must avoid any action which will tend to perpetuate these wrongs and must engage in undertakings which give promise of correcting the inhumanities and grave injustices which now bar the way to a just and lasting peace.

AMENDMENT TO REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

Mr. DINGELL. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. Liberalization of the act, and of the program established by it, has been sought by interested civic and political leaders for some time. The current Refugee Relief Program is due to expire at the end of this year. It will be terminated with approximately 40,000 of the visas earmarked by Congress for issuance to refugees, unused and unusable.

Thus, it appears necessary to lengthen the life of the program and to facilitate its administration.

In my bill, I have provided for the extension of the Refugee Relief Program until December 31, 1960. Visas not allocated on the termination date of the current law, December 31, 1956, are to be reallocated on a proportional basis to any prospective entrants covered in the original act.

The current law provides for the issuance of 205,000 refugee visas. I feel that this number is unnecessarily small and fails to tap the true potentialities of the United States as a haven for victims of oppression and natural calamity. Thus, the bill I have introduced provides an additional 15,000 visas for allocation under the program.

One of the great problems in the current law is that entrance is denied to victims of tuberculosis. In the United States, this disease is no longer the scourge it is elsewhere. It can, and has, been treated. Yet, because of the bar against its victims, numerous refugee families, in dire need of resettlement, refuse admission rather than leave behind a relative who has been found to have tuberculosis. My bill provides for the admisson of 1,000 such sufferers, providing that they are members of a family group being admitted under the act and will not endanger the public health or become public charges.

It has been currently estimated that from 6 to 9 months are required to process each alien applying for admission under the act. Such a delay brings hardship to the refugees waiting to come to this land, and to the persons in the United States who are sponsoring them. Thus, I have suggested several administrative changes to eliminate the complicated and time-consuming procedures now operative. I have provided that the Secretary of State and the Attorney General may waive the passports and other travel documents now required under the act. People who have escaped from tyranny often have no such papers and scant means of obtaining them. Furthermore, even if such documents are obtainable, months often elapse in the process of getting them. Hence, administrative waiver in certain deserving cases certainly seems necessary.

Another provision which hampers administration of the act also is changed by my bill. Under the present law, a visa cannot be issued a prospective refugee unless he can provide documentary evidence of his activities for 2 years prior to his application. Obviously, many Iron Curtain escapees and disaster victims cannot comply with this requirement. Consequently, these persons are forced to wait out the 2 years in refugee camps in order to provide themselves with the necessary documentation. It seems only just to eliminate this restrictive requirement.

Other changes are needed. Under the current program, refugee applicants must be sponsored by individual citizens. This means that the numerous voluntary agencies, which operated so well under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act, are now prevented from sponsoring refugees. These agencies have the means and the know-how to sponsor and provide for resettlement of aliens. Barring agency activity tends to cut down the number of aliens entering under the program. Thus, on the basis of fairness, and of sound administration, my bill provides that accredited voluntary agencies can give sponsorship to refugees admittable under the act.

My bill provides for a major change in the administration of the Refugee Relief Act. At the present time, the program is directed by the Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the State Department. This official has numerous governmental responsibilities, with which the Refugee Relief Program must compete for time and attention. Yet administration of this vital activity is a complicated job,

requiring the full efforts of a skilled Administrator. Therefore, it appears to me to be necessary to have the President appoint an administrator for the refugee relief program, whose sole responsibility would be getting the victims of oppression and calamity into this Nation as simply and speedily as possible.

My entire bill has this end in view. I urge early congressional passage on this basis.

THE LATE COMPTON I. WHITE

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, both the country and my State of Idaho lost a dedicated and industrious public servant in the death earlier this month of Compton I. White. "Comp," as he was known to all, held for 16 years the congressional seat I now hold—and few Members of Congress have ever done a better job for the people back home.

"Comp" White's name was synonymous with service while he was in the Congress. No Member was ever more responsive to the needs of the people he represented, and no Member ever worked with more vigor and persuasion for the things he believed would develop his State. He was a veritable juggernaut of force and persistence when he wanted something. He literally camped in the office of a Government official until he got some injustice straightened out or some problem cleared.

Compton White was born in Baton Rouge, La., in 1877, and spent his boyhood there. When he was 13 his family moved to Clark Fork which is in Bonner County, in the Idaho panhandle. He pioneered with his father in reclaiming a farm from logged-off land, and in operating a sawmill business.

His family sent him off to business college in Chicago, and then to Gonzaga University in Spokane. He was in the railway service for a while as telegrapher, trainman, and conductor, but his love for the land brought him back to Clark Fork where he engaged in agricultural, lumbering, and mining activities.

Throughout his life, "Comp" White was devoted to the development of the West. He was a fervent advocate of the free coinage of silver, and served as chairman of the Coinage, Weights, and Measures Committee. His other committee assignments also gave him an opportunity to best serve the section of the country he loved so deeply—he held membership on the Indian Affairs, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, and Public Lands Committees.

"Comp" White was a colorful and effective Member of Congress. He wrote a record of accomplishment which those of us who follow him will find it difficult to equal. He will be long remembered in both Idaho and Washington.

THE SUPREME COURT VERSUS STATES' RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have 30 minutes, but my statement will only take 15 minutes. The other 15 minutes I hope will be taken by reaction from my statement. As you Members all know, I am not a lawyer, and therefore my statement, while it is on the Supreme Court with reference to States' rights, will not be expressed in legal language. It will be expressed in layman's language.

Most of you Members know that I do not take the floor on any question outside of my own field. I have done it once before in 20 years in this House, and that was back in 1937 when the Supreme Court packing plan was brought before the House, and I just could not resist at that time. I feel the same today, and that is the reason I am taking this time, calling attention to the recent Supreme Court decisions and their effect upon States' rights.

Mr. Speaker, over a long period of time the Supreme Court has ruled that when Congress enacts legislation on any subject, Federal jurisdiction over that subject becomes exclusive; thereafter the States are deprived of power to enact or enforce similar laws, even if those laws are not in conflict with the Federal law.

During the past 20 years a New Deal Congress has legislated "all over the waterfront." Congress has stretched the Interstate Commerce Clause and the welfare clause of the Constitution to the point where they now embrace all the ills and the needs of mankind—and a New Deal-appointed Supreme Court has upheld such legislation. Under this program it is only a question of time before all power and all sovereignty residing in the States to enact and enforce laws will be taken over by the Federal Government.

THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA *v.* STEVE NELSON

Mr. Speaker, a case in point is the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court upholding a decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in the Steve Nelson case—a Communist convicted and sentenced under the sedition law of Pennsylvania. The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania reversed the decision of the lower court in the case, on the ground that the Smith Sedition Act passed by Congress preempted the field of sedition, and deprived the State of Pennsylvania of all jurisdiction in that field. The United States Supreme Court upheld the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania on substantially the same grounds.

Both the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania and the United States Supreme Court in rendering their decisions completely overlooked or deliberately ignored the clear intent of Congress as expressed plainly and specifically in a clause of the Smith Sedition Act which states:

> Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof.

Mr. Speaker, this clause clearly states that the passage of the Smith Act did not and should not take away from the States the responsibility and jurisdiction over sedition under the laws of the various States, as long as there is no conflict with the Federal judiciary. In their dissenting opinion Justices Reed, Burton, and Minton pointed out that this clause clearly stated the intent of Congress, and could not be ignored. They stated also that there was no conflict in the Steve Nelson case with the Federal law nor with the Federal judiciary.

Congress now must pass legislation that will in effect veto or nullify the Supreme Court decision in this case, and state again in language that cannot be misunderstood—even by a New Deal-appointed Court—what the congressional intent is in this matter. Congress has had to act at least a dozen times in the last 10 years to correct decisions of the Supreme Court, where the Court clearly ignored the intent of the Congress. The natural-gas decision is one example.

SEGREGATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. Speaker, in the decision of the Court on segregation in the public schools, the Court overruled a 60-year-old decision of the Supreme Court giving approval to "separate but equal" facilities and services for white and colored in the public schools. The Court also overruled other recent decisions that approved the same formula, a formula under which the Negroes of the South have made steady and peaceful progress for more than half a century. Today's Court has now established a new formula—integration of races in the public schools.

The decision of the United States Supreme Court in this case was presented in the form of a thesis, a thesis supported mostly by citations from college professors, sociologists, and psychologists, but not supported by citations from eminent lawyers or by previous Court decisions. The Court did not say that "separate but equal school facilities" was bad law. What the Court did say in effect was that "separate but equal schools" was bad sociology and bad psychology.

The Court rendered its decision without any implementing legislation being passed by the Congress. In fact, the Court entirely disregarded or overlooked legislation passed by Congress setting up the school lunch program, wherein Congress specifically acknowledged and accepted "separate but equal schools" for colored children. In that legislation Congress stated that in dispensing school lunch aid in States that maintained separate but equal schools for white and colored pupils, the school lunch aid should be distributed equitably as between the separate schools.

Under the 10th amendment to the Constitution, control over the public schools was specifically reserved to the States. Under the 14th amendment no State could discriminate between colored and white pupils with reference to school facilities. Therefore, it is the function and the responsibility of

the States to provide schools, to regulate them, and to have full control over them; the only requirement being that the schools shall provide equal educational opportunities for the pupils, whether colored or white.

Mr. Speaker, under the Constitution, the United States Supreme Court is the final arbiter as to the meaning of the Constitution, and also whether legislation passed by Congress is constitutional or not. Any and all decisions of the Court become the law of the land. The Court's decisions are to all intent and purposes as much a part of the Constitution as if they had been written into that document in the first place.

For today's Court, therefore, to overrule a previous decision of the Court is the same, in effect, as if the Court amended the Constitution itself—which the Court has no power to do. If the Court has the power to overrule or change at will a previous decision of the Court, then it becomes, willy-nilly, a Court of whims and caprices, with its decisions made on the basis of political, social, or ideological theories, not based upon the provisions of the Constitution and the law.

DR. HARRY SLOCHOWER *v.* BROOKLYN CITY COLLEGE

Mr. Speaker, now comes the United States Supreme Court decision in the case of Dr. Harry Slochower against Brooklyn City College, New York City. Dr. Slochower was fired by the college authorities because he invoked the fifth amendment and refused to answer the questions of the Senate Internal Security Committee concerning his previous Communist affiliations. By a 5-to-4 decision the Court ruled that Dr. Slochower had been fired illegally because in his case "the due process of law" had not been strictly followed.

The college acted legally and properly under a provision of the New York City charter that provides for the automatic discharge of any city employee who under questioning by an official investigating committee invokes the fifth amendment. This Supreme Court decision—so the four dissenting Justices claim—"interferes with the right of New York City to protect its local government institutions from the influences of officials who do not meet the required standards for employment."

Mr. Speaker, where is the usurpation of States' rights by the United States Supreme Court going to end? It is only a question of time before the States will be deprived of all power and sovereignty in the enactment of laws for the protection of health, of welfare, of education, of labor, and so forth.

H. R. 3, by Congressman HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia, goes to the heart of this matter. If passed it would be a long way toward stopping this rapidly increasing usurpation of States' rights by means of United States Supreme Court decisions.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman SMITH's bill, H. R. 3, should be passed without further delay.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois upon the statement which he has just made to the House. I concur fully with the gentleman's support of H. R. 3. He has made a very clear and lucid statement regarding the pattern which the Supreme Court has set up in the last 20 years to establish a judicial dictatorship. I began to point this out in speeches on the floor of the House in 1949. The record of the Supreme Court in the past two decades is replete with factual evidence which demonstrates the Court's intention to change the Constitution whenever it desires, through judicial decisions, in utter disregard of the procedure required by law to amend that instrument.

In the course of those years the Court has abolished the right of political parties to set their own rules for membership. It has declared that the right to protect transfers of real estate by restrictive clauses in deeds is a violation of the Constitution. It overruled the construction of the Constitution, as the gentleman pointed out, that had been sustained for nearly 70 years when it arbitrarily declared that segregated schools violated the 14th amendment. In these cases and in other cases decided in the last 20 years the Court has overruled many more longstanding cases, and in so doing has undertaken to change the meaning of the Constitution as effectively as if it had been duly amended according to the method provided in the instrument itself.

In a step-by-step process, the Supreme Court has usurped the functions of the legislative branch of Government. It is apparent that the ultimate intention of the Supreme Court is to abolish every vestige of States' rights and replace those rights with a central bureaucracy in Washington.

Two recent decisions by the political Justices on this bench provide additional proof, if any is needed, that the Supreme Court is driving this country closer to a complete judicial dictatorship.

As the gentleman from Illinois pointed out, on Monday, April 9, 1956, the Supreme Court ruled that a college in New York could not discharge an employee because he invoked the fifth amendment when questioned about the Communist Party. In this case, Dr. Harry Slochower refused to state before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, in a 1952 investigation, whether he had or had not been a Communist in 1940 and 1941. His employer, Brooklyn College, took the only reasonable course and discharged him. Now the Supreme Court has denied the right of an educational institution to determine upon what grounds an employee may be discharged. With a total lack of legal precedent, the Supreme Court has undertaken to further extend its control of local educational institutions.

Colleges, like other employers, may reasonably conclude that failure to furnish appropriate information at an official inquiry is grounds for disqualifying a person for a position of public trust.

Furthermore, such employment is not a right. It is a privilege. In the first place, the State may make known membership in an organization dedicated to overthrow of the Government by force a ground for disqualifying a school teacher. If, in the determination of this policy, a school official refuses to cooperate to the extent that necessary information may be obtained, then this in itself is grounds for dismissal.

The important question here is unmistakably one of unlawful encroachment on States' rights, and not of protecting the individual rights of citizens as the Court, in its customary smokescreen manner, would have us believe.

Either through apathy, indifference, or lack of essential knowledge, many people in the remaining 47 States will meekly accept this ruling as the unquestioned law of the land. The mere fact that this decision has no personal effect on them will cause many people to regard it as of no importance.

To adopt either of these attitudes would only invite still further encroachment on States' rights in cases affecting other States and in matters of personal concern to them.

When the Supreme Court invades the reserved rights of the separate States; when the Supreme Court acts in a manner wholly disregarding the 10th amendment of the Constitution; this invasion should be met with a solid wall of resistance by the people in all of the 48 States. For, while in one instance the justices may unlawfully encroach upon the rights of only a single State, unless challenged in their abortive assumption of excessive power, it can be reasonably concluded that the Court, whenever it sees fit to do so, will also trample upon the rights of the remaining 47 States.

The Supreme Court took still another slice of the reserved powers of the States in the so-called Steve Nelson case.

In this case, the Federal Supreme Court reversed a Pennsylvania court conviction of a known Communist, supposedly on the basis that the intent of Congress at the time it passed the Smith Act was that the Federal Government should occupy the whole field against subversion, and preempt State laws on the subject.

This is a palpable and dangerous extension of congressional statute. There is no such congressional mandate present in the Smith Act. In fact, there is nothing which so much as suggests that the Federal Government intended to occupy the entire field.

The 10th amendment reserves to the States, or to the people, all powers not granted to the Federal Government. The creator, which in this case is the several States, gave to the creature, which is the Federal Government, certain powers. Extension of these powers would indicate that the creature has become larger than the creator which, of course, it cannot do.

For the Supreme Court to invalidate the sedition laws of the State of Pennsylvania, when it is obvious that it was never the intent of Congress that the Federal law should pre-empt the State law, is a brazen and irresponsible attack on the sovereignty of all of the States.

It points up in no uncertain terms that this Supreme Court has dedicated itself to the complete destruction of the States.

It states, in language too obvious to be denied, that the ultimate intention of the Supreme Court is to erase the State boundaries and create in their place a type of superbureaucratic State with Washington as the focal point.

If the integrity of our constitutional form of Government is to survive, then the sovereignty of our separate States must be maintained.

No act outside of the law, which would destroy the lines that separate the States, must be recognized. For, if we do recognize such lawless acts, we can fully expect additional usurpation of States' sovereignty until eventually the States will be powerless to administer their own affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his most scholarly statement. He said he was not a lawyer, but after listening to this address no one would believe it. As a matter of fact I can state that he is a better lawyer than many who are now members of the Supreme Court. I just wish we had some lawyers like him on our Supreme Court.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, what the gentleman from Georgia means to say is he wishes we had some lawyers on the Court.

Mr. LANHAM. Some lawyers; that is exactly right. By the way, I wonder how many of you know that there are absolutely no requirements, no qualifications, other than age, in the law or the Constitution for members of the Supreme Court. The President of the United States has to be a native-born American, but the same provision does not apply to members of the Supreme Court.

Now we have seen come to pass just exactly what was predicted years ago by our Founding Fathers, and if the gentleman will permit I would like to read into the RECORD just a few brief statements, the first by George Washington, the Father of Our Country, when he warned us as follows:

> It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of Government, a real despotism. * * * If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates.

And Jefferson, in speaking of the Supreme Court, had this to say:

> The legislative and executive branches may sometimes err, but elections and independent people will bring them to rights.
>
> The judiciary branch is the instrument which, working like gravity, without intermission, is the one which may some day press us into tyranny.
>
> The great object of my fear is the Federal judiciary. That body, like gravity, ever acting, with noiseless foot, and unalarming advance, gaining ground step by step, and holding what it gains, is engulfing insidiously the special governments into the jaws of that which feeds them.
>
> It is a very dangerous doctrine to consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions. It is one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy. * * * The Constitution has erected no such single tribunal, knowing that to whatever hands confided, with the corruptions of time and party, its members would become despots.

Mr. MASON. May I say before I yield further that my only purpose in taking time today was to try to strike a little spark that would spread into a prairie fire if the legal-minded Members of this body would only carry on and keep this before the people, because they do not know what is being done to them by the Supreme Court decisions.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to learn that the gentleman was not a lawyer, because having observed his forensic ability here over a number of years, I just assumed that he was. He is a better lawyer than many of us who are licensed to practice. I do want to make 1 or 2 comments on the statement that the gentleman has just made because he referred to a bill of which I am the author, H. R. 3, to correct a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Steve Nelson and other cases. I am glad to announce at this moment that I have been advised the Judiciary Committee will proceed to conclude hearings on the bill this coming Friday. I do hope that the House will have that bill before it in a reasonable time so that we may explore the situation much further.

The gentleman referred to the segregation case. The bill which I have before the Judiciary Committee has no relationship to the segregation case. The passage of that bill would have no effect on it whatsoever. I do not think it has any effect upon the New York school teacher case either. But I would like for the Members of the House to understand that all the bill, H. R. 3, does is the Congress says to the Supreme Court that we do not intend to affect any State law unless the Congress says so. It is just about that in plain terms, it is just that simple.

I introduced the bill, H. R. 3, in another form in the last Congress and under another number immediately after the decision in the Steve Nelson case. I did not draft the bill to correct merely the Steve Nelson case. That is just one phase of a very broad situation, a situation where the Supreme Court has assumed out of a clear sky to say what the Congress intended when the Congress has not said it. If anything is to be done upon this subject, I think it is very important that we have a general law which will simply say that when Congress means to do away with State laws the Congress shall say so. If your bill is going to correct one Supreme Court decision at a time, we are just neglecting our constitutional duty and we are placing just a shin plaster on a broken leg.

I do hope that the House will realize the situation and if we pass any law at all, let us pass a general law. If you are not willing to stand up and be counted on a general law to correct this situation which we all know is wrong, then let us fight the thing out. I would rather have nothing than a bill which merely corrects decision by decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. MASON. I agree entirely with the gentleman.

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

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I want to congratulate the gentleman for bringing to the House very classically his feeling about the Supreme Court. His observation is a very fine example of what a sensible layman thinks of that outfit now occupying the black robes of the Supreme Court. They are not any more lawyers than the man in the moon. State by State they are abolishing States. The latest were the States of Pennsylvania and New York. The gentleman says that no lawyers agree with them. Not a single self-respecting lawyer in this country has written an opinion justifying the segregation decision. The American Bar Association has an outstanding offer now to any lawyer who can justify that decision, and there are no takers.

Mr. Speaker, something has got to be done to stop that Supreme Court. They are a greater threat to this Union than the entire confines of Soviet Russia. If some way is not found to stop them, God help us.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I join in commending the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, not only for the brilliance and logic of his presentation, but also for having the courage to make it. I agree with the gentleman completely, of course, with reference to H. R. 3, and I trust that the Congress will pass that legislation prior to adjournment.

I have always considered strict adherence to the constitutional limitations imposed upon the Federal establishment and the rigid protection of the reserved rights of the States to be our strongest bulwarks against despotism. It is alarming, indeed, to find that an irresponsible Supreme Court is eating these bulwarks away as fast as they can.

If the States do not use legal constitutional right of interposition against these illegal attempts by the Supreme Court to amend the Constitution, and if Congress does not act to protect the rights of the States when they are assaulted in such decisions as in the Nelson case, then I predict that even this generation will live to see the day when individual human liberty and freedom

will become nothing more than a sacred memory.

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my commendations to those of the other gentlemen who have spoken for the splendid presentation made by my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MASON. All thinking Americans everywhere, who really love this county, in every single one of the 48 States of the American Union should be grateful for the remarks you made in this House here today.

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for the fine statement he has made. About 10 days ago one of the most distinguished lawyers in America, a former president of the American Bar Association, appeared before our committee and made the statement that 98 percent of the good lawyers of America had no respect for the legal ability of the present members of the Supreme Court. This is a sad situation in this country, when the leaders of the bar feel that way toward the present members of the Court.

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the gentleman that he has made a wonderful contribution to our form of government here today. I certainly join with him in the hope that the position he is taking is going to spread like wildfire all over our great country while there is yet time. I am sure that the gentleman knows that our Supreme Court some time ago made the statement that there were no restraints whatsoever upon them except those that they imposed upon themselves. Now, I know that the gentleman disputes that, and so do I, because we have a Constitution, and that Court is bound by the Constitution the same as you and I. Now, I might also say to the gentleman that 1 or 2 years ago there was a bill introduced and passed in the Senate which came over to our Committee on the Judiciary, and I say to the distinguished gentleman that, if I never do anything else whatsoever during the time that I am in Congress, I will always thank God that I was permitted to be here and to read that bill and to lead the fight to kill it, because that bill provided that the Supreme Court would have appellate jurisdiction on all constitutional questions of both law and fact, period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuing this matter further, I want to say to the gentleman that thank God our present Constitution provides that the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction on all constitutional questions, both law and fact, subject to such exceptions and regulations as this Congress might make. What I am saying to the gentleman is that a year or two ago there was a bill which would have deprived this Congress of the power to make any exceptions or any regulations. We have that power now and it is time for the Members of Congress to rise up and exercise that power under the duty and responsibility that they owe to the people of the United States. I thank God that the gentleman is in the vanguard. I appreciate that.

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add, for whatever it is worth, my little contribution to what has already been said about the splendid statement made by the gentleman from Illinois, a gentleman whose actions in this House I have long watched with much approbation.

What I wanted to say to the gentleman is this, that it is most refreshing to see that the gentleman, from one of our so-called Northern States, has so much in common with so many from the so-called Southern States here today.

Mr. MASON. May I interject this comment, that the last decision in the Pennsylvania case and the decision in the New York case and the one in the natural-gas case affect the whole country, not merely the South. It is only that one case that seems to apply to the South more than the North.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman has stated what I was trying to lead up to. The constitutional provision providing a tripartite division of the functions of Government is not something that only the South believes in. It is something upon which this great and glorious Republic was built, and on which it has thrived and prospered. The point I am trying to make is that it is so encouraging to see a stalwart American such as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] rise here and expound the views that some of us from my section of the country perhaps expound too much, if that be possible. Perhaps, sometimes, there are those who think that we, from my section, feel that we have a monopoly in the field of maintaining State sovereignty.

I agree with the gentleman in his references to the bill which has been under discussion here briefly, H. R. 3, by the very distinguished and outstanding statesman of this Congress, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I introduced a similar bill, but it is his bill and I am not trying to take any credit for that. But that bill does not affect the South any more than it affects Illinois, New York, or any other State. It attempts to raise the "halt" sign—the "stop, look, and listen" sign for the Supreme Court to see. This Congress, if it believes in what we talk about so much, in a division of the powers of Government and in the sovereignty of the several States, had better do something about it and just quit this lip service.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend and stalwart colleague, a great American, for the contribution he has made here today.

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentleman.

THE STATE OF ISRAEL EIGHTH ANNIVERARY OF INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, today the people of Israel celebrate the eighth anniversary of their independence. On this occasion, I want to extend best wishes to this new nation and to her energetic people and leaders. I want to commend them for the remarkable achievements and progress in the establishment of a strong and democratic state in an area—the Middle East—which has been and remains to be of vital importance to the free world. It is satisfying indeed to reflect that the United States and her citizens have contributed moral support as well as material support to the young Republic of Israel to enable her to achieve a certain degree of the economic stability that is so vital for a healthy democracy. Today after 8 years of hard work, the people of Israel continue in their endeavors to prove that their new nation is worthy of its membership in the international community of free nations.

The history of the Jewish people has been a continuous struggle for freedom, peace, and security. It has been a history of oppression and persecution—most recently, by totalitarian dictatorships. Now in the 20th century, after many long years of suffering, they have once again acquired freedom and have been able to fulfill their hopes and cherished dreams in the establishment of a Jewish homeland.

But as the Jewish people seem to have fulfilled their dreams we find that the Communists, experts and past masters of creating tournaments of hate in every area offering an opportunity for maximum disorder, not only offer arms, but economic aid as well, in an effort to establish themselves in the Middle East. So another threat has been added to the existence of a Jewish homeland.

Since 1948, when the Jews won their independence on the battlefield, many cultural, social, and economic feats have been accomplished by the new republic of the Middle East. The dreams of yesterday have become the realities of today. The displaced Jews of Europe have been absorbed and amalgamated in the new state. They have been provided with jobs in an expanding economy. They have been given the opportunity to make a new life for themselves and

their families. They have been given a different outlook on life which holds more encouraging prospects for the future.

In its short period of existence, the Republic of Israel has made notable progress in industry and agriculture. Since 1948, population has increased from 650,000 to 1,789,000. Her industrial output has increased each year—1955 output 12 percent above 1954, with 76 new industries established in first 9 months of 1955. It has been successful in providing new farmlands for its increasing population. New crops such as cotton and peanuts helped raise farm production by more than one-third last year. By their ingenuity, the Jews have succeeded in changing barren lands into productive food-raising centers. The transportation system which plays such an important part in the economy of a nation has also been improved. A 48-mile railroad was completed last year, connecting the Negev with Jerusalem and the port of Haifa. All of these programs are to the credit of this new democracy and give testimony to the fact that the people of Israel are dynamic and progressive. Their nation, with the highest living standard in the Middle East, is worthy of being called a true modern democratic state, and entitled to its place in the family of nations under international law.

My remarks thus far have been directed toward the accomplishments and the successes that Israel, with her limited resources, has achieved during her short existence. But what does the future hold for this determined nation? What are the problems she will have to face and overcome in order to prosper? Unfortunately, they are many, and some are most complex.

Probably the most difficult problem of Israel today is the problem of defending its borders. Although the Israelis won the war for their independence in 1948 and signed an armistice agreement with the Arabs, the fighting has not stopped. The Israelis live in the constant fear that the Arabs will provoke further hostilities which will only lead to more unnecessary bloodshed. Since 1948, there have been several border incidents which make this fear even more real. The recent purchase of arms by the Arabs from the Communist bloc has added to the danger. Is it any wonder the leaders of a newly created state, if they are rational, should take cognizance of these facts and attempt to arm their own homeland—a homeland which has taken so many trying years to achieve? Therefore, in an effort to defend their borders, the officials of the Israeli Government requested permission from the United States to buy certain defensive arms. It has been over 3 months now, since this request was first made, and the State Department has yet to give either a "Yes" or "No" answer. While our State Department takes the request under advisement the Communists are active and the Soviet Union, studying closely all the varying interests in every Near East country, continues in its policy of creating unrest and tensions in the area by playing one faction against the other. Long have they been expert in appraising and evaluating conditions which readily admit of creating a maximum of disorder. The Communists have applied a new tactic in their efforts to further international communism and dominate the world. This time they offer not only arms, but economic aid as well, in an effort to establish themselves in the Middle East. While the Communists are making these moves and furthering their own cause, the State Department has yet to create or put into practice any countering plans to keep the Middle East in the Western camp. If something is not done soon, the consequences will be grim at best. Time is of the utmost importance—at this very moment and hour it is working to the advantage of the Communists and the disadvantage of the West. The loss of the Middle East with all of its vast resources and strategic location, if it should ever come, will have a tremendous effect. If it is to avoid disaster, the West must counter the moves of the Soviet Union.

In February 1956, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on conditions in the Middle East, Secretary of State Dulles stated that Israel could not win an arms race with the Arabs. The Secretary of State based this statement on the fact that Israel is small in both size and in population and that the Arabs, numbering some 40 millions, have access to large stocks of armaments from the Communist-bloc nations. What this line of reasoning overlooks is that determination, skills, and weapons are more important in modern war than mere numbers. Israel itself demonstrated this when it fought for and won its independence in 1948. It seems to me that one sure way to bring about war in the Middle East is to let the Arabs get so far ahead of Israel in armaments, that they would be tempted by the thought of an easy victory. Our Secretary of State should immediately grant to the State of Israel the $50 million worth of armaments which she needs for her vital defense.

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

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

Mr. CELLER. If the admonitions of our Secretary of State are cogent then we have no right to offer any aid whatsoever to the small nation presided over by Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa, because the population of Formosa is a minuscule in comparison to that of Red China on the mainland.

Mr. BOYLE. I thank my distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee for that very pointed analogous observation.

A second problem confronting Israel today is that posed by the Arab refugees. This is one of the main factors of contention between the Israelis and her Arab neighbors. The Arabs have charged that Israel displaced 900,000 Arabs and that she has refused to either invite them back or to pay a just compensation for the loss of their land. The Republic of Israel has shown good faith in this matter by offering to discuss the problem with the Arabs, but thus far, the Israeli proposal has fallen on deaf ears. The Arab States continue not to recognize the independent State of Israel—which was created by the United Nations—and continue to refuse to enter into any discussions which might resolve the factors of contentions on both sides. If these discussions could be approached with sincerity by both parties, they could lead to an easing of the growing tensions and bring about stability to an area that is vital to the free world.

Third, too long have some irresponsible Arab leaders themed and oversold the nonsensical stated objective of extirpating the Jewish State. This insidious aim is impossible of accomplishment but having fanned the fires of hatred for political and selfish reasons they now find themselves enmeshed in its conflagration and they are in fact its very prisoners.

Lastly, the State of Israel is confronted with the problem of expanding her economy in the fields of industry and agriculture. Israel has accomplished feats that might almost be called miraculous. This success is due primarily to her dynamic and resourceful people. Their aim is to establish their nation on a firm footing so that it might support its own economy, and they are willing to make sacrifices to accomplish this goal.

In the past Israel has suffered from the Arab boycott and blockade, which has forced her to use too much of her foreign exchange income by trading elsewhere. Because of the boycott, furthermore, firms operating in the Arab States hesitate to do business with Israel. Despite these obstacles, however, Israel is beginning to overcome her economic problems. Although she has made great progress, much is still to be done. Of her current foreign exchange requirements, Israel earns only about two-fifths. There is thus a need to utilize her resources more fully and to develop her industries.

All of these tasks will take time, but the courageous people of Israel have the drive and determination and intensity of purpose that is needed. They will, I am sure, succeed in their aim to make the new Republic of Israel a self-supporting nation, free and secure, and in so doing they will assist in the development of the resources of the entire region and make it prosperous and proof against Communist infiltration.

In closing I would like to include the following telegrams received today from some of the Jewish leaders of my community:

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 15, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As president of organization Machne Israel, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land auspices of his eminence, Chief Rabbi Meracham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

MACHNE ISREAL,
1535 West Touhy Avenue.
Rabbi S. HECHT,
Director.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 15, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of congregation Kehilas Jacob Beth Shmuel, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and school in the Holy Land auspices of his eminence Chief Rabbi Menachan Schneersohn head of Lubavitcher Chasidic movement which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer, in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institution in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION KEHILAS JACOB BETH SHMUEL,
3701 West Devon.
Rabbi JOSEPH KAGAN,
SAMUEL T. COHEN, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 16, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of Congregation Shaarei Tfilo Anshei Maariv which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of his eminence Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institution in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION SHAAREI TFILO ANSHEI MAARIV,
1234 West Devon Avenue.
Rabbi B. ROSENTHAL,
ISIDORE TAITZ, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 15, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE:

As rabbi and president of Congregation Beth David, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of His Eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION BETH DAVID,
4900 North Bernard.
Rabbi LAZAR MEISELS.
SIDNEY GENZ, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 16, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of Congregation Anshei Motele, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of his eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION ANSHEI MOTELE,
6520 North California Avenue.
Rabbi L. KAPLAN,
JACOB KOHN, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 16, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of Congregation Yisroel which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of his eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic Movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION OF YISROEL,
4610 North Kedzie Avenue,
Rabbi D. LIEBERMAN,
LOUIS BELL, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 16, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of congregation Beth Jacob of Albany Park, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of His Eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institution in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION BETH JACOB OF ALBANY PARK,
4920 North Kimball Avenue.
Rabbi HASKELL LEHRFIELD.
BEN STIEBEL, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 16, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of Congregation Anshei Lubavitch, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of his eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April. 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

CONGRESSMAN AMSHEI LUBAVITCH,
7424 North Paulina Street.
Rabbi S. HECHT,
JACOB KARZ, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 16, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of Congregation Agudas Chabad, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of his eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION AGUDAS CHABAD,
5021 North Winthrop Avenue.
Rabbi HAROLD SHUSTERMAN,
MAX MARCUS, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 16, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of congregation Beth Hamidroch Keser Mariv Anshei Luknik, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of His Eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Habidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION BETH HAMIDROSH KESER MARIV ANSHEI LUKNIK,
6418 North Greenview Avenue.
Rabbi ZEV WEIN,
M. MOSHEL, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 16, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of Congregation Lev Semach, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of his eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION LEV SEMACH,
5555 North Bernard.
Rabbi H. TWERSKY.
SAM FISHMAN, *President.*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, today is the eighth anniversary of the founding of the infant State of Israel. Israel represents 8 years of heroic acts, 8 years of unremitting efforts, 8 years of unique achievements amidst triumphs, frustrations, hopes, and deferred hopes fulfilled. And all this has been accompanied by a wondrous courage on the part of her people, a wondrous faith and a great determination, a determination as firm as the rock you hold in your hands. But, of course, Israel, a land of history has now had history gathered back under it for permanent abode.

Not all is good in Israel and not all is bad. To each obverse there is a reverse. But if tremendous faith and hard work and courage are the criteria, then the metal that eventually will emerge from the mold will be brighter than Israel's own Mediterranean Sea.

I have been there, and I have seen much of Israel. The Israelis had a shortage of food, yet they fed more. They had little of clothes, yet they clothed more. They fretted how they could house everyone, yet they opened the door to more, and those portals have never been closed to the driven Jew theretofore cast about throughout the nations for centuries like dried leaves before the chilly autumn's blasts. It is a story, indeed, that tugs at one's heart and only the heartless can remain indifferent and only the selfish can refuse to look with kindly eye.

I was at a farm over there and I saw wondrous potatoes being grown. I said to the farmer, "With what do you mix your soil that you can get those potatoes which rival our own Idaho and Maine potatoes?" His answer was simple. His answer was "brains, that is what we mix our soil with." And because of the use of ingenuity and resourcefulness the Israelis have done much in that short space of 8 years.

They have even developed an Atomic Energy Commission. They have developed new processes for developing and utilizing solar energy. They extract energy from the sun and are manipulating with that energy small engines. I could go on and tell you of the vast resourcefulness and the technological know-how of these people.

But, unfortunately, they are surrounded by bellicose and extremely hostile neighbors. The frontiers are everywhere. Look out, you are told, that hill is in Syria. Do not go near it. Be careful that you do not cross the Mandelbaum gate between Jerusalem and Jordan. But, that gate is merely a railroad gate. At Acre I was told, "Be careful. This path leads to Lebanon. We do not travel that path at dusk. It is too close to the frontier of Syria, and it is dangerous to get too close. You may be sniped at by hostile Arabs." And, we now hear of the terrible plight of the Israelis as the result of the letting loose into Israel of the so-called commando squads, the suicide squads of the Arabs.

And I read to you from a press dispatch. It is called Death in Schoolhouse:

> In a small schoolhouse in Shafrir, a group of teen-aged boys were standing stiffly erect, reading their evening prayers. Out of the darkness, three figures crept silently onto the schoolhouse porch. One of them edged forward and kicked open the schoolhouse door. As it swung back, he raked the schoolroom with a burst of automatic fire. Three of the boys and their instructor were killed.

And many, many more of these lads, these innocent lads at prayer, have been wounded. This has been going on night after night in Israel, but the Israelis have shown wondrous restraint, a restraint that has elicited from United States Ambassador Edward B. Lawson, words of praise.

He said he was amazed at "Israel's patience and restraint in the face of continuing terror and night marauder squads." He said he hoped that the world appreciated Israel's behavior in this crisis.

Israel has asked for arms from the United States, but the United States, through a benighted policy, or in accordance with a benighted and shortsighted inequitable policy emanating from the White House and the State Department denies Israel's rights to purchase arms, although arms are being supplied to all the neighbors of Israel.

Even the United States has sent to Saudi Arabia, which has refused to enter into peace negotiations with Israel, tanks, the most modern tanks, and England and Czechoslovakia have supplied the most modern arms, including jet planes and Centurion tanks to Egypt and Iran and Iraq, which have refused to even enter into armistice agreements with Israel, much less peace negotiations. All of these Arab nations are well armed as the result of their purchases of arms from many countries in Europe, including Sweden and, now I am informed, Japan. Yet, Israel has its application for arms vetoed by the President. He said it would be an arms race if the United States supplied arms to Israel, but it would not be an arms race if Britain and France supplied arms. I cannot understand that upside-down logic if logic it is at all. It is just a lot of "malarkey" to say that there is no arms race if Britain and France supply arms to Egypt, but to Israel it is an arms race if the United States supplies arms. Well, this is a rather unusual arms race, if all the contestants sprint around the track at top speed save Israel. Israel is held down by shackles on her ankles at the very start of the race, when the President and Secretary of State Dulles with unhappy irony say that the United Nations will take care of you, dear little Israel. Until the United Nations could act, Israel would be destroyed. The United Nations debating society would take God knows how many days until it could come to any kind of conclusion, and I do not want to speculate as to what that conclusion may be. But, remember also, in the United Nations Russia has the veto power, and Russia is supplying these arms to Egypt.

So there is no recourse, so far as the cessation of Israel's travail is concerned, in the United Nations. It would be a hopeless application. When Israel is told, "Well, you should wait and maybe something will be done," it reminds me of a story of a pauper who lamented to his rabbi that his wife was sick and his children hungry. The rabbi said, "Go home, God will help you." That is what the rabbi assured him. The pauper said, "Thank you, rabbi. I am sure God will help, but until he does, will you lend me 5 rubles?"

That is what Israel wants, until help can come. Give her the arms so she can defend herself. She does not want United States Marines in close proximity to her land. She does not want foreign troops on her soil to fight her battle. She wants no foreign blood to be shed on her land. She wants herself to fight and she can fight if she is given the wherewithal, if she is given the arms to do so.

David Ben-Gurion, the very doughty Prime Minister of Israel, said in a news dispatch this morning that Egypt was planning to "slaughter" Israel and he called on the security forces to continue to deliver "two blows for one." He went on to say:

> A heavy responsibility toward the history of humanity has been assumed by powers that are supplying aggressive arms to the Egyptian dictator and also by those powers that deny defensive arms to Israel.

He meant thereby the United States. Also he said:

> The conscience of the great powers failed when the Nazi dictator sent to slaughter 6 million Jews of Europe. Will that conscience fail again now that this Egyptian dictator and his allies are planning to do the same thing to Israel in her own land?

You must remember, there is an old saying that on the plains of hesitation lie the countless bones of millions. It is because we hesitated when Hitler first showed his teeth and when Mussolini first showed signs of aggression and then invaded Ethiopia; when Hitler took over the Ruhr land and the iron and steel industries, that the results were tragic. Are we going to hesitate again in the case of this new dictator who is arising in Africa, whose ambition is to control the entire Near East and the Middle East if not the Far East? I remind the President and I remind Mr. Dulles of recent history when freedom bowed in fear before ruthlessness.

However, Colonel Nasser's successes to date are, we are told, merely the first act in the drama of glory which is to come. The Cairo press envisions an Egyptian empire surpassing the realm of the Pharaohs and the conquests of Mehemid Ali.

Yes, he is very ambitious. In the meanwhile, what are we doing in the face of that ambition and the marauding and rapine and plunder inspired by Nasser? I would say that our foreign policy vis-a-vis Egypt and Israel lacks forthrightness, lacks courage and is replete with hesitation. We seem to be frightened. We are constantly hesitant. Our failure to act may have most tragic consequences following in its train.

Dulles seems to be incapable of any firm decision. The price of drift is enormously dangerous. We are now told, in a recent dispatch, that the Sudan has made application for the purchase of arms from Czechoslovakia or Russia. That means that not only in Egypt but in the Sudan, adjacent to important British and French possessions, there will be Communist arms, because I can assure you that Czechoslovakia will send those arms into the Sudan. And in the meanwhile our Secretary of State does not know what to do. I think Fletcher Knebel had it right when he said the following:

> The Eisenhower team says it will fight aggression in the Middle East. However, there will be a slight pause while Secretary Dulles flips a coin to find out which side we are on.

I think that hits it right on the head. I do not think he knows himself what side he is on. I know what side he should be on. He should be on the side of democracy. Israel is the only democracy in the Near East and wherever that flame of democracy burns, we should do our utmost to nurture that flame of democracy, otherwise, it will be blotted out by Nasser and his gang. Yes, Mr. Dulles thinks that all evil including the Russian evil in the Middle East can be stopped by his lofty preachings and all the ballyhoo about moral precepts. All he does is hope for the best, or vaguely appeal to the United Nations. How long will the President dodge his responsibility in this regard and arm Israel? When will they cease taking refuge in mere words of ridiculous optimism and bland generality? Maybe if the President

played a little less golf and paid a little more attention to the serious functions of his office—and I say that advisedly—it is not an offhand statement on my part—and if Mr. Dulles sifted the situation most cautiously and with prudence and with an eye to humanity, maybe we would get some forthright action and arms would be sent to Israel presently in the most desperate plight.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] for giving me this opportunity, and for his foresight in getting an hour's time to discuss the question of Israel, particularly on the 8th anniversary of the founding of the first democracy in the Middle East—the free State of Israel.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the remarks of my friend and colleague, the distinguished Member from Illinois. Neither his sound and constructive remarks nor his eloquence can come as a surprise to those of us who have listened to him on past occasions.

On this eighth anniversary of the independence of Israel, it seems to me that it is a time for us, as a Nation, to refrain from the usual congratulatory platitudes and, instead, to reaffirm the fundamental principles upon which our friendship and support for the democratic State of Israel is based.

Eight short years ago, Israel came into existence through action taken by the United Nations, and with the concurrence of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union.

The nature of our friendship and the principle upon which it was established was reiterated in 1950 when the United States, with Great Britain and France, issued the tripartite agreement which, among other things, declared it to be the policy of the signatory nations to act either within the United Nations or jointly against agression in the Middle East. This agreement also spelled out the policy of maintaining a balance of armaments as between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

With this friendship and support, the prospects for Israel 6 years ago were bright indeed, but in the short span of less than a decade, the positions of both Israel and the United States in the Middle East have disintegrated beyond recognition. Our policy of impartial friendship toward the Arab nations and Israel has been reciprocated by growing suspicion, cynicism, and animosity. When we are willing to face facts, we will realize that we are being damned in some quarters and scoffed at in others for our lack of resolution, our loss of political courage, and our compromise of principle.

One development in the United States attitude toward the strife-torn Middle East is the State Department's current move to downgrade the tripartite agreement of 1950—in which these powers promised to take action within and without the United Nations to keep peace in Palestine. As short a time as 6 weeks ago, there followed from the Eisenhower-Eden conferences in Washington the general, if somewhat ambiguous, affirmation of the tripartite agreement, and only 2 weeks ago, President Eisenhower was emphasizing the importance and possibilities of that pact. But today, it is conspicuous only by its omission from practically all diplomatic conversation. The closest we have come was the recent statement on behalf of the President that "the United States is likewise determined to support and assist any nation which might be subjected to such aggression."

I sincerely question the scuttling of the tripartite agreement, because I believe it was based upon principle. All of us are aware that circumstances have altered radically in the Middle East since that agreement was signed, and that additional methods must be explored to prevent aggression in light of the changed circumstances.

In light of the emergence of the Soviet Union's influence in the Middle East, it is difficult to explain the all-out effort of the administration to handle the Israeli-Arab situation exclusively through the United Nations—where Russia holds the veto power as a member of the Security Council. While all of us share the hope that a solution may be found through the United Nations, there still remains the question of the character of United States leadership in coping with Mideast tensions and the nature of our policy in this area.

These are questions which at present lack any kind of definition. We seem resolved to avoid unpleasantness at any cost, even the abdication of principle upon which our leadership has been based. We are not willing to sell arms to Israel; yet, we make it plain that we have no objection to our allies doing so. So today, we find Saudi Arabia armed with Soviet jets, American tanks, and British artillery pieces. To offset this increasing military advantage, Israel must turn to France, of all nations, for needed defensive air strength. If this is the basis of our "impartial friendship," can we expect anything other than loss of face and rebuff throughout the Mideast and throughout the world?

The time has come to speak plainly and to again return to the kind of principle for which the United States has long been respected. The problems ahead of us are complex and difficult, but they will find no solution by our failure to meet them forthrightly and honestly. It is time that our policy in the Middle East be made known not only to the nations involved in that area, but to the American people as well.

Until we do this, felicitations to the gallant State of Israel upon her eighth anniversary of independence will be hollow indeed.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am most happy to have this opportunity to join with my distinguished colleague from California in expressing by sincerest friendship and encouragement to the people of Israel on this 8th anniversary of their independence. The gallant State of Israel can be everlastingly proud of its achievements, as they recall their desperate bid for independence and international recognition 8 years ago. Born out of the utmost adversity, the Israeli nation has grown and strengthened itself during these short 8 years in a manner which has astounded the world and heartened all believers in democratic institutions.

It is particularly appropriate at this moment for the friends of the Israeli people to signify their desire to see them continue their inspiring struggle to create a thriving democratic nation in an area replete with deterrents to such an enterprise. In addition to the natural drawbacks of their desert land and their unavoidably inflated rate of immigration, the Israeli people must contend along their entire frontiers with hostile Arab neighbors. In their economic relations with other countries they are severely handicapped by the boycotts and restrictions of the Arab bloc, which sits astride the Suez Canal. Under such conditions the determination of the Israeli people to demonstrate to all the world the permanence of their magnificent accomplishments has remained unwavering.

I wish to pay tribute to this determination, as well as to the economic and political accomplishments which it has fostered. My views on the imperative need for the United States to prevent any aggressor from destroying Israel are clearly on record. The balance of military capabilities between the Arab bloc and Israel should not be permitted to tip in favor of a restless and ambitious set of military leaders. It is encouraging to see our President go on record to put more teeth into the tripartite policy of Britain, France, and the United States to prevent any aggression in the Middle Eastern area from succeeding. It is also important that we are working through the United Nations to the same purpose. It is the hope of all freedom-loving people that no aggression will ever be attempted. It is my personal hope and desire that the State of Israel will continue to prosper in the next 8 years of its independence in a fashion far superior to the past time of troubles, and I look forward to tributes being paid to this intrepid and inspiring nation on its Independence Day for as long as this House continues to meet.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate greatly the opportunity of following the two distinguished addresses which have been made here today congratulating the State of Israel on its eighth anniversary of freedom and inde-

pendence. It would seem to me that it is quite significant that the first gentleman who spoke, the gentleman from Illinois, represents one of the great districts in the Middle West, coming as he does from the great city of Chicago, and that the gentleman who has just preceded me represents a district from one of the greatest cities in the world, New York City, on the east coast of our country, and I have the privilege of representing a district from the west coast in the city of Los Angeles. It seems fitting, indeed, that Israel should know that her support comes from every part of our great country and it is most important, I believe, in these days when she faces such trials and tribulations that everyone who has the opportunity to do so should send her not only best wishes but should send her the knowledge of our determination to stand behind her and not to let her down in her most difficult hour. We should not forget—we Americans—that we were the first nation to grant recognition to the newest of all democratic nations, the State of Israel. It would seem to me a great shame that, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has so eloquently stated, our policy today before the world is one of confusion; is one which is worse than confusion, because it gives help and encouragement to the enemies of democracy. How can we who joined with France and Great Britain in the tripartite agreement of 1950 say to our allies "It is all right for you to go ahead and give arms to the State of Israel but we will not do it." It is an open secret that the reason we have given for such a mistaken policy is that we are afraid that any action on our part might bring Russia into the picture in the Middle East. How dense and how stupid can we be? Russia is already in the Middle East. It is her technicians, it is the arms of her satellites who are today causing all of the disturbance that in a word we fear a third world war might start.

In this country we have voted billions of dollars under the principle that if one remains strong enough we defer aggressive military action by our enemies, and yet when it comes to the state of Israel we have turned around and done exactly the opposite. Here we hope perhaps reasonableness and sweetness and a fair sense of justice will be enough to deter aggression against the tiny state of Israel. We know better than that, and it is time we began to practice what we preach. I believe with all my heart that if those who will look at the broad picture will only begin to realize it, Russia is in the Middle East because she wants to take advantage of the tremendous hatred on the part of the Arabs against the democratic institutions of that little but brave and wonderful state; that she wants to go further than that and she wants to wipe out all of the American Air Force bases in North Africa, within Arab countries, which are today the great protection that we in America have against any aggressive attitude on the part of the Russian authorities. This is a bigger question than just Israel itself. It comes down to the long last hope to avert war and to establish peace. But under the leadership of the present administration there has been seemingly no consciousness of what has already taken place and what can take place if we do not quickly determine to stand by the State of Israel and let the whole world know it, so that there can be no question that any act of aggression will result in instantaneous action on our part.

How discouraging our present policy must be to those people who have to suffer indignities and terrors, which the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] so brilliantly described. How discouraging it must be to be told that America may move if Congress can be summoned quickly enough to pass the necessary legislation. How her people must feel who know that it takes 8 minutes to fly from Cairo to the cities of Israel—8 minutes to drop a bomb that will wipe out almost all vestige of a civilization which has been built up by the sweat and by the courage and by the sacrifices of the men and women of Israel. Those 8 minutes will not wait. Those 8 minutes that might destroy all the hopes of democracy in the area where democracy must grow if eventually we are to have a buffer against the despotism of that great giant to the north.

So I say that in this time when we give happy birthday greetings to the State of Israel we give it with the hope that our country may soon come forward with the same kind of encouragement which came to us as a tiny nation and that when that encouragement comes that we will be able to give the signal to the whole world that we are working at last toward a permanent and lasting peace throughout the world under a system of liberty and freedom for all men everywhere.

I congratulate the gentleman from Illinois for what he has said, and I hope that his words and those of others who will speak today will have effect in our country and will convey a sense not only of our gratitude for what has been done so bravely by the people of Israel, but may also carry to them the determination of many of us that Israel shall not fall, and that we shall do our part to sustain her in the years to come.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], has asked that his remarks be incorporated in the RECORD at this point. I therefore request that this may be done.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am aghast at the outrages that are being perpetrated on the State of Israel, 8 years old today, and the good men and women of that land, who are striving with vision, determination and unsurpassed bravery to build a fortress of democracy in that troubled area in the pattern of our own great democracy. Israel's cause is our cause. If we permit Israel, sorely beset by ruthless enemies, to fall we will not be guiltless of responsibility for one of the catastrophic tragedies of history. In Israel is a government, like our own, that respects the dignity of man and the divine purpose in the creation of man. It stands in its zone of influence for the things for which we in our zone stand. Any blow struck at Israel is a blow struck at us.

I am glad that my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] has obtained this time on the birthday of Israel in order that we here in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States can make our position as Israel's friend so crystal-clear and so militantly positive that all the world must take notice, and especially that part of the world now in conspiracy to wipe Israel from the face of the world. Let the enemies of Israel know once and for all that the United States stands determinedly between Israel and the execution of that diabolic conspiracy.

Mr. Speaker, I wish at this point to read four telegrams that were handed me as I left my office to come to this Chamber. The wording in all the telegrams is the same, the signatures only being different, but the message is so potent and commanding that it will stand being read four times. I wish that message to sink well into the minds of my colleagues. The oftener it is read the better.

MESSAGE FROM FOUR RABBIS

Here are the telegrams that pinpoint the dangers Israel is in, the diabolical lengths to which her enemies will go, and the need of firm and prompt action by the United States.

Congressman BARRATT O'HARA:

As rabbi and president of Congregation Amschod, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of his eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION AMSCHOD,
814 East 51st Street.
Rabbi MALVIN RUSH,
HAROLD ORLINSKI, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 16, 1956.*

Congressman BARRATT O'HARA,
Washington, D. C.:

As Rabbi and president of Congregation B'Nei Bezalel, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of his eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION B'NEI BEZALEL,
7549 South Phillips Avenue.
Rabbi EFRAIM PROMBAUN.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 13, 1965.*

Congressman BARRATT O'HARA,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of Congregation Beth Yosef, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of his eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we

register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION BETH YOSEF,
1508 East 70th Street.
Rabbi ZELIG STARR.
ISIDORE KORETZKY, *President,*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 16, 1956.*
Congressman BARRATT O'HARA,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of Torah Synagogue, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of his eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

TORAH SYNAGOGUE,
2357 East 75th Street.
Rabbi M. LITOFF.
H. ROSENSON, *President.*

EIGHT YEARS OLD TODAY

It was 8 years ago that the tiny State of Israel was proclaimed a new nation among the world's powers. Since then, it has been struggling for survival and development against tremendous odds, working amidst a swirl of pressures from the conflicting great powers on the one hand and a growing Arab nationalism on the other. The fact that the Israeli nation, however, has progressed in spite of these obstacles, modernizing and developing, makes us all very proud. We warmly congratulate the Israeli people on this triumphant record produced against such great odds.

In view of these achievements, it is heartbreaking that Israel finds herself today at the vortex of a crisis that threatens to embroil the entire world in war. Let us review briefly the events that have placed her in this position. First, the British, who had formerly had the task of holding the lid on the Middle East, underwent a steady dimunition of their power.

By virtue of the fact that the United States was the only nation in the West that had the requisite strength to take over this task of preserving our common interests, we Americans found ourselves abruptly projected into the role of leader in the Middle East as in other areas. Almost immediately, the United States realized that peace in the area could be built only on a stable balance of power. However, the tensions produced by the political fragmentation and internal instabilities made this difficult indeed to realize. The center of unrest within the area—that is, as distinguished from the threat of communism and the Soviet Union—was the situation that developed with the creation of the State of Israel.

ARABS WAR ON ISREAL

The Arabs met the Israelis with war. In 1949 Egypt, and eventually the States of Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria, signed U. N.-sponsored armistices with Israel. Peace, however, was not forthcoming with the truce, and the anti-Israeli campaign of the Arabs was increasingly more belligerent and destructive. In the absence of an effective peace settlement, the United States, Great Britain, and France signed a tripartite resolution in 1950 in which it was acknowledged that the Arab States and Israel needed to maintain a certain level of armed forces for internal security, legitimate self-defense, and a participation in the defense of the area as a whole. In point 3 of this tripartite declaration the three Governments further stated the following terms: "should they"—the United States, France, and Britain—"find that any of these states was preparing to violate frontiers or armistice lines, they 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." This resolution, however, which was intended to prevent the type of situation which has recently developed, never had teeth put into it, and it has been gradually fading into the background. It seems to me that the United States has failed in the Middle East, that its actions have actually had the effect of encouraging the Arabs to believe that they can start a new war with Israel without fear of effective interference. In calling for peace by negotiation under U. N. auspices yet failing to make a resort to arms unprofitable by announcing our determination to give the tripartite declaration teeth, we lead the Arabs—and the Soviets—to think we will not act until too late.

The British have made the tripartite declaration fundamental to their Middle Eastern policy, as we all agreed to do, and are apparently prepared to back it up. According to recent news dispatches they are now beginning to fear that inadequate United States support of that declaration has served to undermine the whole Western position. In the meantime, the Soviet Union has been encouraged by our indecisive stand and doubtless anticipates a war from which she can profit in her usual way.

WAR TO AVOID BIG WAR

It seems to me that if we are to avoid the big war we must avoid or limit small ones. In these days of crisis diplomacy when world powers must make mature and sure decisions practically on the spur of the moment, there must be agreement on basic foreign policy objectives operating within an area and our leadership must be firm. In the area of the Middle East, especially in regard to Israel, the United States must accept the responsibilities incurred from our original advocacy for the creation of a new nation-state.

Today, as never before, the United States must support the Israeli nation and people in their moment of greatest trial. It is no time for weak gestures and tongue-in-both-cheeks conversation. We are on Israel's side and all the world should know it.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of inserting their remarks on this subject at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of the founding of the new democratic, freedom-loving State of Israel in the land of Palestine is a notable event for the world, and for America where so many of her citizens look to Israel as their spiritual homeland.

The joy with which such an event should be celebrated is, however, tinged with sadness by the dark shadows which now overhang the Middle East. We know, however, that America is taking effective steps to help dispel those shadows; and we are confident that Israel will have the glorious future so richly deserved because of the fortitude, sacrifice, and patriotism of her people.

Two recent visits to Israel have enabled me to witness in person the remarkable developments in this land. Here the people are taming the deserts and the rocky hillsides much as American frontiersmen developed our own country.

Those visits enabled me also to see the physical aspect of the country and to appreciate the value to this small republic of every acre of land within its borders; to appreciate that frontier disputes which might be of relatively small consequence to larger nations are of the utmost consequence to this smaller nation; to realize the difficulties of defense in a land where in meeting hostile attack, there can be no retreat from the frontiers.

For these reasons, I have publicly urged that Israel be granted defensive arms, that the United States participate with other nations in a security pact covering that region, and that America be prepared to stand back of its policy of opposition to aggression in that area by granting advance authority for the use of force, if found necessary, by means of a Formosa-type declaration.

America wishes Israel well on this her day of anniversary, and hopes that Israel may yet receive that priceless gift, which has indeed become a word of greeting in that hospitable land—shalom, peace.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Israel's eighth anniversary as an independent and sovereign state comes at a crucial time. During the past year the situation in the Middle East has deteriorated badly, so that the area has been kept in a constant state of tension and its peoples know no peace. It all began when Egypt concluded an agreement with the Soviet bloc some 7 or 8 months ago to obtain the newest and most modern arms from the Communist countries. Since then the entire region has been in turmoil.

The military balance of this strategic area, which is so vital to our defense structure against any possible onslaught from communism in the future, has been upset by Egypt's action in giving Soviet Russia a foothold in the Middle East. For all practical purposes, Russia has made important inroads into the area and will not be easily or quickly dis-

lodged. Egypt and its opportunistic leaders will have to bear the full blame and responsibility for this deed, for which the free world may some day have to pay a big price.

The continuing grave crisis in the Middle East threatens the existence of Israel and, in fact, the peace and security of the free world. It is now exactly 8 years since that historic day, May 14, 1948, when Israel was established as an independent state. During these 8 years the people and the Government of the United States have given Israel material and moral support and have helped that little country to build a free and democratic society and way of life which is very much like ours. Close ties of friendship have been cemented between the two countries, so that today there is not the least doubt in anyone's mind that Israel is one of our best and most sincere allies in that part of the world.

In the present crucial situation, we cannot ignore Israel's plight, nor can we afford to stand aloof when its very existence is being threatened by an aggressive neighbor who opened the door of the Middle East to Communist Russia. The Arab leaders maintain that they desire peace in the Middle East, yet they refuse to enter into peace negotiations with Israel. Their lip service and uncompromising attitude is only encouraging Soviet Russia to exploit every opportunity for further intrusion into the area—an intrusion from which the Arab people will be the first to suffer.

On several occasions during the past few months I have urged the United States Government to adopt a firmer policy in the Middle East and to end the policy of appeasement of the Arabs. The more we appease the Arabs, the less support we get from them. The more material aid we give to Egypt, to Saudi Arabia and to Syria, the less respect they seem to have for us.

This firmer stand on our part should be expressed in another way, that is, to make available to Israel the necessary arms for legitimate self-defense in the event of aggression from her Arab neighbors. It does not make sense when we provide arms to Iraq and Saudi Arabia, but we refuse to sell arms to Israel. This is not impartiality, but it constitutes a very definite and partial pro-Arab attitude. This is not the traditional American policy in that area and is not what the American people want.

On the occasion of Israel's eighth anniversary of its independence, we in the United States take note of this event with great pride because of the important role played by our country in the creation of the State of Israel and in helping it achieve a more solid economic foundation during these 8 years. We have found in Israel a devoted ally to the cause of freedom. We wish for the people of Israel that the year ahead may be a year of peace, security, and happiness.

I extend my sincerest greetings to the government and people of Israel and pray that their efforts to attain genuine peace may be realized in the very near future, so that they may continue to build up their ancient homeland. I also send my greetings to the Jews of America who deserve much praise for their continued help to Israel, for their moral and material support which is in itself a glorious chapter in the annals of humanitarianism.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of real pleasure to join with my colleagues to the State of Israel as it observes its eighth anniversary of statehood.

It is most fitting that at this time we extend our hand in a symbolic gesture of everlasting friendship to the gallant people of Israel. We have watched with pride as the State of Israel has labored arduously to develop into a strong and free nation, and we have thrilled at its magnificent progress during its brief existence. We are saddened today at the troubles which have come upon the Israeli people. They are a people in jeopardy, a nation exposed to the gravest peril. Their cause is our cause—the universal cause of freedom and justice.

Our course is clear. We must act with dispatch and with energy. We must support Israel for the sake of peace and decency among nations. Let us approach this problem on the high plane of prudent statesmanship and farsighted diplomacy and muster all the energies within us to resolve this dispute honorably and wisely.

More than just a small, independent nation is involved in this Middle Eastern crisis. To be sure America has a strong sense of moral compulsion to safeguard Israel. We have watched hopefully while that young independent nation grew and prospered since her declaration of independence in 1948. But our interests extend to far broader dimensions than the borders of Israel. Our own national interest is involved in this crisis.

It is vital that we act decisively to end the threat of war in the Near East. The American people will not tolerate anything so immoral as the sacrifice of Israel to Communist infiltration of the Near East.

As we send our warmest greetings to the State of Israel on this eighth anniversay, may she be heartened and encouraged by the knowledge that the sympathy and support of the American people are with her in this hour of grave danger to her continued existence as a free and valiant nation.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having this opportunity to extend to the people of Israel my most sincere congratulations on the anniversary of the founding of their country. Eight years ago today, the State of Israel came into being—the final culmination of centuries of earnest hope and prayer.

The world will long remember the valiant struggle for freedom which led to their declaration of independence when the new State of Israel was established just 8 years ago. It is not necessary for me to go into the history of the political struggle of the Jews in Palestine to establish their new homeland. That has already been done by other speakers here in the House of Representatives today. It is, however, well to recall that in accordance with the decision of the United Nations in November 1947, the territory that was mandated was to be divided into a Jewish and an Arab State. This mandate ended in 1948 and the youngest democracy in the world, the State of Israel then declared its independence.

The progress made by this new democratic country since that date has indeed been phenomenal. The new nation can well be proud of the courage it has displayed in hewing to the line laid down for it by its founding fathers. We, too, have a right to share in that pride by virtue of the contribution we in the United States, Jews and Christians alike, have made to insure the successful launching of the Israeli ship of state. We must, however, in justice continue our efforts to guarantee that Israel, the one country in the Middle East that has proven itself steadfast in the fight for democracy, shall not fall before the critical onslaught with which she is presently faced. For such to happen would be an international tragedy.

It was with this thought in mind that on December 27 of 1955 I wrote to the President of the United States as follows:

> The furnishing of large quantities of Communist arms to Egypt has created a grave crisis in the Middle East and threatens not only the very existence of the State of Israel but poses a distinct threat to world peace.
>
> The situation appears to be worsening with each passing day. The free world cannot afford to let Israel, the single bastion of democracy in the Near East, become another Korea. It cannot afford to allow the Communists to gain a foothold in the Middle East. The United States must take direct and positive action to counteract the gravity of the pending situation and prevent the conflagration of large-scale war in that area.
>
> I strongly urge (1) that the United States take immediate steps to maintain the balance of power in the Middle East by furnishing the necessary arms to Israel for self-defense and (2) that the United States offer to enter into mutual-security pacts with both Israel and the Arab States, guaranteeing the borders of those countries.

Since the date of my letter to the President, the threat to Israel has increased and the tension and possibility of armed warfare greatly aggravated. I am convinced that this Soviet action poses a distinct threat, not only to Israel, but to our own national interest as well. I believe that it is in the best interests of the United States that immediate action be taken by this country to maintain the balance of power in the Middle East. Our entire heritage and tradition tells us that we must stand with the free nations of the world.

We must not turn our backs on the people of Israel who so desperately need our help.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, today the people of Israel are observing their eighth anniversary as a free and independent nation. I am happy to salute her and it is gratifying to know that millions of my fellow Americans send their best wishes and greetings to the new state on this occasion.

Israel has concluded 8 years of extreme hardship, struggle against overwhelming odds, enmity and aggression by her neighbors. Although she has not been permitted to enjoy peace, for which she

has begged, she has managed to hold her own. She has made tremendous strides in building her economy, reclaiming lands, developing her agricultural program, and expanding her industries in spite of the fact that she has had to deflect a major portion of her assets, resources, and manpower to the building of her defenses against enemy neighbors who have sworn her defeat and extinction.

We cannot use the word celebrate in connection with Israel's eighth anniversary for she is now in her darkest hour. The threat of war was never more ominous; her enemies are mightily armed. The small State of Israel stands alone and, in view of the military might of her aggressors, defenseless. So, in this time of crisis, Israel needs more than our expressions of friendship; she needs our help, she needs our prayers.

At this point, when the moral isolation of Israel has been very largely achieved, it will be of great comfort to her citizens to know that they have the good wishes of encouragement and the prayers of so many Americans. The Israelis have a right to a homeland; Americans recognize their right to have peace in their homeland. This is our opportunity to let her know of our confidence in her prowess as a state, in the courage and ideals of her citizens, and our conviction that Israel is here to stay. It is going to stay. The American people, who helped create Israel, who were the first to recognize her, and who hold warm feelings of friendship for her, are going to see to it that she stays.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a new country is being built today in the heart of the most ancient cradle of civilization. Israel is a pioneer land. Looking back into our own history, we are proud that our country offered a haven to the persecuted and an opportunity for those seeking a better life. Now, in the mid-20th century, it is Israel which is a citadel of hope and opportunity for the oppressed and the ill-advantaged. More than that, Israel, like our own country, is a bastion of the democratic heritage. There is no question in my mind but that Israel's devotion to political freedom has been the cornerstone of all her progress in her 8 years of independence, for it has inspired the support of her own people, and of people all over the world, for the great material advances of less than a decade. It is this same dedication to freedom which makes Israel such a stanch ally of the United States today. In these days of tension, the American people will never lose sight of this basic fact.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in these grim days of tension in the Middle East, it is most fitting to mark the eighth anniversary of the founding of the independent State of Israel and to hail the advancements which the people of this democratic outpost in the strategically important area have made in these 8 short years.

Israel today stands as a model of enlightened progress in the spirit of free democratic government. The evil forces of world communism are attempting to destroy this symbol of democracy by incitement of the racial and nationalistic prejudices of its neighbors. Israel has stood firm for freedom and resisted the blandishments of the Communists. It has also fiercely resisted harassing border raids from its hostile neighboring countries and has reaffirmed its intention of maintaining at all costs its freedom and territorial integrity won in bitter conflict only a few short years ago.

The United States played an important role in the founding and recognition of Israel as an independent nation. Under the Tripartite Declaration of 1950, our Nation recognized the importance of military preparedness among both the Arab States and Israel, in the defense of their own nations against aggression. Military assistance has been given to the anti-Communist nations of the Middle East in the past. But the threat posed to the continued independence of Israel by the recent shipment of arms from Communist Czechoslovakia to the Egyptian Government raises a serious new problem which must be met by the United States in a positive and decisive manner. We must face this immediate crisis by making available supplies and weapons for the defense of Israel by its embattled citizens.

Our Nation has a significant opportunity to demonstrate to the world its determination to assist free peoples in the defense of their homeland, while at the same time offering to all the downtrodden peoples of the Middle East a positive alternative to the Communist efforts to sacrifice them in another move for world conquest.

We must renew our efforts to erase the age-old marks of poverty, misery, sickness, and economic exploitation which still haunt these peoples and nations. We must convince them that the bright new tomorrow which they seek does not lie down the road toward war against Israel, with the blind and forlorn hopes of economic reward and plunder. Instead, we must make every possible effort to channel their fierce nationalism and desire for economic abundance along the road toward the constructive realization of these goals, through self-help, technical assistance, and economic rebuilding programs.

In this way we can reveal the true intent of the calculated Soviet power manuever in the Middle East in all of its cold-blooded deceit and cynical promises and win a smashing victory for the free world in its struggle against Communist imperialism.

Israel, the people of the United States commend you for your valor and high resolve in the name of freedom. We salute you for your significant accomplishments in these past 8 years. We pledge ourselves to strengthen your people in our common struggle and to make every effort to assist in the preservation of your hard-won freedom and independence.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in the tribute that Members of this House are paying today to the gallant nation of Israel on her 8th anniversary. It would be a far happier occasion if, in paying our tribute, we could see, for the people of Israel, a time of peace and mutually beneficial relations with neighboring nations as they begin this, the 9th year of their existence as a nation. But we can see no such prospect. Surrounded by hostile nations dedicated to her destruction, this small but brave nation has endured in the past several weeks some of the worst depredations of her short but war-torn existence. Lawless and brutal gangs have invaded even the quiet of children at prayer to wipe out young lives in this terrible contest.

Yet we can and should, I think speak some words of hope to this gallant nation today. We too were once a small and struggling people, threatened in our early years by hostile powers that coveted our land. We have good reason to stand as a loyal friend to others who are working, as we worked to become strong and to secure to their children the blessings of peace and abundance. Many of us have watched, with great concern, in the past several years, the increase of tension and violence in the Middle East and the growing threat of war. We have urged our own leaders to take firm and vigorous action to forestall the terrible prospect of war. In recent days, we have finally seen signs that this administration is awakening to the danger that looms there and is stirring from its lethargy to do what should have been long since done. So I think that we can say today, with some assurance, to our friends in Israel that we will not stand idly by and watch their destruction. Like them, we are determined that there shall be peace in the Middle East. We are determined that no nation shall be destroyed by the aggression of her neighbors. We are determined to shoulder responsibility and to do our share in building, where now there is violence and distrust, relations of peace and mutual help, to the end that Israel and her neighbors may some day share in the kind of peaceful interchange that will mean stability and prosperity and a happier future for all the people of the Middle East.

That, I think, is the best pledge we can make to the people of Israel on their 8th anniversary. I, for one, am ready to work wholeheartedly to redeem that pledge. As the people of Israel celebrate this day, our hearts should go out to them, in compassion, for the trials they are now suffering. Our purpose should be firm to do everything in our power to bring their trials to a speedy end and everything in our power to help them and their neighbors to build a better and happier future.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, April 16, 1956, marks the anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel. Eight years ago a new nation arose from the depths of despair and oppression to walk vigorously in a new light of hope, fulfilling a dream of 2,000 years. If we could persuade some individuals in this country to forget for a moment the envy, hate, and animosity indiscriminately hurled against the young nation of Israel, if we could remind them how similar are the struggles and sufferings undergone by Israel to those experienced by our Founding Fathers when they fled religious oppression and persecution to establish a peaceful haven in this country, if we could remember how much we appreciated the sympathies and help of some European countries in the struggle

to secure our independence, we would all then be better disposed toward Israel. We would understand that she has only one desire—and that is to live peaceably alongside her hostile neighbors. Because there is this striking similarity in the history of our people and that of the Israeli nation, the American people have deeply sympathized with the cause of Israel and have given liberally to help her in every possible way.

Nevertheless, against this tangible and most generous proof given by a majority of the American public in support of the righteousness of Israel's aspirations, there stands the ill will of a few who nest themselves behind the shield of a Government agency, the Department of State. These do everything to promote hostility rather than peace. They have encouraged Arab belligerency over Israel's protests; they have rejected Israel's request for equal treatment—in short, they have done their best to provoke another war. Our Secretary of State has proved himself insensitive and insensible to the facts and moralities of the area.

How can they ignore the fact that at the very time that the representative of the United Nations was pleading in Cairo for peace, Egyptian murderers shot down in cold blood children at prayer in Israel?

Can we in good faith claim that the best interests of the United States are served by the few in the Department of State whose actions result in encouraging feuding among nations? Why should they be so anxious to appease the Arabs at the expense of Israel? If we agree to extend military assistance to one, we should in fairness grant the same to the other. Are we to have more faith in the Arabs than in Israel? Has not this young state clearly demonstrated how seriously and efficiently she has been working and progressing during the past 8 years?

Israel's record is proof of her aim for peaceful existence to carry on her programs of agricultural and industrial improvement. In her struggle Israel aspires to become again the promised land for thousands and thousands of refugees, so that all people can say, with the Prophet Ezekiel:

> This land that was untilled is become as a garden of pleasure, and the cities that were abandoned and desolate and destroyed are peopled and fenced.

Israel has become the most progressive and energetic state in the Middle East. In the last 8 years more than 400 new agricultural settlements have been created in a small area, compared to less than 300 in the 70 years prior to Israel's coming into existence. Every type of industry has bloomed; transportation and housing have flourished—but beyond this material success, Israel is today the symbol of courage and expectation for all humanity who secretly hope and pray that in this chosen land, the people of the earth, if God touches their hearts and enlightens their minds, might finally reach a mutual understanding and establish the foundation of a new era of everlasting peace for the entire world.

In rejoicing over the recurrence of the birth of Israel, we also voice the prayer that the relations between the United States and Israel will be strengthened and more closely bound.

We pray that the benighted officials in our executive department will open their eyes and their hearts and that they will lend the might and power of our great country, material and spiritual, to establishing true peace in the world.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, today one of the most ancient lands observes its status as the youngest of free nations.

Israel observes its eighth anniversary on this April 16, 1956, its indepenedence threatened by unfriendly neighbors. In this hour of trial I believe the great majority of American join me in the devout prayer that this new democracy will prevail.

Eight years ago the United States was the first to recognize the new nation of Israel. On this anniversary I am happy to see other Members of Congress joining me in an expression of reassurance to Israel that its people still have our friendship and support.

The threat to Israel's survival is a threat to all free nations, and the increasing tension in the Middle East is a threat to world peace. I share the disappointment of the people of Israel over our State Department's delay on Israel's urgent plea for defensive arms.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I would like to insert the following statement in the RECORD on the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the State of Israel:

I am happy to join in extending my heartfelt congratulations to Israel on the eighth anniversary of its proclamation as a state. Americans everywhere can be proud of their contribution to this achievement.

As we look back upon the events since May 14, 1948, when Israel again achieved statehood after an exile of over 2,000 years, we find a remarkable record of progress and accomplishment. Here is a country which has given shelter to hundreds of thousands of homeless people, most of whom were victims of the war, and provided them with a chance to live productive lives. On the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, the State of Israel was built, a great new outpost of Western democracy, on a foundation of freedom and liberty.

Israel is an example of democracy in action whose accomplishments for human welfare and civilization in 8 years rivals anything done in countries ruled by dictators. Israel has made this progress without paying the totalitarian price of slave labor and ruthless pressure.

The people of Israel have come from all parts of the world, speaking many languages and representing many cultures. Like the immigrants who came to this country, they have joined in a common endeavor, learned to speak a common language and helped to build a common civilization. This is in miniature a repetition of the great American experiment in creating a civilization out of a wilderness with men and women whose common heritage is their humanity. And, indeed, many Americans have recognized in the people of Israel a spirit that closely resembles that of our pioneers a century ago.

Today Israel is threatened as never before by the forces of dictatorship and oppression. Yet it has maintained the rights and liberties of its people despite the danger of invasion and has constantly sought and worked for peace. At the same time, it has realistically been compelled to provide for its defense against the growing arsenal in Arab lands.

The United States has done much to foster and encourage the development of Israel, and the people of Israel have repeatedly demonstrated their appreciation. Our country has made a firm commitment to preserve the integrity of the State of Israel, and I am sure that we have every intention of standing by that commitment. Many of us in Congress, however, are convinced that one of the steps we must take without delay is to restore the military balance in the Middle East. We can do this by allowing Israel to purchase the defensive weapons she must have to discourage would-be aggressors.

The fact that Moscow has shipped modern weapons to Egypt and other Arab States in quantity makes it imperative that our country take the lead in helping Israel to defend itself. The press has reported that France, Italy, Canada, and other nations are ready to help this fellow democracy with jet fighter planes and other arms for defense, but I should like to see my country demonstrate its willingness to go further than others in releasing arms to a beleaguered ally. All the world looks to us for the example to follow, and we dare not yield our responsibility to any other nation.

I recognize, of course, that defensive arms to Israel are not a solution to the problem of achieving peace in the Middle East, but their deterrent effect can avert war and give us time to work for peace, time in which tensions may be relaxed and reason prevail. Let no one be deceived into thinking that this is an isolated conflict between the Arabs and Israel. It cannot be localized. Our civilization is so constituted that the problems of the Middle East reflect the worldwide conflict of ideas between the East and the West, and whatever happens between Israel and her neighbors will inevitably affect the lives of all Americans.

As Israel enters the ninth year of its existence, we hope and pray that a beginning shall be made toward the establishment of peace, not only in that troubled area, but for all people all over the world. With firmness and resolution we can defeat the Communist threat of war and bring about the initial steps to a lasting peace. On this anniversary we can bring to the people of Israel an assurance that they do not stand alone in their gallant fight to create a nation of free people under God and that we stand with them against the enemies of democracy.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my distinguished colleagues and say a word with regard

to the observation of the eighth anniversary of the State of Israel. I am unable to say "happy birthday" for this is not a happy day for the little democracy which is surrounded on all sides by hostile, aggressive, and threatening neighbors.

I wonder how long the State of Israel will have to stand on guard. I wonder for what period of time she will have to continue to spend practically all of her substance on armament and a military establishment. This is the state which cheerfully burdened itself with a program of immigration for distressed and homeless people and sought to work out an economy amidst most inhospitable surroundings. From a harsh, cruel, and unyielding desert of sand, Israel's people have brought forth a citrus industry. They have worked the farms so that now her people are self-sufficient insofar as vegetables are concerned.

Israel has worked and has accomplished much to educate and give medical ministrations to the people of the Middle East. She has given dignity and self-respect to people who have heretofore despaired of any further whatsoever. All the while she has had to stand guard. Farming, with a rifle ready at hand. Teaching children with a lookout on the hill. Nursing the sick with an armed guard on the roof of the hospital.

Israel has endeavored and succeeded in making a great humanitarian contribution to a benighted and backward part of the world. She is entitled to a happier birthday than the one she celebrates today.

I wish merely to say, Mr. Speaker, that if Israel's requests for defensive arms are granted by this country, Israel will have a happy birthday because war will be averted. There will be no conflagration in the Middle East with the fearsome possibility of its spreading throughout the world. Stability will take the place of impending chaos. There will be no need for foreign intervention. And I must here repeat, Israel is not asking that the United States send its soldiers to fight her battle. Israel wants to defend itself, or better yet, ward off and avert Nasser's threatened aggression.

President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, you, gentlemen, can make this a happy birthday for Israel, and at the same time, you can serve the cause of world peace, democracy, and fair play. As Winston Churchill has recently put it, you can discharge an obligation which this country owes to the democracy of Israel as a matter of honor.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic day for the people of Israel, for it was 8 years ago that the dynamic democracy now known as the State of Israel was established. Once merely a dream and an idea in the minds and hearts of many who now call it their homeland it is now a reality. The courage and the fortitude displayed by these people in their great struggle brought about this gallant little nation which is now a matter of history. Their spirit of freedom and their desire for peace, their determination to live as a truly democratic nation among the family of free nations, is worthy of their great heritage.

Today, as I have done before, I salute the State of Israel and its proud people. Theirs is a record of achievement and accomplishment during 8 short years of existence.

But today this bulwark of democracy in the Middle East is threatened. It is threatened by the shadow of international communism which has been reaching out over the Middle East fomenting hostilities and creating tensions. We know that this is a threat not alone to the security and peace of Israel—the Middle East—but to the whole free world. For pulling the strings behind the whole Arab-Israeli conflict are the Soviet agents who by their offer of arms and economic aid to the Arabs seek to establish themselves in the Middle East.

We must not permit this nation to fall at the hands of the Communist conspirators. The United States should take immediate steps to maintain the balance of power in the Middle East by providing Israel with defensive arms. We must in justice to the name of democracy, in the interest of world peace and freedom, help to preserve the integrity of Israel as a nation. The people of Israel look to us—as the champions of democracy—we cannot and must not turn our backs on them. Let us help to maintain this fortress of freedom.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to extend my most heartfelt and sincere felicitations to the gallant people of Israel on this the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the State of Israel as a free and independent nation.

The tremendous social, political, and cultural accomplishments that have transpired in Israel since its independence was declared in 1948 are an inspiration to every democratic form of government in the world as an example of what free men can do under the flag of democracy.

Today the State of Israel stands as the bulwark of democracy in the Middle East.

Yet, in the face of all these accomplishments, this tiny democracy is confronted with an alarming situation which affects not only the peace and tranquillity of the Middle East, but the peace and tranquillity of the entire free world. This crisis in the Middle East has been brought about by the steadfast refusal of the Arab States to recognize Israel as a democracy, recently aided and abetted by the creeping shadow of international communism.

We cannot permit this nation to fail at the hands of the Communist conspirators. We in the West are faced with the necessity of taking decisive steps to prevent an all-out war in this area. This can be done quickly and effectively if the Arab countries can only be made to realize that Israel herself is interested only in peace. If the Arab leaders can be convinced of this, and be persuaded to make peace with Israel, the economic, spiritual, and social benefits reaped by all the countries in the areas will be overwhelming.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged today to add my sentiments to those of my distinguished colleagues in the House and Senate in congratulations to the State of Israel upon the occasion of the eighth anniversary of its establishment as a free, independent, and sovereign state.

This is a singularly happy occasion that shines out like a star of hope in a dark-clouded sky. In a world beset by confusion, aggressions, and subversions, in a world where the democratic ideal is so often under attack, it is an exhilarating satisfaction to call attention to one new nation that has from the beginning manifested its adherence to the ideas and ideals of a democratic society.

It is also gratifying to know that this new nation has exhibited a generosity of national spirit that has solved a problem of homelessness for hundreds of thousands of people to whom it opened its doors in welcome. The great humanitarian service that Israel has rendered in converting desperate people from the category of "refugees" to that of upright, free citizens will always shine as a bright page in the history of our times.

In saluting the State of Israel and extending to it our good wishes, I cannot help but draw parallels with the early history of our own country, the United States of America. We, too, started as a new young Republic after the embroilment of war, with a devotion to independence and democracy and in need of understanding and friendship. It is heartening to know that the social and spiritual concepts that marked the birth of the United States have their parallels in the State of Israel.

I hope that the views expressed by Members of both Houses will give notice to the world at large of American friendship and support for the State of Israel. Those with aggressive designs on the security and independence of Israel might do well to read the record of the United States Congress and reconcile themselves to the bonds of friendship and mutual regard that link the people of the United States of America and the people of the State of Israel.

This occasion, however, must not be noted without regard for the threats of an actual aggression that hover like a calamitous cloud over the State of Israel. The cry of the victims reaches out to us and calls upon us to reassert vigorously our national policy to prevent aggression and to warn and, if need be, punish aggressors.

The security of the State of Israel is vital to the stability of the entire area of the Middle East and this in turn is basic to America's own defense and the defense of the free world. This calls for an administrative policy of action rather than of inaction; and of direct, friendly, and timely intervention rather than by a nod to our allies. It calls for prompt and sympathetic action as to the defense needs of the State of Israel, out of the same considerations that justify our provision for our own defense needs and for those of the Western World.

It calls for an ample and timely counterweight to the armaments furnished by the Communist and satellite governments.

Above all, it calls for a clear unambiguous assertion on the highest level that the United States is committed to the proposition that peace is indivisible

and that peace and the safeguards of peace for the State of Israel are basic in our national policy.

NEGOTIATED CONSENT DECREES IN ANTITRUST CASES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVINS). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, acting on the basis of complaints of small-business men, Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Small Business Committee, of which I am chairman and the Honorable TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, and the Honorable TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, Republican, of Illinois, are members, held hearings on March 28 and 29, 1956, on the effect on small business of consent decree procedures in Government antitrust actions against large corporate defendants.

In the preparation for and during these hearings I had the opportunity to study the antitrust consent decree negotiated between the Government as plaintiff and the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and the Western Electric Co. as defendants, which was entered into by the Attorney General on January 23, 1956.

I am convinced that this consent decree represents the lowest point in modern times in the disposition of major antitrust litigation.

The A. T. & T. consent decree cannot be reconciled with the purpose of the Government in filing the original action. It cannot be reconciled with present facts. It cannot be reconciled with Judge Barnes' position in other major antitrust litigations. It cannot be reconciled with any known philosophy of antitrust enforcement.

The only conclusion possible from the facts is that A. T. & T. has been given favored and special treatment by the present administration and Attorney General Brownell.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I take it that it is the gentleman's point that in the decree there should have been divestiture and Western Electric should have been separated and truncated from American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee is absolutely correct. I am going to cover that in full and it will be noted that in the testimony before the subcommittee, Judge Barnes admitted that the original purposes for which the suit was filed were completely forgotten.

Mr. CELLER. As for myself I embrace the gentleman's point of view in that regard.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman and appreciate his statement very much.

Because the implications of this decree go far beyond the jurisdiction of the House Small Business Committee, I feel it is my duty to report all the facts within my knowledge to the Congress and to recommend that a thorough and complete investigation be made, not only as to the reasons why A. T. & T. received favored and special treatment in the consent judgment, but also the extent to which special privileges have been afforded A. T. & T. by other Government agencies to enhance its monopoly power and monopoly profits.

While the operations of A. T. & T. are subject to public utility regulation, those of its wholly owned subsidiary, Western Electric, are meant to be in the area of our free enterprise economy. The Government's complaint against A. T. & T. and Western Electric was to put an end to Western Electric's illegal monopoly existing under the protection of the monopoly at A. T. & T. as a public utility. The Government's complaint was preceded by a very long, careful investigation by the Federal Communications Commission of the problems generated by this monopoly which resulted in a comprehensive report, containing findings and recommendations in great detail.

The complaint filed in 1949 charged that Western Electric manufactures and supplies more than 90 percent of all telephones, telephone apparatus and equipment sold in the United States. It also charged that A. T. & T. required its operating companies as well as its Long Line Department to buy substantially all of its equipment from Western Electric. The significance of this is indicated by the fact that A. T. & T. owns and operates more than 98 percent of the long distance telephone facilities in the United States, and owns and controls operating companies which furnish approximately 85 percent of the country's local telephone service.

To remedy the almost complete lack of competition in the manufacture, distribution and sale of telephone equipment, the complaint sought a separation of Western Electric from A. T. & T. and a dissolution of Western Electric into three competing, manufacturing concerns. Relief of this kind was the principal reason the case was brought. This relief was essential to thwart the monopoly and to protect the public.

The Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, Judge Barnes, admits all of these facts. He states that A. T. & T. has "practically a 100-percent monopoly" on the facilities used in the rendition of long distance service in the United States.

He admits that A. T. & T. owns and controls operating telephone companies which furnish approximately 85 percent of all local telephone service in the United States.

He admits that Western Electric manufactures and sells between eighty to ninety percent of all telephones, telephone apparatus, and equipment sold in the United States.

He admits that A. T. & T. requires its operating companies, as well as its long-lines department, to buy virtually all of their telephone equipment from Western Electric.

He admits that as a part of an alleged conspiracy between A. T. & T. and Western Electric to monopolize the telephonic industry that they bought up or otherwise eliminated competitive manufacturers of telephones, telephone apparatus, and equipment. Judge Barnes states that this "is a matter of record."

Finally, Judge Barnes admits that in filing the complaint "the purpose certainly was to restore competition. The charge was that it"—Western Electric—"should be broken up."

Judge Barnes nevertheless testified that the original purpose of the suit to separate A. T. & T. and Western Electric had to be abandoned because there was insufficient evidence. In the face of his own admissions as to the facts involved, this excuse defies creditability.

Certain there can be no question that the facts stated to be true by Judge Barnes are more than sufficient to prove the prima facie case that Western Electric is a monopoly of formidable proportions and as such is illegal under the antitrust laws of the United States.

What then does the consent decree do to break up this monopoly as charged in the original complaint filed in 1949 and as stated by Judge Barnes in the hearings before our subcommittee on March 29, 1956? The answer is that the consent decree is worse than nothing. For the consent decree solidifies and gives Government sanction to the very monopoly which the complaint was designed to break up, and makes impossible the bringing of any further action by future administrations.

What justification can there be for such a shocking consent decree against the public interest and against all known philosophies of antitrust enforcement?

The feebleness of the explanation given by the Department of Justice serves only to emphasize the conclusion that the administration has granted A. T. & T. favored and special treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point in the RECORD an article by John Harriman appearing in the Boston Daily Globe April 2, 1956.

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

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

Last week Antitrust Chief Stanley Barnes announced an action by the Department of Justice against the American Radiator and Standard Sanitary Co. and Mullins Manufacturing Corp.

This is the sixth major antitrust action, of which Mr. Barnes spoke early in the week before the House Small Business Committee. (Another said to be cooking on back of the fire is General Motors.) So far these suits are in the style of trust busting initiated under the present administration.

FASHION NOWADAYS TO NEGOTIATE

Nowadays it is the fashion in these actions not to go to trial. What happens is that the Department of Justice works up its case, and then sits down with the defendant and talks things over. In most cases a meeting of the minds is arrived at, and the defendant consents to certain demands in the Government's case. These consents are then incorporated in a decree, and all is settled amicably.

This, of course, makes for good feeling all around, and provides a nice show of newspaper headlines of the sort which in an election year never hurt anybody.

But there are those who look at these consent decrees, and utter a mild horse laugh. This, they say, is trust busting a la mode,

with the ice cream going to the Government and the pie to the offending company.

In short, say the skeptics, this isn't really trust busting at all, but the giving of what amounts in effect to immunity from further prosecution to companies at a very small cost to them.

For instance, no other administration, it is being pointed out, will now bring an antitrust action against the Bell System, which has just submitted to one of Mr. Barnes' consent decrees. And Bell, it is argued, may be very satisfied to have put itself in this position by yielding to Mr. Barnes on points which were relatively minor.

BELL MADE PATENTS AVAILABLE TO ALL

Originally the Government's suit sought to force Bell to divest itself of Western Electric, its manufacturing subsidiary. But in the consent decree entered, there were mighty compromises.

Western Electric was left with Bell, which was only required to drop certain activities which in toto are estimated to account for not much more than 1 percent of the parent company's gross revenues.

All the Government really won was that Bell should make its patents available to all. And this, say some, is of no great importance, as Bell is the main customer for the products made under these patents, and Bell will presumably buy only from its own subsidiary.

It was these facts which cause the major victory claimed by the Department of Justice in this case, to look to the penetrating eyes of Business Week like "little more than a slap on the wrist."

It will be interesting to see the nature of the Government's suit against General Motors, it comes off. We hear that it will be concerned not with that company's position in the whole automobile field—just in its activities in supplying 80 percent of the bus market.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, one of the two major points made by the Department of Justice in attempting to justify the consent decree is that the cost of Western Electric equipment sold to A. T. & T. is subject to public utility regulation and that such regulation is made easier by the decree. Why is this purported to be so? Because, according to the Department of Justice, the consent decree provides that Western Electric must—and I quote and emphasize—"maintain cost accounting methods that conform with such accounting practices as may be generally accepted, taking into account the magnitude and the complexity of the operations involved." This provision is useless and meaningless. I asked Judge Barnes what changes it would make in Western Electric's accounting methods. He replied "We do not necessarily know that it will make any." Further, it is obvious that this provision is so broad, vague, and ambiguous that no court could ever hold Western Electric in contempt for violation.

But even more important, the purpose of the antitrust laws and the duty of the Attorney General is to restore competition in those fields of our free enterprise economy where it does not exist. The fact that A. T. & T. is subject to public utility regulation gives no immunity to Western Electric from the antitrust laws. In the Government's antitrust case against the Pullman Co., the court ordered the separation of Pullman's unregulated monopoly in the manufacture and sale of sleeping cars from its monopoly of sleeping cars service, the latter being subject to Federal regulation. Since the court did break up the Pullman monopoly, what conceivable reasons could lead Judge Barnes to believe that the court could not similarly break up the A. T. & T.-Western Electric monopoly?

The Attorney General through Judge Barnes does not dispute the fact that there is a monopoly in the manufacture and sale of telephonic equipment, materials, and apparatus, that this monopoly is not protected by public utility legislation and is subject to the full force of our antitrust laws. The consent decree, however, allows Western Electric to remain a monopoly. This is a betrayal of the most basic principles of our antitrust laws which Attorney General Brownell has sworn to uphold. This betrayal cannot be justified. It must be censured.

The second point made by the Attorney General in his attempt to justify the decree is that a measure of patent relief has been granted in the electronics field. The suit was not brought for this purpose. The suit was brought to restore competition in the manufacture and sale of telephonic equipment and all the patent relief in the world cannot restore competition as long as Western Electric is left with some 80 to 90 percent control of the market and as long as A. T. & T. will purchase its equipment only from Western Electric.

But even so, the patent relief contained in the consent decree is completely imaginary. Judge Barnes states that the decree requires royalty free licensing to all applicants on some 8,600 existing patents of A. T. & T. But in the same breath he was forced to admit that A. T. & T. under the decree could still make a charge to licensees for "know-how" and that this could be virtually the same as the royalty charge. Judge Barnes was read a statement made by Dr. Vannevar A. Bush, a director of A. T. & T., in which he pointed out "that the royalty rate charged by A. T. & T. for its patents subject to the decree had been based upon the know-how that went with the patents." Judge Barnes then admitted that the charge for know-how and technical information which can still be made under the consent decree could be as much as the former royalty.

Secondly, the decree accomplishes very little in requiring the licensing of the patents involved, since the Bell System Co. has had a licensing policy since 1949 to license anyone for any purpose.

Thirdly, with respect to the alleged 8,600 patents involved in the consent decree, RCA has the unrestricted right to sublicense, retain royalties, and sue for infringement on a substantial number of these patents—the exact ones being unknown to the Department of Justice. The consent decree does not affect these rights of RCA.

Fourthly, a substantial number of the patents involved in the consent decree have expired.

Finally, a substantial number of the patents involved in the consent decree are not sufficient to enable the licensee to manufacture and sell FM and TV commercial broadcast transmitters or receivers without an RCA package license. In brief, Judge Barnes admits that many of the licenses allegedly made available to others by the consent decree are worthless because, and I quote Judge Barnes' testimony, "in the RCA pool there are patents over and beyond A. T. & T. or Bell Laboratories patents which may well be necessary before you can get into an open-handed, free, and easy production of electronic devices."

Mr. Brownell stated in his press release accompanying the signing of the A. T. & T. consent decree that—

> The patent relief obtained in this decree is a long stride forward in the efforts of the Department of Justice to destroy the divisions of patent rights * * * in electronics. The decree makes available to any citizen all inventions and know-how of the Bell System.

But Judge Barnes testified before the subcommittee:

> I would certainly agree with you, sir, that the entire field of electronic patented articles cannot be freed to universal competition until and unless something is done in the RCA case.

The key to patent relief in electronics is, therefore, in the pending RCA case, and not in the A. T. & T. consent decree.

What then is left of the consent decree? I submit there is nothing—except an urgent need for a complete explanation from Mr. Brownell as to why he and several of his subordinates abdicated their responsibilities and lent themselves to the preservation of the A. T. & T.-Western Electric monopoly.

In this connection an attorney in the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, familiar with the case, recently stated that Mr. Brownell, himself, established the policy that a consent decree was to be negotiated with A. T. & T. and Western Electric without separating the two. Instructions to this effect were made known by Mr. Brownell's office to the members of the Antitrust Division. This official has stated that the Antitrust Division was put into a straitjacket in negotiating the decree by virtue of these instructions.

What is more, the consent decree was signed and negotiated by the first assistant to Judge Barnes, who has a reputation, both within and without the Department, for his softness toward antitrust enforcement and solicitude for big business. I believe it can be established that he was placed in the Antitrust Division at the request of highly placed, big business officials close to the administration. Was there secret connivance between him and Mr. Brownell? It has been reported that these two met in private to determine policy as to the consent decree at the very time Judge Barnes was absent from the city.

True, some attorneys in the Antitrust Division realized that the proposed consent decree would in effect give Government sanction to Western Electric's monopoly and prevent further prosecution. They recommended that the lesser evil would be to dismiss the suit entirely, but were overruled.

Relevant in this regard is the testimony of Judge Barnes before our Subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee on March 29, 1956. The judge stated that high Government officials insisted that A. T. & T. and West-

ern Electric could not be separated and Western Electric split up because, and again I quote directly from Judge Barnes:

> You have got a situation where you have got research half way between manufacture and operations, and so tied up, according to certain allegations, that from a practical standpoint they have to be together. Now, I am not buying that. I am just saying that is an argument which has been expressed, and very violently expressed, by people in high places in the Government.

Whether Judge Barnes, himself, bought this argument is immaterial since the decree gave A. T. & T. precisely what these people in high places in the Government wanted. The decree also gave A. T. & T. what it wanted. As reported in the February 6, 1956, issue of Newsweek:

> How much was A. T. & T. harmed by its consent judgment? Nothing really hurts, A. T. & T. President C. F. Craig implied, so long as the whole team—Bell Telephone Laboratories, Western Electric, and the Bell System—remain intact, instead of being split up as the Government originally demanded.

The question remains unanswered. Who were the people in high places in the Government who violently expressed the argument that A. T. & T. and Western Electric could not be separated? And if Judge Barnes did not buy their argument, why did the Department of Justice still accede to their request.

Let us open Pandora's box and see who are some of the people in high places in the Government who would have had the greatest governmental interest—and the greatest private interest—in the A. T. & T. consent decree. Here is the rollcall of the officials or directors of A. T. & T. or its subsidiary companies who have held policymaking and influential positions in the United States Government under the present administration:

Cole A. Armstrong, Office of Defense Mobilization.

Donald R. Belcher, first assistant, Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Harold M. Botkin, Office of Defense Mobilization.

Robert Burgess, Director of the Census.

Albert J. Carey, Office of Defense Mobilization.

A. B. Clark, National Security Agency.

Victor E. Cooley, Deputy Administrator, Office of Defense Mobilization.

Stanley Damkroeger, Department of Commerce.

William Means Day, Department of the Army.

John M. Ferry, Special Assistant to the Under Secretary of the Air Force.

G. D. Garner, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics).

Frederick J. Given, Office of the Secretary of Defense.

R. Karl Honaman, Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Department of Commerce.

George Ireland, Department of Commerce.

Dr. Marvin J. Kelly, Department of the Air Force and the National Bureau of Standards.

George A. Landry, Office of Defense Mobilization.

George B. Larkin, Office of the Assistant Secretaary of Defense (Supply and Logistics).

Walter A. MacNair, Department of the Army.

George C. McConnaughey, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission.

William H. Martin, Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, and prior to that appointment Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Stewart E. Miller, Department of the Air Force.

Arthur W. Page, Cabinet Committee on Transportation Policy and Organization.

Charles W. Potter, Office of Defense Mobilization.

Donald A. Quarles, Secretary of the Air Force.

Robert T. Stevens, Secretary of the Army.

Joseph D. Stockton, Office of Defense Mobilization.

William A. Vanstory, Department of Commerce.

Charles E. Wampler, Office of Defense Mobilization.

Benjamin F. Young, Office of the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization.

This list, while not complete, is nevertheless illustrative of the force and influence that A. T. & T. can exert upon Government policy and Government actions. Indeed, there appears to be no area of Government whose activity affects A. T. & T. where an A. T. & T. official is not in a position of influence or control.

This infiltration of A. T. & T. officials throughout the top levels of the administration, whether accomplished with the best or the worst of motives, represents a real threat and danger to our democratic processes.

A. T. & T. officials in Government have been in a position, for instance, to control or influence Government policy in relation to the SAGE project. But thanks to the vigilance of our distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, to the vigilance of our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Honorable CARL VINSON, and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable CLARENCE BROWN, the American people were saved the sum of $830 million which otherwise would have improperly gone to the A. T. & T. monopoly.

And thanks to my distinguished colleague from Montana, the Honorable LEE METCALF, provisions have been made so that rural electric cooperatives will not be excluded by the A. T. & T. from participating in the Government work to be done in connection with the SAGE project.

I can only say with the deepest regret that the full implications of the A. T. & T. consent decree, entered into by Mr. Brownell, were not similarly recognized and action taken by the Congress before it became a fait accompli. However, the A. T. & T. consent decree does raise a warning for the future which, I believe, cannot be ignored. I, therefore, respectfully recommend to the House that a thoroughgoing investigation be made of the influence of A. T. & T. upon Government and in particular upon the Department of Defense, the Department of the Air Force, the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Department of Justice.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. In this situation it is not a question that we do not have enough laws on the statute books to cope with the situation. The trouble lies in the fact that we do not use the laws we have. Is that not right?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I completely agree with the distinguished gentleman, and I point out that if the original purposes for which this suit was filed had been adhered to there would have been no such case as can now be made. I do not think it is a question of needing new legislation. I think it is a real and not an imaginary enforcement of the antitrust laws.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from California, Mr. ROOSEVELT, for the generous references he made to me in his very able speech. I also want to congratulate my friend from California for the tremendous work he has done in connection with this important matter and in the powerful address he has just made, conveying to the House and to the country very important information which all adds up toward the one powerful message of big business control of our country through this administration and also discrimination against small and independent businessmen.

The gentleman from California is chairman of a subcommittee of the Special Committee on Small Business. The special committee itself has done outstanding work. The subcommittee of which the gentleman from California is chairman has also done outstanding work and I extend my hearty congratulations to him and the other members of his subcommittee.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am very grateful to the distinguished majority leader.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the statement of the gentleman with a great deal of interest and I join with my friend from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, in extending congratulations to the distinguished gentleman from California for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. The gentleman has said that some of the scope of the matter is beyond the jurisdiction of our committee, but certainly it is not beyond the jurisdiction, as the gentleman has pointed out, to censure this procedure; and I commend the gentleman for it.

It would seem to me that the lengthy list of the men whose names he has called, former employees or people closely associated with the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., is indicative of the influence which they exert in this

administration and of the great power which no doubt has been exercised in the bringing about of this consent decree.

It would also seem to me that, while the present administration is opposed to 90 percent of parity for the farmers, it is in favor of 90 percent plus in the form of monopoly for the A. T. & T.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank my distinguished colleagues of the Small Business Committee.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to join in commending the gentleman from California for the outstanding statement he has just made in bringing the A. T. & T. case to the attention of the country and also its relation to this present administration.

Only 2 weeks ago the Armed Services Committee appeared before the Rules Committee on a piece of legislation that would protect small industry and small business as far as their applications for procurement and contracts through the Defense Department were concerned. The most astounding revelation that Chairman VINSON of the Armed Services Committee brought out before the Rules Committee was that approximately 94 percent of the procurement and the contracts that have been given by the Secretary of Defense went through without competitive bids being asked for by the head of the Defense Department. If the Defense Department under former President Truman defied the law and procurement regulations in this way, the newspapers would be demanding his impeachment.

The fact is that 94 percent of approximately three billion and some odd hundred million dollars worth of contracts was released by negotiation without any competitive bids being called for on the part of the Secretary of Defense.

The legislation that passed this House will, we hope, in future give small industrial competitors as against General Motors an opportunity to participate in some of the defense contracts and procurement purchases in the future. I do hope this new law will help small business to be recognized by the Secretary of Defense as competitors against big business and particularly General Motors.

I again want to commend the gentleman from California for the outstanding contributions he has made for the benefit of American taxpayers in his remarks to the House this afternoon.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman from Indiana very much. I would reemphasize again, sir, that if we are going to survive as a democracy we must have competition, not only competition which allows small business to exist, but in this particular instance I would be perfectly happy if they would let a few big people compete in order to get some of these large contracts.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman will agree with me that it is much better for our country and our national economy if we have more companies rather that less companies.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Exactly. That is the only way we can stop an economic dictatorship and I think the gentleman will agree with me that economic dictatorship is, unfortunately, the forerunner of political dictatorship, and that is what we must fight with all our might.

THE CASE OF SPENCER WELSH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUIGLEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the more eloquent and most effective declarations of fundamental American principles was made, in my opinion, by President Eisenhower on the night of November 23, 1953. On that date he was addressing a dinner, at which he received an award, conducted by the B'nai B'rith Antidefamation League, at the Mayflower Hotel, here in Washington. The President's remarks on that occasion were carried to millions of Americans by radio and television.

Speaking very informally, Mr. Eisenhower pointed out that our pride in being Americans was a spiritual rather than a material thing. Then he went on to say, according to the text reproduced in the New York Times of November 24, 1953:

> We are proud first of all because from the beginning of this Nation a man can walk upright, no matter who he is, or who she is. He can walk upright and meet his friend or his enemy, and he does not fear that because that enemy may be in a position of great power that he can suddenly be thrown in jail to rot there without charges and with no recourse of justice.
>
> We have the Habeas Corpus Act and we respect it.
>
> I was raised in a little town of which most of you have never heard. But in the West it's a famous place. It's called Abilene, Kans. We had as our marshal for a long time a man named Wild Bill Hickock. If you don't know about him, read your westerns more.
>
> Now that town had a code, and I was raised as a boy to prize that code. It was: Meet anyone face to face with whom you disagree. You could not sneak up on him from behind, do any damage to him without suffering the penalty of an outraged citizenry. If you met him face to face and took the same risk he did, you could get away with almost anything, as long as the bullet was in front.
>
> And today, although none of you have the great fortune, I think, of being from Abilene, Kans., you live, after all, by that same code in your ideals and in the respect you give to certain qualities.
>
> In this country, if someone dislikes you or accuses you, he must come up in front. He cannot hide behind the shadows, he cannot assassinate you or your character from behind without suffering the penalties an outraged citizenry would inflict.

These remarks by the President were universally well received. The people accepted this declaration as a muchly needed expression of the philosophy of Mr. Eisenhower and as ground rules for the conduct of his administration.

Earlier this year, however, my attention was invited to a situation where President Eisenhower's subordinates—the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission—were doing great violence to the "code of Abilene." As a consequence, on February 28 I addressed the following letter to the President:

> The PRESIDENT,
> *The White House.*
>
> DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The purpose of this letter is to bring to your attention the situation in which one Spencer Welsh now finds himself. Mr. Welsh is a young veteran who resides in York County, Pa., not too many miles from your home in Gettysburg, and, as such, he is one of my constituents. I hasten to add this latter fact does not in itself justify this letter, but it does explain how I became aware of Mr. Welsh's present predicament. However, the frightful implications of things destructive to fundamental American concepts inherent in this young man's case, in my opinion, more than justify this appeal to you as President of the United States.
>
> Very briefly Mr. Welsh's situation is this: In March of 1950, at the age of 17, he enlisted in the United States Army. Eventually he reached Korea and landed in a Communist prison camp. He remained in Communist prison camps for 34 months before he was released under the Korean truce prisoner exchange agreement. Following his release, he was honorably discharged. In addition, Mr. Welsh received the Good Conduct Medal, and at present he receives Veterans' Administration compensation for a 10-percent disability. Beyond this, Mr. Welsh applied for and received approval by the Veterans' Administration for a GI loan. Accordingly, it would seem that the United States Army and the Veterans' Administration considered Mr. Welsh a good soldier and a deserving veteran, and until very recently he was considered to be both by all of his friends and neighbors. However, this was before the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission was heard from. This Commission recently ruled that Mr. Welsh is not entitled to the prisoner of war compensation payable to ex-POW's under Public Law 615, because he had not proven to the Commission's satisfaction that during the course of his imprisonment in Korea he had not collaborated with the enemy.
>
> Mr. President, I think you will agree that no more serious charge than collaborating with the enemy could possibly be made against any American citizen. I know further that you will agree that when such a serious charge is made the accused should be given every conceivable right to defend himself in a fair hearing after having been advised as to the true basis of the charge against him and that, most important of all, the accused should be given the right to confront and cross-examine his accusers. I regret to advise you that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, in the case of Mr. Welsh, saw fit to observe none of these fundamental American precepts of fair play and justice. Charges made against Mr. Welsh by the Commission were couched in the vaguest and most general terms without any specifics as to the time and place of his alleged collaboration. To this date, Mr. Welsh does not know whether in the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission's files he has one or many accusers and, while he was given what the Commission called a hearing in which he was represented by counsel, this hearing made a mockery of the traditions of American justice. At the hearing no one appeared to testify against Mr. Welsh, and the entire burden of proving his innocence was upon Mr. Welsh.
>
> In reviewing the manner in which this case was handled, I want to make it crystal clear that I am, in no way, passing on the guilt or innocence of Mr. Welsh. It seems to me if I were to do that without hearing all the evidence I would be guilty of the same shoddy un-American conduct as the Commission itself.

If Mr. Welsh's situation were the only case of its kind, I think it would demand your personal attention. However, I regret to further inform you that I have been advised that there are at least 250 other exprisoners of war whose cases have been handled in a similar manner by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

Mr. President, I know I do not have to point out to you that what is involved here is a flagrant violation of one of the things that makes this country really great. What that something is has been expressed in many ways, but seldom more eloquently than you yourself expressed it in your famous speech about the Code of Abilene. I am sorely afraid that the members of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission never heard of that code, let alone of Abilene. On the basis of their conduct in this case, I am not certain that they even heard of Kansas and, if they heard of America, I'm afraid that its true meaning and real purpose managed to escape them completely.

It is my present plan to support legislation in the Congress which would abolish the kangaroo-court proceedings now being pursued by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. I further understand that the appropriate committee of the United States Senate contemplates holding public hearings on the manner in which the Commision has administered the act. However, it appears to me that this is a situation which should not and need not require legislative action. Since the members of the Commission were appointed by you, this should be a matter which could be corrected once and for all if you did nothing more than indicate to the Commission members your great displeasure that they are administering the law in a manner which violates sacred fundamental American principles. Such action on your part, I am certain, would guarantee to these American combat veterans the rights for which they fought and, if it didn't, I am confident you would not hesitate to replace the present members of the Commission with Americans who give more than lip service to our American ideals.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. QUIGLEY,
Member of Congress.

It took the White House 5 weeks to answer that letter. Why it took so long I will never know; perhaps a lack of courage, perhaps a lack of convictions. When the answer finally did come I found out it was both. And when the answer finally did come it came, not from the President, but from Gerald D. Morgan, his special counsel.

Mr. Morgan wrote:

The President asked me to look into the matter you wrote about under date of February 28, and to reply to your letter.

The administration was from the beginning opposed to the provision contained in the bill that became Public Law 615 requiring the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to pass upon the serious charge of collaboration in connection with its consideration of a claim for prisoner of war compensation. It is still opposed to having the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, in the absence of a final determination by the armed service concerned, pass upon such a serious matter, and hopes that the Congress will see fit to amend the law.

With respect to the claim of Mr. Spencer Welsh, the chairman of the Commission has advised me that no finding of collaboration was in fact made, and that no inference of such a finding is to be drawn from the Commission's decision in his case.

Let us examine these White House weasel words; let us contrast them with the big, bold language of the code of Abilene.

Mr. Morgan says:

The administration was from the beginning opposed to the provision contained in the bill that became Public Law 615 requiring the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to pass upon the serious charge of collaboration in connection with its consideration of a claim for prisoner of war compensation.

The administration was opposed, we are told; but what odd opposition. Insofar as I have been able to find out, the record shows that no such opposition was ever made known to Congress. In the 83d Congress, the President did submit a reorganization message to the Congress changing the name of the War Claims Commission to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. In that message he recommended that legislation be adopted extending compensation to Korean POW's, just as it had been granted to POW's of World War II.

The House passed a bill which went to the Senate, where it was accepted by the Judiciary Committee and the Senate without amendment. It was signed into law by the President. The 83d Congress was controlled by the President's own party. Now I recognize that the 83d Congress gave the President a great deal less than wholehearted support and cooperation, but I do not believe we can blame the 83d Congress for failure to read the President's mind. It would seem to have been the easiest matter in the world for the President, or one of his assistants, to have picked up a telephone, to have communicated with some of the able Republican leaders, and to have had that provision removed. He could have vetoed the bill and requested new legislation. He did none of these things. Yet, Mr. Morgan tells us now that "the administration was from the beginning opposed to the provision."

Mr. Morgan, presumably speaking for the President, goes on to inform me that the administration is still opposed to this provision and "hopes that the Congress will see fit to amend the law."

If this is the attitude of the administration, I have found nothing in the record to show that Congress has been so advised. This Congress has been in existence since January 5, 1955—a matter of 15 months and 2 weeks. I find no communication from the President or anyone else in the administration expressing opposition to this provision of Public Law 615, 83d Congress, and asking that it be eliminated.

In both these matters, I can be in error. If I am, I hope that the documents may be produced to show that my search of the record has not been complete.

In Mr. Morgan's final paragraph he informs me that the Commission made no finding that Mr. Spencer Welsh had been a collaborator, and further that no such inference is intended.

This was further clarified when a member of my staff discussed this case, by telephone, with Mr. Andrew T. McGuire, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission counsel. News dispatches appearing in the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily indicate that Mr. McGuire made much the same comment to that paper's Washington correspondent.

Mr. McGuire pointed out that while a finding of collaboration made a claimant ineligible, there were two other reasons for denying claims. These were failure to prove that a prisoner was mistreated, or underfed.

Mr. McGuire further explained that the Commission did not specify why claimants were denied compensation in order to avoid tainting a veteran with suspicion of collaboration.

I felt then that my efforts had not been completely in vain, that something had been accomplished. Mr. Welsh could once more face his friends and neighbors, secure in the knowledge that his government was not branding him as a collaborator.

An indication of how this clean bill—no matter how difficult it was to pry it loose—was received is contained in a letter I have received from Eugene H. Stauffer, who was until last week, commander, West York Memorial Post, No. 8951, Veterans of Foreign Wars. The VFW, it might be noted, first approached me to ask that I intercede in behalf of Mr. Welsh. In his letter, Commander Stauffer said in part:

I want to commend you on your very fine efforts and services in bringing to the attention of the President of the United States the case of Spencer Welsh and the injustice done to him by denying him his POW bonus. Although the injustice has been by no means corrected as yet, and I know you have not relinquished your efforts to have them corrected, the fact that the President's reply to your letter stated that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission Chairman said and I quote "no finding of collaboration was in fact made and that no inference of such finding is to be drawn from the commissioner's decision in this case," does remove a stigma that would have been placed over Comrade Welsh's head for the rest of his life and would have been a question as to his loyalty to the United States Government. This in itself is a partial victory as I said before when I conferred with you in the presence of Comrade Welsh that this stigma was one of the reasons for objecting to this injustice. However I am by no means satisfied that the injustice done to Comrade Welsh has been corrected by these statements. From your past efforts and interest shown in this case, I am cognizant that you will continue through other means to correct it.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the "partial victory" which Commander Stauffer hailed has been short lived. Last Tuesday evening Whitney Gillilland, chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, addressed a meeting of joint veterans' organizations in Council Bluffs, Iowa. According to the text of his remarks, as released to the press, he said, in part:

Now it will be noted that anyone who might have been guilty of outright disloyalty, that is, voluntarily, knowingly and without duress, collaborating with the enemy, would in any event be excluded by either the provisions (1) concerning food and mistreatment or (2) those precluding payment to anyone who voluntarily, knowingly and without duress at any time or in any manner served such hostile forces. Therefore, it never became necessary to pass on the issue of collaboration and no claim was rejected

on that ground. Therefore, no inference is to be drawn that any particular individual denied benefits was disloyal.

On the other hand, it will have been apparent that any collaborators would be included among those claimants denied for the two mentioned grounds and that the total number of collaborators could in no event have exceeded the total number of claims denied on those two grounds.

Despite the pious claim that Foreign Claims Settlement Commission did not wish to taint the character of any claimant; and although technically these veterans are not charged with being collaborators, what Mr. Gillilland is saying is that every one turned down was a collaborator.

When President Eisenhower made his "Abilene code" speech I was under the impression he was talking off the cuff but from the heart. But when the chips are down the President hides behind the shadow of a White House aide and Foreign Claims Settlement Commission's chairman hides behind the shadows of legal technicalities and bureaucratic doubletalk. Everybody has something to hide behind except the veteran. The veteran who went out to fight to defend his Government and the Code and is now rewarded for that effort by having that Government assassinate his character from behind.

I have seen their victim and I can assure "Wild Ike" Eisenhower and his partner "Jingles" Gillilland that the bullet was not in the front.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will have the courage to act where others have faltered, that we will step into the breach and enact legislation which will grant Mr. Welsh and all the others in his circumstances—men who braved enemy gunfire and suffered the rigors of Communist prison camps—the chance to have their day in court; the opportunity to meet their accusers, face to face, in accord with the Code of Abilene.

THE FARM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, speaking for the six Republican Wisconsin Members of Congress, Messrs. SMITH, BYRNES, DAVIS, WITHROW, VAN PELT, and myself, I wish to commend President Eisenhower for his veto message which was read this morning to the House of Representatives. The Wisconsin farmers whom we represent will be ever indebted to President Eisenhower for his action in promptly vetoing H. R. 12.

The farm bill as it was placed on the President's desk by this Democrat Congress would have meant loss of income to the Wisconsin farmers of over $12 million and would have materially aggravated the cost-price squeeze. In 1955, Wisconsin farmers paid $130 million for feed used but not produced on their farms. Under the vetoed farm bill, Wisconsin farmers' costs would have been increased by 20 percent to at least $156 million because of the increase in feed grains support levels required by the legislation. Wisconsin farmers, under the terms of H. R. 12, would have received $14 million by the increase which was granted in the farm bill in the manufacturing milk support price. This entire increase of $14 million would have been wiped out and plowed under by the $26 million increase in their feed bills.

The President in vetoing the farm bill and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to increase the support price of manufacturing milk to $3.25 per hundred pounds and the support price of butter fat to 58.6 cents a pound, has truly befriended the Wisconsin farmer.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, the text of the letter to President Eisenhower from six Wisconsin Republican Representatives, urging his veto of H. R. 12, the farm bill, is included at this point in the RECORD:

TEXT OF LETTER TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER FROM SIX WISCONSIN REPUBLICAN REPRESENTATIVES URGING HIS VETO OF H. R. 12, THE FARM BILL

APRIL 15, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We feel it our duty as Representatives from a State which derives over half of its cash farm receipts from dairy products, to point out to you the dangers to the dairy farmer inherent in H. R. 12, the farm bill now on your desk.

H. R. 12 was written for the basic crop farmer, particularly the commercial producers of peanuts, rice, cotton, tobacco, corn and wheat. It is loaded with all manner of devices to increase, through Government payments, the prices of these products. While we have no quarrel with these farmers, we must protest when legislation discriminates to heavily in their favor to the detriment of the majority of other farmers in the Nation, particularly the dairy farmer.

There is little need for us to elaborate on the importance of the dairy and livestock industries to American agriculture. Next to receipts from cattle and calves (a good share of which is derived as a byproduct of dairying) the single largest source of cash receipts for American farmers is dairy products. Farmers receive almost as much cash from dairy products as from cotton, tobacco, rice and peanuts combined. Cash income from the closely-allied dairy and beef industries is almost $2 billion more annually than from all of the basic crops together.

In States like Wisconsin, the relative importance of dairying and livestock is even more striking. In our State, 50 percent of the farmer's cash receipts is derived from dairy products. Seventy-two percent of our farm cash receipts come from three sources—dairy products, cattle, and poultry. Eighty-seven percent of our farm income is derived from livestock and its products. In contrast, only 2½ percent of our farm cash income comes from basic crops.

You can, we believe, understand our concern over a bill which will prove temporarily beneficial only to those farmers producing less than a quarter of our cash crops nationwide and only at the expense of major elements of American agriculture, particularly the dairy industry. A bill which sacrifices the dairy farmer on the altar of the basic crop farmer should be summarily rejected.

The harmful effect upon the dairy farmer of H. R. 12's bias in favor of the basic crop farmer may be summarized as follows:

1. The bill raises the general support level of basic crops, and feed grains, by 15 to 20 percent while providing only a temporary 2½ percent increase in the support level of milk.

There can be no logic, or fairness, in a national farm program which so discriminates against a major segment of our farm population. If increases in the support level are necessary, they should be uniform. Crops which represent income to some farmers represent costs to others. A dairy farmer's net income is based not only on his milk check but upon his feed bill as well.

It should be understood that, for the first time, feed grains are required to be supported at a fixed support price level pegged to the basic commodities. This raises the price of feed in excess of 20 percent.

The discrimination in support levels will cost the Wisconsin dairy farmer, for example, $12 million in 1956. The estimated $14 million Wisconsin farmers will receive from the raise in their milk support price will be wiped out and plowed under by a $26 million increase in their feed bill. In 1955, Wisconsin farmers paid $130 million for feed used but not produced on their farms. Under H. R. 12, this bill will be increased 20 percent to at least $156 million because of the increase in feed grain support levels the legislation requires.

The impact of this $1 million a month loss upon Wisconsin producers of milk, poultry, beef and hogs will be disastrous.

2. The bill requires the support of certain basic crops at the higher of two methods of computing parity. Manufacturing milk, on the other hand, would be supported, in future marketing years, under a formula which leads to a constantly decreasing minimum support price.

The dual parity provision for basic crops, in effect, throws out the parity theory in an effort to get the highest possible support price for these favored crops. The bill, on the other hand, approves, after the current marketing year, a formula producing a constantly reduced support price for manufacturing milk. At that time, manufacturing milk supports would be calculated under a formula which leads to a constantly lower parity equivalent because of the growing disparity between the price of fluid and manufacturing milk. In our State, 80 percent of our milk production goes into manufactured dairy products, and the combination of increasing basic crop support prices and constantly decreasing manufacturing milk prices would be economically disastrous. Our efforts to stabilize the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk, by providing a representative rather than a moving base period, were fought and defeated in the House by the Democratic leadership.

3. The bill provides no protection to the dairy farmer from the production of milk by basic crop farmers on land under acreage allotment, and worse, adds immeasurably to this problem by failing to provide adequate protection on land put in the soil bank.

Twenty yearse ago, a distinguished Wisconsin Representative, now Judge Gerald Boileau, pointed out the need for dealing with the problem created by acres taken out of production of basic crops under acreage allotments, converted to feed production, either of grains or roughage, and then utilized to produce milk. This problem has never been dealt with by Congress and it is not dealt with in H. R. 12. Wisconsin farmers are able and willing to compete with farmers in other areas of the country on a freely competitive basis but they cannot do so if other farmers are being paid out of the Treasury for withholding acres from the production of certain crops while being at liberty to use those acres for the production of livestock and milk.

H. R. 12 not only fails to deal with this problem; it compounds it by creating a new diverted acreage problem. It provides no real safeguards against the use of soil-bank acreage for milk and livestock production. The conference report itself states that the conference committee struck from the bill "a provision desired chiefly by livestock pro-

ducers as a protection against a farmer placing land into the soil bank, receiving his payment therefor, and then using the land for grazing purposes."

The dairyland is composed of farmers who devote their lives to providing the Nation with pure, wholesome milk. It constantly strives to keep its production in line with demand. Milk production will surge, and depress prices everywhere, as long as farmers outside the dairy area are subsidized by the Government to go into the dairy business.

These, Mr. President, are the principal reasons why we fought and voted against H. R. 12. It will be injurious to the farmers we represent and to the dairy and livestock industries which form the backbone of American agriculture. These same reasons, we are confident, will lead you to the conclusion that H. R. 12 would prove a disservice to agriculture and the Nation at large. We urge your prompt veto of the bill.

Congress can still pass sound farm legislation if it forgets politics and buckles down to it. We suggest, therefore, that you not only veto H. R. 12 but that you urge the Congress to pass forthwith legislation which will provide a sound, long-range solution to the farm problem, dealing equitably with all segments of agriculture.

H. R. 12, if amended by the motion to recommit which we supported in the House, forms the basis for such legislation. It would embody the far-seeing proposals you made to Congress early in this session. It would remove the bulk of the objection we raise in this letter on behalf of the dairy farmer.

That motion to recommit, you will recall, would have:

(1) Removed the discriminations in favor of basic crop farmers and detrimental to dairy and livestock farmers by eliminating mandatory 90 percent supports for basic crops and striking out the dual parity provision.

(2) Lowered basic feed costs by eliminating mandatory price supports for feed grains.

(3) Provide a sound and permanent formula for computing the parity equivalent of manufacturing milk. It would have provided an immediate price support increase for manufacturing milk, prevented the drop which can take place next April and assured the dairy farmer of stability of price.

We can have sound farm legislation this year. It can best be obtained by a veto of H. R. 12 and a plea by you to Congress to assume its responsibilities for the welfare of all American farmers.

Respectfully yours,

GLENN R. DAVIS,
Member of Congress, Second District. Wisconsin.

GARDNER R. WITHROW,
Third District, Wisconsin.

LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
First District, Wisconsin.

JOHN W. BYRNES,
Member of Congress, Eighth District, Wisconsin.

MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Member of Congress, Seventh District, Wisconsin.

WILLIAM K. VAN PELT,
Member of Congress, Sixth District, Wisconsin.

THE STATE OF ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire today to add my voice to the voice of my distinguished colleagues, the gentlemen from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and my good friend from the State of Illinois [Mr. BOYLE], in congratulating the infant State of Israel on its eighth birthday. As you know, Mr. Speaker, we in this country and we in this Congress had a great deal to do not only with the formation of the State of Israel but with the wonderful growth which the people of Israel have enjoyed since the formation of that state. It was my late father, Congressman John Dingell of Michigan, who introduced one of the first pieces of legislation which was aimed at aiding the infant State of Israel during its time of trouble after our great former President, Harry Truman, extended to that state the recognition which made its present existence possible.

Today Israel is 8 years old. An article recognizing its eighth birthday yesterday in one of the Washington papers appeared in the same section which had to do with the obituaries of certain of our prominent citizens. It is my hope that we in this Congress and this country will not permit those two facts to have any significance.

Israel today is faced by 40 million hostile Arabs. Israel has a population in its own country of slightly in excess of a million, odds of 40 to 1. Each day Israel's enemies grow stronger. They are getting arms which are furnished to them by Communist Russia, an enemy not only of our own country but an enemy of the freedom of all countries throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, one fact which I think many people overlook in their appraisal of the present Middle Eastern situation is that Israel, being the size of the State of Massachusetts, some 8,000 square miles, is so small that it could be overrun before the United States could send aid to help Israel against an aggressor. Our foreign policy overlooks the fact today that before the U. N., which has been supervising the attempts of the world to solve the problems of the Middle East, could arrive on the scene to determine who is the aggressor, Israel probably would not only have been overrun but its people would have been exterminated under a pogram of the type that has shamed Russia for so many years. The administration has consistently delayed the delivery of arms to Israel or any consideration of the subject. Yet during this time substantial amounts of arms have flowed to the Arab nations and in one instance 18 tanks were delivered to Saudi Arabia. It is interesting to note that not only does Saudi Arabia ally itself with Egypt, but that its troops are being led by Egyptian army officers and that its whole economy is infiltrated by the Egyptians with economic advisers, much in the same manner, as a matter of fact, as the Russians infiltrate an area when they send their economic advisers in to guide and to control the destiny of a country. We seem to overlook in this country the series of incidents which have been provoked by the Arabs during the recent weeks. On some of these occasions, Israel has acted in the only way that a country dare act. They have retaliated strongly, and they have retaliated as a deterrent to protect themselves against further depredations. Now, the Arabs want war, Mr. Speaker. Nassar himself said that the Arab world will not rest until—and I am quoting from Mr. Nassar now—"until the Israel cancer has been cut from the Arab heart." Everyone knows that that is the same man that endorsed the candidacy of Mr. Eisenhower for President.

Now, Israel asks for only one thing, that we furnish her with the arms that she requires to protect herself in time of trouble. She has asked us for arms. There are many in this Congress, myself included, who advocate that Israel not only receive these arms but that she be accorded the protection which the United States could give her by including her in a defensive alliance, in NATO or in SEATO or in any alliance or organization which would offer the security she so desperately needs. Yet, nothing has been done.

Mr. Speaker, there is something that this Congress should take very serious cognizance of. While the administration has been vacillating and doing nothing, Mr. Dulles and Mr. Eisenhower have come out and told the Congress that we, the Congress, are expected to come forward and to approve the sending of troops into this area, after the administration, through its present policy of muddle and delay, has arrived at a situation where the peace of the world is endangered and where the peace of the Middle East is probably reaching its last days. We, according to the White House, may expect, in this Congress, after this policy of muddle and delay, to send American troops to fight in an area where that fighting would not be necessary had arms been sent in time so that Israel could have been sufficiently strong to defend herself.

Now, I want our people to know about this because we are, in this Congress, being asked to ratify a muddled administration policy and are being asked to place our stamp of approval on that policy. We are being asked to send American troops into an area where there is no necessity for them being there if we had acted vigorously in the time in which we should act. Now, this country can do much yet to head off the war that is impending. We read in the intelligence reports that Egypt will probably have assimilated its arms from the Soviet bloc by late summer. By that time there are a large number of people, who know much about the area, who expect that Israel will be attacked by Egypt. There have been a large number of people who are well familiar with the area who have told us that Egypt could and possible would attack the Israelis as early as 2 weeks hence. These things our people must know.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I again call to the attention of the administration the fact that a large number of Members of this House and a large number of Members of the other body are on record at this time as favoring furnishing military aid to Israel and to furnish that aid at an early date. I hope that the administration will take that counsel, and I hope that the administration will see to it that Israel gets the arms which she needs, so

that our sister democracy's next celebration of its independence day will be in sufficient strength that Israel and her friends will know that it will continue to exist as we and the free world so strongly hope.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE CREATION OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on this eighth anniversary of the rebirth of Israel, I am happy to join in saluting that gallant little nation. Americans naturally and traditionally have had a special regard for a nation that has fought for and won its independence, but this is an occasion for special pride and rejoicing. For in the face of mammoth physical odds and the ruthless hostility of her neighbors, Israel has made tremendous progress in the short space of 8 years, and has vindicated the democratic ideal in an area where feudalism and corrupt dictatorship have flourished.

A year ago I stood on the floor of the House and recounted some of Israel's achievements. I am proud to be able to say that during the last 12 months Israel has continued that forward march, an eloquent tribute to the courage and spirit of her people. They bring to mind our own hardy pioneers who overcame the obstacles of nature and man to carve out the great Nation America is today. The people of Israel, with their indomitable spirit, have likewise built a new nation in the face of even greater natural hazards and man-made obstacles. They have converted a desert into a nation of thriving industry and agricultural settlements.

Israel has won for her people a standard of living which is today the highest in the Middle East. Over 75 new industries alone were established last year. Israel has built additional rail facilities and increased the size of its merchant marine fleet. This progress, remarkable as it is, is even more impressive when we consider that Israel has been compelled to divert a good part of its resources and manpower from peaceful civilian pursuits in order to defend herself against the constant threat of attack. How much further could Israel have advanced if her Arab neighbors had accepted Israel's repeated pleas for peace.

But this story of Israel's material progress is only a part of the story. It neglects the human side. It does not tell how Israel in the 8 years of its existence has opened wide its doors to over 800,000 immigrants, most of whom were refugees from Nazi and Soviet concentration camps. It does not tell the story of how Israel has given life new meaning for these immigrants where once they faced only a hopeless future. It does not tell the story of the magnificent scientific, educational, and medical achievements of the young state, and it does not tell the story of her democracy in an area surrounded by feudal dictators more interested in preserving their own power than in the welfare of their impoverished subjects.

Israel today has a government that in spirit and ideal is very much like our own. Her people enjoy a free press, free speech, and a freely elected representative government, with Moslem, Christian, and Jewish officials. In the 8 years which have passed since its independence, Israel has proved itself to be the most stable and representative government in the Middle East.

Israel's eighth birthday is, indeed, an occasion for pride and joy for Americans, because the United States played such a significant role in its establishment, in the development of its economy, and in making it the strong state which it is today. Former President Harry S. Truman, in the name of the United States, 8 years ago, promptly recognized the new nation and welcomed it into the family of nations; and in the years since, this country, I am proud to say, has included Israel in its economic assistance program. And Israel has amply justified America's confidence and support by her steadfast defense of freedom and her determination to fight for the democratic way of life.

But our joy on this occasion, great as it is, is nevertheless tempered because Israel today is in the hour of its greatest peril. It faces a threat even greater than any since it declared its independence. Then five Arab armies marched on Israel but the Israelis repelled the invaders and threw them back. Today, however, they face a militarily stronger foe, a foe armed and trained by the Kremlin. Israel looks to the nations of the free world for needed assistance to halt this threat of Arab-Soviet aggression to its own borders and, indeed, to the peace of the world.

Just a little over 2 months ago I joined with many Members of this body in urging our Government to make defensive arms available to Israel to deter this threat of war in the Middle East. At that time we said:

> 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 that 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.

Unfortunately events since that time have made this statement even truer today. The continuing flow of Communist arms to the Arab States has encouraged Premier Nasser of Egypt to undertake a series of military incursions into Israel, and to intensify his campaign against the West by stirring up trouble for France in north Africa and by playing a sinister part in Glubb Pasha's ouster from Jordan.

I realize, of course, Mr. Speaker, that an arms race will not bring peace to the Middle East. But we are not suggesting such an arms race and that is not the issue. A recent New York Times editorial defined the issue so simply that I think it well to refer to it at this time. The editorial said:

> We say we will not furnish arms to Israel because we do not want to see an arms race. This merely confuses the issue. How have we kept the peace in the world against Russia since the war except by arming ourselves and our allies to the point where the Russians do not dare to start a war? It is not an arms race to let Israel acquire fighter planes for defense against the Ilyushin bombers the Czechs have sold to Egypt? There may well be war in the Middle East if one side gets much stronger than the other.

If we were to furnish defensive arms to Israel, we would be doing no more than what we have done elsewhere in the world in order to deter the Soviet aggressor. In Korea, in Greece, in Formosa, in Southeast Asia, and in many other parts of the world we proved our readiness to take the lead in the defense of freedom. Now it is Israel that is being threatened by the Cairo-Kremlin axis which seeks to overrun the entire Middle East, and we must meet that challenge by permitting Israel to get the weapons she needs to defend herself. It is time for action and deeds, not words.

I recognize, of course, that we need the friendship of the Arab States. I realize, too, how important Middle East oil is to our own security and how important it is to keep that oil out of Russian hands. But I submit that our Middle East policy today—if it can be called a policy—is bringing about the very result which we are seeking to avoid. Each day we see further evidence that, while we pursue a policy of drift and improvisation, the Middle East is being gradually turned over to the Communist sphere of influence. We saw only too well how drift and appeasement failed before World War II. They will not work now. The dictator, whether he be Russian, Nazi, or the feudal despot, respects only courage and principle backed by determination. We can win the respect of the Kremlin-Cairo axis only if we show our resolve to prevent Israel's destruction, and we can show that determination by giving Israel the necessary arms to defend herself.

The administration policy—or lack of policy—has served only to embolden the Arab States. We all know of the flagrant discrimination which Saudi Arabia and the other Arab States have practiced against Americans of the Jewish faith. They have denied visas to Americans because they happen to be Jews. They have instituted boycotts against American business firms which are owned in part by Americans of the Jewish faith. They have now gone so far as to dictate to us which American soldiers we should send to our airbase at Dharan by requiring us not to send American soldiers of the Jewish faith.

How can this country expect to win the respect of the Arab States when we submit to such degrading demands? What we need today is a policy which is based on moral principles rather than expediency.

We do well to recall the words of a great Democrat whose hundredth anni-

versary of his birth we celebrate this year—Woodrow Wilson. In 1911 the Russian Government was practicing an offensive discrimination against Americans of the Jewish faith, and Wilson demanded that we resist it, saying:

Russia cannot respect us when she sees us * * * preferring our interests to our rights. * * * An intolerable situation will be remedied just as soon as Russia is convinced that for us it is indeed intolerable.

These eloquent words are worth remembering today. They point the moral for our problem in the Middle East. It is only when we assert our rights and principles that the Arab States will really respect us. Then and only then will we be able to win a friendship based on respect. Then and only then can we help to build peace in this area and make a contribution in the finest tradition of American diplomacy.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks an editorial, "Storm in the Middle East," appearing in the New York Times of April 10, 1956:

STORM IN THE MIDDLE EAST

As the Secretary General of the United Nations hastens eastward on his peace mission into the face of the gathering storm, the war clouds are rolling up again around Israel's embattled borders. The latest outbursts, involving the death of at least 75 persons, are the most serious in several months. A special session of the Israeli Parliament has been called. There is no doubt that the situation is dangerous.

Border clashes between Egyptian and Israeli troops last week led to the shelling of Gaza, and this in turn led to the penetration of Israel by Arab "commando" raiders. Cease-fires have been arranged only to be broken. Tension is high. Each side, as usual, accuses the other of starting the affray, and each side is committed to a policy of retaliation. The Premier of Israel said Sunday there would be no reprisal for 48 hours, pending certain assurances from Egypt; if the raids—whether from Egypt or Jordan or both—are not curbed by the Arab Governments involved in conformity with the cease-fire, there is no telling what will happen.

What is of paramount importance in the present crisis, similar to and yet different from the many crises that have preceded it, is that the shooting, the border-crossing, the murders be halted. These border incidents have in them the potentiality of blowing the Middle East sky high; and the first duty incumbent upon Cairo, upon Tel Aviv, upon Amman, is to call them off. They can and must be stopped. If they are, the deep-seated quarrel between Israel and the Arabs will be no nearer a solution; but it will be further from the ultimate folly, the anarchy of war.

Peace in the eastern Mediterranean will not be easy to come by, but it is still not too late for effective action. It is still not too late for the United States to allow the sale of defensive arms to Israel; it is still not too late for us to join the Baghdad Pact that we ourselves inspired; it is still not too late for us to make it clear that we are prepared to implement the tripartite agreement by intervening with force if necessary to forestall an aggressive war in the Middle East, which would be the best guaranty that it would not become necessary.

In his statement yesterday that the United States would observe its commitments under this and other agreements to oppose any aggression within constitutional means, the President moved in the direction of a more forceful enunciation of American policy; and the meeting of congressional leaders with Secretary Dulles today is designed to strengthen it still further. We believe the President should ask for specific congressional endorsement of the use of troops in the Middle East in view of the fact that he once before felt obliged to ask similar congressional approval in respect to the Far East. Up to the present, the American position has been too nebulous, vague, and uncertain to afford the vigorous leadership required in this critical juncture in Middle Eastern and in world affairs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCHERER (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio), from April 16 through April 20, on account of official committee business.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for Monday, April 16, and Tuesday, April 17, on account of death of his mother.

Mr. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. SAYLOR), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

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. SIKES, for 30 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. PRICE, for 15 minutes, on Thursday.

Mr. POWELL, for 30 minutes, on April 17, and for 1 hour, on Wednesday, April 18.

Mr. CELLER, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. LAIRD, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. POAGE, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROONEY, with regard to Pan-American Day.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENTLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR and to include the partial result of a poll recently taken.

Mr. KEARNS (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include an article.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HESELTON and to include extraneous material.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FULTON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. MCDONOUGH.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. PHILBIN in two instances.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3481. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution requiring conference reports to be accompanied by statements signed by a majority of the managers of each House; to the Committee on Rules.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6712. An act to amend section 1237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 17, 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:

1742. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, relative to reporting that there have been no significant developments to report for the month of February relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1743. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of over-obligation of two allotments, pursuant to section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1211 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951, and administrative regulations promulgated thereunder by the Department of Agriculture and procedures of the former Production and Marketing Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1744. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1745. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act so as to extend the coverage of such act to employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia employed in District of Columbia institutions located in Maryland and Virginia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1746. A letter from the Secretary of State transmitting a copy of a special resolution concerning the late Honorable Chauncey W. Reed adopted by the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration at its meeting on February 20, 1956; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1747. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Little Wood River project, Idaho, pursuant to section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 381); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1748. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting additional information relative to the case to Karl Yu, A-8870546, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1749. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 382); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1750. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the second report of the Attorney General of the United States, pursuant to section 207 (a) of the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House on April 12, 1956, the following resolutions were reported on April 13, 1956:

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 473. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 501, a joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; without amendment (Rept. No. 1999). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 474. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 10387. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2000). Referred to the House Calendar.

[*Submitted April 16, 1956*]

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. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3897. A bill to relieve the Secretary of the Interior of certain reporting requirements in connection with proposed National Park Service awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof; with amendment (Rept. No. 2001). 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. ABBITT:

H. R. 10500. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to make certain payments to the counties of Dinwiddie, Nottoway, Brunswick, and Lunenburg, Va., from the proceeds of sales of timber located on lands within Camp Pickett, Va.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 10501. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to make certain payments to the county of Mecklenburg, Va., from the proceeds of sales of timber located on that portion of the land within the John H. Kerr Reservoir, Va. and N. C., situated in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 10502. A bill to provide for the control of destructive aphids; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 10503. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 10504. A bill to allow a homesteader settling on unsurveyed public land in Alaska to make single final proof prior to survey of the lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10505. A bill to authorize the conveyance of homestead allotments to Indians or Eskimos in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 10506. A bill to provide for the control of destructive aphids; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 10507. A bill to prohibit the importation of certain agricultural commodities which are in surplus supply; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 10508. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 10509. A bill to provide for the collection of income tax at source on dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10510. A bill to allow amounts paid for the institutional care and training of a mentally retarded child of a taxpayer to be deducted for Federal income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 10511. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 to redefine the term "refugee", to admit (subject to adequate safeguards) certain aliens afflicted with tuberculosis, to provide for agency assurances, to eliminate readmission requirements, and for other purposes; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 10512. A bill to provide for the control of destructive aphids; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 10513. A bill to provide for the control of destructive aphids; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 10514. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 10515. A bill to provide for the control of destructive aphids; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 10516. A bill to provide that the Blue Ridge Parkway shall be toll free; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 10517. A bill to clarify the jurisdiction of the Tax Court in abnormality relief cases arising under the World War II Excess Profits Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 10518. A bill to amend section 6 of Public, No. 2, 73d Congress, to establish a priority for combat and overseas war veterans in obtaining hospitalization from the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 10519. A bill to amend section 304 (d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with respect to the disposition of certain imported articles which have been seized and condemned; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 10520. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital at Seattle, Wash., as the George E. Flood Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 10521. A bill to amend section 172 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the net operating loss deduction in case of taxable years beginning in 1953 and ending in 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. R. 10522. A bill to allow certain persons to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid for meals and lodging and travel when employed away from home for temporary periods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 10523. A bill to confirm the appointment and compensation of the chief legal officer of the Post Office Department to the method of appointment and rate of compensation provided for comparable positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 10524. A bill to amend section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to place certain restrictions upon ownership or control of broadcast stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 10525. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to place a maximum limitation on the 3-percent tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10526. A bill to provide for the disposition of certain property of the United States heretofore conveyed to the Housing Authority of the city of Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 10527. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 10528. A bill to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to clarify the authority of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 10529. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the use of broadcasting stations by Presidential, Vice Presidential, and congressional candidates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 10530. A bill to amend chapter V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the period during which World War II veterans may obtain guaranteed loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 10531. A bill to amend chapter V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the period during which World

War II veterans may obtain guaranteed loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 10532. A bill to amend chapter V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the period during which World War II veterans may obtain guaranteed loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 10533. A bill to amend chapter V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the period during which World War II veterans may obtain guaranteed loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 10534. A bill to amend chapter V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the period during which World War II veterans may obtain guaranteed loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 10535. A bill to include the present area of Zion National Monument within Zion National Park, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 10536. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10537. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of nonferrous chrysotile asbestos in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10538. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 7, 1916, as amended, by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the employees' compensation fund by Federal employing agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10539. A bill to adjust the limitations imposed on veterans outpatient dental care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 10540. A bill to provide that the Blue Ridge Parkway shall be toll free; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 10541. A bill to provide pension for widows and children of veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict on the same basis as pension is provided for widows and children of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 10542. A bill to liberalize certain criteria for determining eligibility of widows for benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 10543. A bill to provide for the control of destructive aphids; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10544. 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. THOMAS:

H. R. 10545. A bill to provide for the modification of the Houston Ship Channel, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 10546. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 10547. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 10548. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 10549. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. J. Res. 603. Joint resolution transferring to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico certain archives and records in possession of the National Archives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. Con. Res. 232. Concurrent resolution extending greetings to the American National Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. Res. 475. Resolution of inquiry regarding settlement of tax claim in case against American Distilling Co.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Armed Forces bombing and artillery ranges; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to commending the Boy Scouts of America and supporting the 1957 Boy Scout Jamboree at Valley Forge; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the proposed Washoe project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to flood control on the Mad and Eel Rivers, South Fork of Eel River, Redwood Creek, Klamath, Mattole, Russian, Smith, and Van Duzen Rivers; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 10550. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Losco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 10551. A bill for the relief of Santiago S. Nazareta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 10552. A bill for the relief of Miss Adria Del Rosario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10553. A bill for the relief of Miss Emilia M. Romero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 10554. A bill for the relief of Geronimo Navarrete-Rivera; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

H. R. 10555. A bill for the relief of Jose Mariscal Avina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 10556. A bill for the relief of Husam Amin Darwazh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 10557. A bill for the relief of Herman Skiber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 10558. A bill for the relief of Marian Anthony Rotnicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 10559. For the relief of Henry G. Chalkley, et al.: to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

897. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of Helmer Twito and other North Dakotans urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

898. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of 45 residents of Williamsport and Lycoming County, Pa., urging the enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

899. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. John Zulpo, Bigelow, Ark., and others urging a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

900. Also, petition of J. Orville Cheney, secretary, Arkansas State Racing Commission, expressing the opposition of the commission to H. R. 8781 and S. 3043, which would reduce to $5,000 the maximum amount of deduction allowable to individuals in the recomputation of taxable income in a trade or business carried on for 5 consecutive taxable years in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1956; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

901. By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of approximately 160 citizens of Pasadena and southern California urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

902. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of American Legion Auxiliary of Osceola, Iowa, urging enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

903. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of naturalized American citizens of Greek origin and descent, of Beloit, Wis., urging Congress to carefully study the present Cyprus situation and to take immediate action to promote the interest of freedom and justice, thereby to avoid the unrest and bloodshed now rampant and to bring both to Cyprus and to Greece itself, America's traditional and historic friend, the peace, freedom and tranquillity which they deserve; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

904. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Iova D. Alexander, Centerline, Mich., and 45 others for separate pension program for World War I Veterans and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

905. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Clerk, the California Junior Statesmen of America, Southern Region, Santa Barbara, Calif., petitioning consideration of their

resolution with reference to requesting that they be placed on record as opposing the adoption of any system of subscription television for the home; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

906. Also, petition of Clifford Grail, Cincinnati, Ohio, stating certain grievances against the executive and legislative branches of the Government, and the Governor of Ohio, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

907. Also, petition of the president, Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, Honolulu, T. H., requesting that the Hawaiian Organic Act be amended so as to provide for reapportionment of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii substantially upon the basis set forth in the proposed Hawaii State Constitution ratified by the voters of the Territory of Hawaii in 1950; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

American Doctrine for American Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on Tuesday, April 10, I had the pleasure of speaking in Los Angeles at the Rodger Young Auditorium, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks which I made at that time.

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

AMERICAN DOCTRINE FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS

I cannot tell you how grateful I am to meet with all of you today. I am proud to be introduced by a distinguished American, Mr. Manchester Boddy, lifelong Democrat, and former publisher of a great daily newspaper in Los Angeles.

This is not a personal meeting. It represents, rather, a typical American opportunity for all of us—regardless of political party—to voice our agreement on some fundamentals by which we hope our Federal Government will be guided in the future, and through which we pray the cause of American freedom will be strengthened and the cause of a just and enduring peace in the world will be advanced.

We believe in the freedom of man. We are devoted to the American constitutional system whose goal is to preserve our free American society, and to guarantee to each citizen in our Nation the right to live his own life and do as he wishes with those opportunities which may present themselves to him. The civil rights written into our Constitution belong to each of us, and belong, also to our Nation. We decline to be pushed around as citizens or as a people. In the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, we intend to pursue happiness, to enjoy life as we may, all under the liberty which our Republic was founded to maintain.

Ours has been a magnificent history. I think we rather convincingly demonstrated in 1776 that Americans intend to be citizens and not subjects. That was the year, you know, when we first rejected colonialism and laid down the precept that Americans believe in the self-determination of peoples. And ever since the rebellious American colonists wrote a Constitution, and conceived the free society of the Republic of the United States, we have overcome the dangers which new situations have placed before us. Each succeeding American generation has preserved American freedom, and has resolutely clung to the same self-evident truths which the patriots laid down at Philadelphia 170 years ago.

All in all, ours has been a history of progress, and we mean, under the providence of God, to continue that progress in the years and generations which lie ahead.

We are now well embarked into a new era on the globe. Unhappily, the struggle for freedom must continue. Almost entirely from the Red ideology of communism stems the current danger to freedom which our generation must overcome. This is the era of the atom and of thermonuclear energy. Men have discovered the secrets of unbelieveable physical power. It is available, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, for either evil or for good. It can annihilate the whole world and all its peoples, or it can be the source of a truly amazing new age of happiness. It can turn wheels, supply power, and wondrously contribute to man's health. One of our great challenges is to assure the use of it in the cause of peace and not in the cause of war.

It is in that background that we can assess our lot in 1956. Our country is at peace. The Korean war ended a little less than 3 years ago. We can be grateful that no American casualty lists are being published. And a very great man, a very humble man, is leading our Government in a dedicated search for the achievement of peace with justice among all nations.

There are many sorely troubled areas around the globe. The insidious policies of Communist Russia in the Middle East are an appalling and heavy factor in the strife and bloodshed in that unhappy area. Russia's aim is to become a power in the Middle East. A conflict of arms between the Israelis and the Arabs poses a most tragic danger to the cause of freedom everywhere. Positive steps must be taken to avert it.

The travail on Cyprus seriously disconcerts all of us. Greece and Turkey, as well as Great Britain, are all our friends, and are all implacable foes of communism. Now, to find them embroiled in a bitter conflict is almost unthinkable.

The Middle East and Cyprus, indeed each sector of the world, must have the closest attention of our Government. Through the United Nations, and also through arrangements with our free friends, which have been made and which are being made, all our actions are designed to bring about a just and enduring peace among all nations.

I sincerely believe that war was averted a year ago in the Far East by the bold leadership of our President, in which Congress, controlled by one political party, and the executive branch by another, stood firmly together in approving an official American policy—the Formosa resolution—which made unmistakably clear our firm and inflexible decision that Free China shall not be overrun by communism. I mention this here because I hope, and I believe, that politics must still stop at the water's edge. And I hope, and I believe, that almost all the people of the United States are knit closely together in their desire to maintain a foreign policy free from partisanship—or from extremes—designed solely for our own people's security in a world of peace and justice.

Those are my views, and I feel assured that they are yours as well. Extremes and extremists, either left or right, must be avoided, as they are being avoided, in all our foreign policy decisions, and, for that matter, in our domestic decisions as well.

Every facet of our foreign policy must be determined on the basis of our own American self-interest, albeit an enlightened self-interest. We are a peaceful nation. We are a free nation. We intend, as Americans, not as partisans, to determine a course that is best for us, as Americans, to pursue. It is to our own interests to promote peace in the world and comradeship among free peoples. That is what we are doing, that is what we propose to do.

That is what this Nation was doing when President Eisenhower last year voiced his electrifying proposal for "open sky" reciprocal air inspection for both Communist territory and the free world. Just a few days ago at the meeting of the United Nations Subcommittee on Disarmament at London, and for the first time, the Soviet apparently announced some tentative acceptance of the Presidential plan. Their deeds, rather than their words will, however, still be the measure of their sincerity.

"What we are trying to do here," said a Western representative at the London Conference, "is to establish some common ground with the Russians. * * * In this nuclear age, if you can devise a sure guard against surprise attack, there will be no attack. And if there is no attack, there will be no war."

In the last 2 years, substantial progress has been made in our mutual-security agreements. Over the violent protests of Mr. Molotov and Russia, our Government led the way in granting sovereignty to the Federal German Republic and approved—with our fellow members—her entrance into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—a real achievement. How the Russians hate it and fear it.

Austria's sovereignty has been restored, not, it is true, as an active ally of the West, but certainly not a partner of Moscow. I feel reasonably assured that Austria's spirit and prayers are entirely with the free nations and entirely against the Communist nations. And on the other side of the world in Southeast Asia, the multilateral mutual security pact continues to furnish the means for friendly cooperation and for agreement to stand firm against aggression.

So, I repeat, our generation continues making progress in determining and overcoming those modern dangers to the cause of our freedom. There are some deadly serious questions remaining with which we must deal, and deal firmly. But the basic hazards of Communist aggression and intrigue is not one for the people of the United States alone. They are the concern of all free peoples, and it will be in concert with them that we shall continue to oppose the Communist ideology.

Meanwhile, the whole world now knows of the fantastic changes in the Communist line. Almost deified in his lifetime, Stalin now is reviled by the Kremlin as a sadist and a wanton murderer. I suppose we will have to wait some time before understanding the full implications of this abrupt change in Soviet philosophy.

There is one part in the Communist line here in California, which remains steadfast. I am proud to tell you that the Communist newspapers in California say a lot of terrible things about me. They are asking our

people to defeat me. I can't tell you how glad I am that this is true. A man is known by the company he keeps. I never have kept company with communism and the Communist press in the past, and I promise all the people of my State I will not keep company with them in the future. We, all of us, Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, are agreed on our uncompromising objection to this godless creed. We shall together oppose communism and all those who fraternize with it.

I am not a witch hunter. I have voted in the Senate for the strongest kind of laws to stamp out all kinds of subversion. And subversion is being stamped out in this country, in my judgment. Our Federal Department of Justice and our Federal Bureau of Investigation are working steadfastly toward that end.

All I can say is that I shall continue, so long as I remain in the United States Senate, to vote for an enlightened foreign policy which is in the best interests of the American people and which promotes the cause of a just peace among all nations. My vote will be free of political concern and partisan concern.

Closely alined with America's international relations is the question of the defense of our people. How have I cast my vote in the Senate on this important question? How have I discharged this obligation to my 13 million fellow Californians? I have done it by voting consistently in favor of the recommendations of President Eisenhower. Preeminently qualified himself in this important field, he has advising him a group of the foremost military men in our country. Chief among them is Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and a veteran of more than 40 years of military experience. Here is what he said last year:

"I feel as of today that we are better prepared to meet any emergency than we ever have been during my service in the Armed Forces.

"In fact the United States forces we plan to maintain are the most powerful, individually by service and collectively as a team, that our Nation has ever undertaken to maintain during a period when we were not actually engaged in a shooting war. These forces are fully adequate to perform all essential tasks in the initial stages of a shooting war, global or otherwise, and they constitute an ample base which will permit a rapid and orderly buildup when and if that should become necessary."

Ten days ago, in Washington, I asked Admiral Radford if his opinion was the same today. He replied that it is, with the continuing understandable proviso that world conditions do not materially change for the worse.

Here at home we have much to be thankful for. We enjoy the highest level of economy in all our history. More people are employed in California and in the Nation than ever before. Part of the responsibility of a United States Senator is to work to continue that kind of healthy, dynamic economy. I promise each of you I shall do just that.

These last 3 years I have introduced legislation, now the law, to construct irrigation projects, dams, storage reservoirs, and good flood-control works to improve the lot of our people. But they'll do more than that. They'll also provide jobs for our people.

The care of our disabled American veterans is a just responsibility of the Nation. America can never fully discharge it. I have interested myself in the welfare of our former servicemen. I am glad to tell you that I successfully urged the Senate to approve my request for an $8 million hospital at Long Beach for our paraplegic veterans. And for northern California the Senate agreed to approve a new 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital for veterans of our wars. These two new institutions will soon be a reality.

I am a coauthor of pending legislation to permit veterans to reinstate their GI insurance. This is of particular interest to Californians, with our country's second largest veterans' population. I shall work for early action on this in the Senate.

There continues to be the most urgent need for Federal legislation providing for the construction of a modern, efficient interstate highway system in America. Last year more people were killed on our highways than died in the entire Korean war. We need this legislation not only to deal with this monstrous problem, but also because of the military and defense needs of our Nation. I promise the people of my State to continue to work diligently for the passage of this long overdue and vital legislation.

Our tuna-fishing industry has suffered woeful deterioration by reason of what I believe to be unfair competition through unlimited and spiraling importation of foreign tuna. I do not quarrel with trade between nations. Indeed, I have enthusiastically supported reciprocal trade legislation. But that very legislation provides for peril points to protect our domestic economy. It should be crystal clear that the peril point has long since been reached and passed as respects the American—the Californian—who makes his living farming the sea. I have cosponsored legislation to assist that industry in the Congress, and I have very much hope that we can receive legislative and Executive approval of it.

I had the honor to be chairman of a Senate subcommittee which wrote the Federal lease-purchase legislation. With appropriate safeguards to protect the public interest, this law permits the Federal Government to use its rental monies to buy necessary public buildings on a time-payment plan. A new customhouse for Los Angeles is in the mill under this legislation. A $40 million Federal building for San Francisco is about ready for bids. Many other of our communities will be the recipients of new Federal structures built by private enterprise which thus will provide new avenues of employment.

Under this legislation, the Government will pay to construction employees the prevailing wages which obtain in the area of construction. This is a sound principle in my judgment. Thus, construction for Uncle Sam will not depress the market in those towns where Uncle Sam becomes a property owner. The theory of paying prevailing wages on public construction in each area of the country ought to apply, in my view, to all Federal undertakings.

Our President has said that there must be no second-class citizenship in America. You and I agree. And I here repeat what I said earlier in our State: I believe that we have made more solid progress these last 3 years in honoring the Biblical tenets of the brotherhood of man than in any comparable period since Abraham Lincoln's day.

Many other problems confront us in this year's election. I shall discuss them in detail in the days ahead. If California can unite, as I believe it will, on its hopes and aspirations for herself, our country, and the goal of a just peace in the world, we will contribute markedly toward their attainment in the city of Washington.

My father once said that one's success in life is attained in great part, by the help of his friends. That is also true of principles. In the coming months, I shall wage a vigorous and an intensive campaign, and I shall do it on the basis of principles you and I share. But I will need the help of friends like you. I thank you for coming here today. I will keep your faith.

Conference Report (Farm Bill) No Help to the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in December 1955, I submitted a questionnaire to the people of the 17th District. The newspapers, through the courtesy of their owners and editors, in our district carried this questionnaire, giving approximately everyone an opportunity to sign their name, their occupation, and their views. Many items were covered but I especially want to call your attention to the results of the voting on one particular subject—the farm program. I submit those results for your consideration:

THE FARM PROGRAM: WHICH PLAN DO YOU FAVOR?

(a) 100-percent price support with acreage control:
Total replies: 0.7 percent yes, 99.3 percent no.
Farmers voted: 23 percent yes, 77 percent no.

(b) Flexible price support with acreage control:
Total replies: 37 percent yes, 63 percent no.
Farmers voted: 17 percent yes, 83 percent no.

(c) Elimination of all price supports and acreage controls:
Total replies: 54 percent yes, 46 percent no.
Farmers voted: 63 percent yes, 37 percent no.

On April 11 the House Conferees on Agriculture submitted to us, and asked for our approval, a bill which is not fair, a bill that would hurt the majority of the farmers and give preferential treatment to a few. The bill would increase cost to dairy, poultry, and livestock farmers. It would help hold down prices on feeder cattle, lambs, and hogs, and without question it would tend to dry up markets for the very farmers for whom help is needed. I voted "no" on the recent conference farm bill, H. R. 12, for the following reasons:

It would put the American farmers more under Federal control and domination.

It would keep the farmers from growing wheat that is necessary for them to feed and use as seed on their own farm.

It would prevent all farmers from voting on a wheat referendum and crop control.

It would continue to permit a sky-the-limit program for loans and payments.

This conference report, as passed, is a one-crop big-farmer bill, helping only the Far West and South and would definitely be detrimental to the rotation farmers, which are so essential to our economy. Very little financial assistance is given to the small-acreage farmer. The Campbell Farming Corp., of Hardin, Mont., received $430,691. The Chandler Co., Saragosa, Tex., received $814,041. One king-size farm drew $1,292,475.25 on his 1954 wheat crop. Thirty-seven

loans, Mr. Speaker, exceed $200,000. The records clearly show that the big one-crop farm operators of the South and West are able to get bigger by Uncle Sam underwriting most of the expenses while the small farmers of our State and area are paying the bill.

We want the equitable treatment and freedom, Mr. Speaker, that many of us fought for; which certainly is not contained in the conference report for the farm bill, H. R. 12.

Finland's Ambassador Visits Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, 1956, the people of my district were honored by a visit from the Honorable Johan A. Nykopp, Envoy Extraordinary and Ambassador Plenipotentiary from the Republic of Finland to the United States of America and the United States of Mexico.

This visit was arranged by the junior Senator from Connecticut, the Honorable WILLIAM A. PURTELL, in the interest of the National Finnish-American Marathon Committee, but unfortunately it was not possible for Senator PURTELL to be present on the occasion of Ambassador Nykopp's visit.

Upon the Ambassador's arrival from Washington, a small reception in his honor took place at my home in Pomfret, where he also had an opportunity to be interviewed by members of the press.

The national chairman of the Finnish-American Marathon Committee, Otto L. Pussinen, is a constituent of mine, and one whose friendship I have long valued. He and his committee conducted the successful project for sponsoring and financing the visit to this country of two athletes from Finland, Eino Oksanen and Antti Viskari, who are to participate in the 30th annual Boston Marathon on April 19, 1956.

These young men have been living in my district since their arrival from Finland several weeks ago, and they have been doing their training for the Boston marathon on the roads in and around Plainfield.

A reception in their honor, attended by more than 1,000 citizens of my district, most of them of Finnish birth or ancestry, as well as by visitors from Massachusetts and elsewhere, took place on Saturday evening, March 31, in the town hall at Plainfield, at which time it was my privilege to introduce Ambassador Nykopp.

Ambassador Nykopp extended a greeting to the athletes from Finland, and from those who had gathered to honor them. After his return to Washington, the Ambassador made some interesting comments about his visit to Connecticut, which I am pleased, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, to insert at this point in the RECORD:

The marathon-benefit night at Plainfield town hall, March 31, 1956, offered me the possibility to learn about the splendid activities of the Finnish-American Athletic Club. For the past 4 years the marathon committee of the club has been raising funds to bring Finland's best marathon runners to compete against the world's foremost athletes in the annual Boston marathon.

The fund has not only made participation possible but also the opportunity for the Finnish sportsmen to arrive early before the competition, to get used to the conditions. The work of the committee, headed by Mr. Otto L. Pussinen, proves how strongly the sport spirit lives among the people of Connecticut.

In this connection I extend my sincere thanks to Senator WILLIAM A. PURTELL and Congressman HORACE SEELY-BROWN, who have warmly supported this good activity of Americans of Finnish origin.

In 1954 the Finnish runner Veikko Karvonen won the marathon, and I am sure that the Finnish participants this year, Eino Oksanen and Antti Viskari, will do their best to defend the Finnish marathon traditions.

At Washington, D. C., April 5, 1956.

JOHAN A. NYKOPP,
Ambassador of Finland.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to many previous appeals which our delegation flood committee and other members have made to the House Appropriations Committee respecting the flood-relief program for Massachusetts and the Northeast, we hereby respectfully again urge that the House Appropriations Committee take early action to expedite approval of various specific and general remedial and protective projects now under consideration.

Recent severe snowfalls in our area have increased our deep concern. The periodic recurrence of flood disasters requires expeditious action to set up comprehensive and appropriate flood protection.

As we have pointed out, delay in acting upon feasible measures proposed will merely serve to increase the risk of future damaging floods and thus constitute great peril to many communities already sorely beset by the heavy floods of last year.

We respectfully urge that the Appropriations Committee, in the exercise of its wise discretion, after considering the evidence, establish its own standards as to what may constitute adequate funds to inaugurate planning, construction, and general flood protection work on a basis of efficiency, speed, and generosity.

We further urge that the hearings be expedited as much as possible in order that suitable legislation may be reported to the House at an early date for consideration and action in order to accelerate the progress of vital projects in the area.

The pertinent recommendations follow:

The Massachusetts congressional delegation presents the following recommendations with reference to pending legislation and respectfully urges the adoption of the following program:

1. For construction, operation, and maintenance appropriations:

	Budgeted item, 1957 fiscal year	Recommended
Adams	$1,976,000	$1,976,000
Barre Falls	1,150,000	1,150,000
Birch Hill (maintenance and operation)	13,000	13,000
Buffumville	1,200,000	1,200,000
East Brimfield	340,000	340,000
Hodges Village	360,000	360,000
Knightsville (operation and maintenance)	16,000	16,000
North Adams	2,000,000	2,000,000
Tully (operation and maintenance)	13,000	13,000
Worcester diversion	840,000	840,000

2. For engineering and planning:

	Budgeted item, 1957 fiscal year	Recommended
Westville (authorized)	None	[1] $100,000
West Hill (authorized)	None	[2] 100,000
Littleville (State concurrence given)	None	[3] 100,000

[1] State concurrence given.
[2] Subject to State concurrence.
[3] Subject to authorization.

3. For the Army engineers snagging and stream clearance fund and section 212 projects for general operations in all Massachusetts river basins:

	Budgeted item, 1957 fiscal year	Recommendation
Snagging and clearing	$500,000	[1] $5,000,000
Sec. 212	1,000,000	[1] 5,000,000

[1] Subject to completion of current engineering studies.

Snagging and clearing projects, up to $100,000, are authorized by section 208 of the Flood Control Act of 1954. This section permits stream clearance, up to $100,000 on any one stream, without specific congressional authorization.

Section 212 projects are authorized by section 212 of the Flood Control Act of 1950. This section permits small flood prevention projects, up to $150,000, without specific congressional authorization. The project must be complete within itself, be economically justified and not be in an area intended to be protected by a larger flood-control project.

Snagging and clearing and section 212 funds would supplement Operation Noah rehabilitation measures already undertaken by the Engineers in the flood-disaster areas of Massachusetts by providing permanent flood-prevention works in the following basins:

Connecticut, Thames, Blackstone, Merrimac, Charles, Neponset, Housatonic, Hoosic, Ipswitch, Mystic, Little, and other streams and waterways in the State where the Army engineers deem protective measures to be necessary.[1]

[1] Merrimac Basin: $90,000 for removal of sandbar in the Merrimac at its mouth near Newburyport (request of Mr. BATES): $500,000 for local flood-prevention projects (request of Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and Mr. LANE).

Charles River Basin: Stream clearance of the Charles River near Newton (request of Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts).

4. On the following navigation and beach erosion projects, your committee recommends:

	Budgeted item, 1957 fiscal year	Recommended
Fall River Harbor	$500,000	$1,000,000
Mystic River	1,500,000	1,500,000
Town River	302,000	302,000
Fore River (Weymouth)	500,000	500,000
Revere Beach shore protection	75,000	75,000

And we also urge upon the Appropriations Committee early favorable action on pending requests for appropriations for all other navigation and beach erosion projects in our State.

5. The delegation urges immediate consideration of H. R. 7870, introduced by Mr. McCORMACK, and companion bills, approved in principle by Secretary of the Army Brucker, and designed to give the Engineers authority to complete urgently necessary projects costing up to $500,000 without further specific congressional authorization.

6. We favor the principle of disaster insurance and urge the Congress to continue its consideration of and report upon pending measures in this field so that action may be taken during this session.

7. For the various recommendations of the New England Governors' Conference, and the New England Council, we once again bespeak every possible consideration by the Appropriations Committee.

8. Thirty thousand dollars for survey of the Neponset and Charles Rivers (request of Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts).

Let's Stick to the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, when a man is elected to the post of governor of a State, the electorate expects him to hold the interests of his State above all else. We in New York State have a strange situation in this regard.

Governor Harriman stated early this week about the President's veto of the farm bill, that the veto marked a black day for the New York dairy farmer.

Actually, the facts of the matter point to a directly opposite conclusion. I am shocked that the governor of a great State like New York should make these intemperate remarks about an important segment of his State's population without looking into the facts of the matter and with complete disregard for the welfare of the farmers of his own State.

The figures illustrate plainly that the cost-price squeeze on New York farmers would have been greatly aggravated had the crazy-quilt farm bill passed by this Congress been signed by the President. Under the terms of that bill, the dairy farmers of my State would have paid $32 million in increased feed costs to get approximately $2,650,000 in increased income from higher price supports on dairy products. If you subtract the $2,650,000 increased income from the threatened loss of $32 million, it is clear that the New York State farmer would be on the short end of the stick to the tune of nearly $30 million. Obviously, the President has done a great service to the farmers of my State by vetoing this bill.

The President has provided for increasing the income to New York farmers by the same $2,650,000 as in the vetoed bill by directing the Secretary of Agriculture to increase the support price on dairy products. But he has not saddled on them these added costs.

The facts of the matter are plain. The President has not only acted in the best interests of the whole country in vetoing the bill, but in particular his action has saved the farmers of my State a great deal of money.

Eighth Anniversary of the Independence of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert the following letter which I wrote on April 9 to Mr. DeVere Kostoff, chairman of the Committee for the Celebration of Israel Independence Day in Saginaw, Mich., in connection with the eighth anniversary of the independence of Israel which was observed there last Thursday, April 12:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1956.

Mr. DEVERE KOSTOFF,
Chairman, Independence Day Committee, Temple B'nai Israel, Saginaw, Mich.

DEAR MR. KOSTOFF: I take pleasure in replying to your letter of April 5 in connection with the celebration of Israel Independence Day by the Saginaw Jewish community.

I have had occasion in the past to express to my Jewish friends in Saginaw my own feelings with respect to the question of Israel. It is, therefore, a real pleasure to reaffirm my own feelings which are to the effect that all freedom-loving people in this country and throughout the world should rejoice at this passage of another milestone in Israel's brief history of independence. I am confident that our own Government strongly shares this feeling and is making every effort to bring peace and security to the Middle East so that Israel may turn her efforts from defense to peaceful ends.

The continued free existence of Israel is a "must" in any consideration of the problems of this part of the world. Any negotiations with the opposing sides must accept this fact as a foregone conclusion—it should not be a subject for international discussion. If our position in this matter is made sufficiently clear to the Arab leaders, I hope that other differences can be ironed out providing that both sides are prepared to make honorable concessions for the sake of mutual peace.

The national security of this country would be imperiled were Israel to be defeated and overrun by her enemies. I am confident that the administration realizes this. I promise you that my own work on the House Foreign Affairs Committee will be guided along these lines.

With congratulations and best wishes to all in attendance, I remain

Sincerely yours,

ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Member of Congress.

Billion-Dollar Prescription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, recently Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH introduced a bill to provide additional funds for medical research, medical research facilities, and assistance to medical education. There appears in the current Saturday Review a short article giving a succinct, clear statement covering the situation as it now is and the grave need of assistance that exists. Trusting the House membership will take the trouble to read it, I am inserting it as part of my remarks:

BILLION-DOLLAR PRESCRIPTION

(By MARGARET CHASE SMITH)

We human beings act strangely. With the exception of our moral and spiritual values, the obviously most important thing to us is life—our own life and the lives of our dear ones and our friends. Yet we don't act that way. We pay little attention to our health. We take our health for granted. We don't get concerned about it until we have lost part of it. And sometimes that is too late.

Here in America last year we spent $10 billion for cocktails and other spiritous liquors. We spent $5 billion for tobacco. We spent $264 million for chewing gum. But when I advocated on the floor of the United States Senate that we spend an extra $200 million a year for the next 5 years on the better care of our health, some people were shocked.

"How could you possibly spend that much money?" these people have asked. "Why $200 million a year for 5 years is $1 billion." Indeed it is. One billion. Forty-nine billion less than our drinking bill during those same 5 years. Twenty-four billion less than our smoking bill. More than $250 million less than our bill for chewing gum.

Having made that comparison, I ask my questioners a question:

"Is $1 billion really a huge sum to spend to help protect and perhaps prolong 165 million American lives?"

I think most people will agree that it is not. And here is my prescription:

1. For medical research, spend $500 million.

2. For medical research facilities, spend $150 million.

3. For assistance to medical education, spend $350 million.

I believe that my prescription is unique in one very important respect. It is long-range medicine—something that we in this country have never attempted before.

As I am not a doctor, or even a nurse, I may be suspected of snap diagnosis. This, however, is not the case. I have been concerned with medical research for a long time. I do want to acknowledge, though, that my thinking was crystallized by an editorial in a great Maine neswpaper, the Bangor Daily News. The title the editorial writer chose was "How About $1 Billion for Health?"

The most thorough study to date of the impact of illness upon our national economy was made in a 6-month-long investigation by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in 1953 and 1954. I have leaned heavily upon my readings of those hearings in reaching my own conclusions. More recently, criticism of inadequate Federal support for medical research has come from the distinguished reports of the Hoover Commission. In these reports there is a recurrent plea for a 5-year program. I am frank to state that the arguments of the Commission have had a great influence upon me. But the detailed dosage that follows is my own formula.

1. MEDICAL RESEARCH

At present the research and training programs of the National Institutes of Health have a current budget of approximately $100 million a year. I would double this budget, making it $200 million a year, an added 5-year cost of $500 million.

Perhaps I should explain, for the benefit of those who are not so close to Government as I am, that the National Institutes of Health together make up the foremost research agency of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. They have extensive laboratories of their own, probably the finest laboratories in the world, certainly the best Government laboratories anywhere. But two-thirds of their funds are spent in support of research and training in non-Federal medical institutions. In this extramural research and training each Institute (there are seven: cancer, heart, mental health, arthritis, and metabolic diseases, neurological diseases, and blindness, dental, and microbiological) is aided by a National Advisory Council. Council members are citizens outstanding in medical science, education, and public affairs. They review all applications for grants, and make recommendations on these to the Surgeon General, who in his turn requests appropriations from Congress.

Historically the councils have been hampered by our system of annual appropriations. Frequently they have not been able to attract the most qualified men to short-term jobs. And many research projects have been turned down because their continuance over the necessary span of time could not be guaranteed.

The more fundamental research becomes—and all the experts agree that it is fundamental (sometimes called "pure") research we need above all else—the less predictable is the time involved. Testimony before the House Appropriations Committee early in 1956 reminded us, for instance, that 33 years passed between (a) the time that the pancreas was found to contain the secret of diabetes and (b) the time when the secret was identified as insulin. Would anyone today begrudge the money spent in hunting down that elusive chemical, which, when finally discovered, saved millions of lives?

By making $500 million more available to the National Institutes of Health, I do not claim to solve the problem of basic research. But I do feel that the Institutes would be given a degree of flexibility in supporting long-range studies. It seems pertinent to note, at this point, that long-range investigation means most in the little understood metabolic diseases which have their worst crippling effects in our growing proportion of older citizens.

2. MEDICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Early this year Senators LISTER HILL and STYLES BRIDGES introduced a bill to provide $90 million over the next three years to match construction grants for medical research facilities in medical schools, hospitals, and private foundations in all parts of the country. The Senate passed the bill unanimously and the measure is now before the House. Under my 5-year prescription I would extend this 3-year proposal to cover 5 years at the same annual rate of $30 million; a total of $150 million.

3. MEDICAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE

Senator HILL also introduced, together with a dozen other Senators, another bill to provide $250 million to match grants for construction of medical-school buildings. This bill has been strongly endorsed by the American Medical Association and almost unanimously by medical school deans. I would increase this appropriation by $20 million a year—from $50 million to $70 million—for a 5-year total of $350 million. That total approximates two estimates made by the National Fund for Medical Education (of which Herbert Hoover is honorary president) regarding the needs of the Nation's medical schools.

My billion-dollar prescription is now complete.

I admit that $1 billion may appear to be a large amount for taxpayers to carry in addition to the burden they carry at present. But I call your attention to the fact that the American people unhesitantly footed a 1954 bill of $1,700,000,000 for research on military weapons alone. This is eight-and-one-half times the annual rate I propose for medical research expansion. May I point out that our national defense and our national security are no stronger than our national health, on which our Federal Government's research spending is less than 1 percent of the national budget?

Compare the current $100 million research and training budget of the National Institutes of Health with the $90 million appropriated at the last session of Congress for research activities in the Department of Agriculture. Add to this $90 million the sum of $250 million which is paid out to farmers for soil conservation. I do not want to imply that I am not heartily in favor of greatly expanded agricultural research. I know, of course, that much of such research benefits us in our studies of the diseases of man. And I have always supported farm-research activities. But I think it is about time this country brought research on human lives up to the level of research on animals and plants.

I referred earlier to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee hearings on the impact of disease on the national economy. The committee found that four diseases alone—heart, cancer, tuberculosis, and arthritis—have resulted in an annual loss of 370 million man-days of work and that the annual cost to the Nation from all illnesses is roughly equivalent to the total income-tax revenue, or $30 billion a year. Alongside that enormous loss, my proposed expenditure of $200 million a year would seem a very modest investment.

Would it be a sound investment for a banker?

Over the last decade alone medical research has added 5 full years to the life expectancy of the average American. We all know something of the wonders of penicillin, streptomycin, isoniazid, cortisone, and a host of other battlers against disease. These miraculous products of medical research, along with new surgical techniques and blood plasma, have brought about these percentage reductions in the death rates of some of the major killers and cripplers:

	Percent
Influenza	77
Appendicitis	69
Acute rheumatic fever	66
Syphilis	56
Tuberculosis	50
Pneumonia	50
Kidney diseases	43

Now let us translate this into economic terms. The National Office of Vital Statistics reported that in 1954 approximately 350,000 Americans under the age of 65 died of cancer and heart disease alone. This is greater than the total of Americans who lost their lives in the Armed Forces during the Second World War and the Korean war together. Remember that those wars lasted not 1 year but approximately 7 years.

Those 350,000 deaths of 1954 occurred, as I have stated, among people under 65, people in their productive years who otherwise would have been at work, earning money, producing goods and services, and consuming as well. Moreover, these people would have been paying taxes which would have gone, in part, to pay for research which would have helped to preserve their own and other lives.

In an earlier year—the year 1951—a study of federally aided rehabilitation revealed that 8,000 people who were returned to work had been on public assistance prior to rehabilitation, at a cost of $5,700,000 annually. The cost of their rehabilitation was $4 million. These people are now employed. Instead of being tax-consumers they are taxpayers.

When we consider that chronic diseases account for 88 percent of the disability of the approximately 2 million physically handicapped people in the United States, we can see that the economic benefits to be derived from medical research on disabling diseases would be vast. The research would more than pay for itself.

I have been asked whether my billion dollar prescription for our national health amounts to socialized medicine. I have publicly and privately stated for many, many years that I am opposed to socialized medicine. The 5-year program that I propose would have no aspects of socialized medicine. It is in keeping with recommendations and endorsements made by the Hoover Commission, the American Medical Association, medical-school deans, and such outstanding doctors as Paul Dudley White, the eminent heart specialist who treated President Eisenhower.

Perhaps because he is the heart doctor of the President, Dr. White's own words have a great dramatic and impressive meaning to the American people on the need for expansion of medical research. Dr. White has pointed out that current heart research is severely limited because of lack of money. Testifying before a Senate committee, as a member of the advisory council of the National Heart Institute, Dr. White said he had been forced to use his own money for research because there were not sufficient Government funds.

His was only one of a tremendous backlog of worthy projects, running into millions of dollars, for which the advisory councils have no money. As long as this backlog exists qualified people are being denied the opportunity to save life.

If one of the Armed Forces can build up a 25-year supply of hamburgers, and if another can spend hundreds of millions of dollars on a fighter plane that could not fly, I say we can afford to appropriate funds to give our children and our children's children the best in medicine.

People of the 15th District Express Their Views on Major Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I recently requested the people of my district to share their opinions with me on several of the vital and important issues

under consideration by Congress. The response and interest in this questionnaire which was sent to all sections of the 15th District and to people in all types of business and professions as well as to wage earners, housewives, and those on retirement was an amazing indication of the personal interest the people of the 15th District have in these major issues.

The great response to my questionnaire was an example of government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and convinced me that the people back home are seriously thinking and want to participate in the affairs of good government by expressing their opinions on these vital issues.

It was very encouraging to me to have this widespread opinion from the people of my district on these vital issues. In many cases I not only received the answers to the questions submitted, but additional opinions on many other subjects.

The satisfaction and gratification that I have received from the replies to my questionnaire is that the replies of the majority have confirmed my opinion and belief on these issues, and in the case of rigid or flexible farm supports, I voted as the majority indicated for flexible farm price supports.

The following are the results of the replies I received on my questionnaire:

[Percent]

	Yes	No
1. Do you favor a greater reduction in foreign aid?	79.0	21.0
2. Will the consolidation of the CIO–AFL be of greater benefit to the average wage earner?	27.5	72.5
3. Should our public school system be left free from Federal aid?	74.1	25.9
4. Should taxes be reduced with a high public debt and unbalanced budget?	24.1	75.9
5. Do you favor rigid or flexible farm price supports?		
Rigid?	10.8	------
Flexible?	89.2	------
6. Should the unlimited power of the Federal Government to levy taxes be restricted by a constitutional amendment?	71.5	28.5
7. Do you believe that wire tapping should be made legal?	49.5	50.5
8. Should secret recordings of jury deliberations be outlawed?	75.8	24.2

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the above review of my questionnaire will be of great interest to the Members of the House of Representatives.

Outpost of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, on this 8th anniversary of the establishment of Israel as a state, I wish to join with my colleagues in saluting the brave and beleaguered nation that stands as an outpost of freedom on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean.

Israel's history has been turbulent and harsh, but it has also been studded with inspiring accomplishments. With calm courage, indomitable will and prodigious industry, she has established herself firmly, against the hostile designs both of man and of nature.

While the future holds vast problems for her—both economic and military—Israel has proved that her spirit and morale are equal to the challenge. As a nation which experienced similar hardships and struggles in another century, we in the United States have every reason to feel the strongest bonds of sympathy with the Israelis, and to rejoice in each passing birthday.

It is a source of satisfaction and reassurance that the statesmen of the West, both within and outside the United Nations, are today bringing all the arts of diplomacy to bear on the problem of maintaining the geographical integrity of Israel and of her neighbors, as we are pledged to do.

While the intermittent hostilities along Israel's borders have created a high degree of tension in the Middle East, Israel, on her eighth birthday, has every reason to be proud of her past and confident of her future.

Pan-American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, Pan-American Day, the day before yesterday, should have reminded us of the reasons that bring together the various American Republics and cause them on this historic day to celebrate their solidarity and the common interests that bind them together.

One hundred and thirty years ago, Simon Bolivar gave impetus to the idea of pan-Americanism at the Congress of Panama. It was chiefly through his efforts, at this Congress, that the blueprint for inter-American cooperation was drawn.

Bolivar's dream became a reality at the first Inter-American Conference, held in Washington, in 1890; for it was at this assemblage of American States that the cornerstone of pan-Americanism was laid with the establishment of the Pan American Union.

Later Inter-American Conferences provided a firm foundation for the growth and expansion of hemispheric cooperation, and at Bogota in 1948, the Ninth Inter-American Conference gave permanent structure and authority to the already proven system of pan-Americanism by establishing the Organization of American States.

Each successive conference contributed positive achievements to the structure. As the system grew the American Republics have shown their ability to work together to promote peace and security; they have agreed that international law and good faith should govern their future relations; and they have provided for cooperative action for economic, social, and cultural development.

It was appropriate that on the 66th anniversary of the establishment of the Pan American Union that the American Republics should express their confidence that this inter-American system, which is based on the equality of all American States and has promoted fellowship and mutual cooperation amongst its members for so many years, shall continue to progress and to contribute to hemispheric welfare and security in the future.

America Salutes Israel Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 29, a mammoth America Salutes Israel Celebration is being staged at Yankee Stadium. With Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz as general chairman, the following national organizations are sponsoring this event: Farband Labor Zionist Order, B'nai Zion Order, American Trade Union Council for Labor Israel, and United States Committee for Sports in Israel.

A program of speeches, plus musical and sports events is planned. A highlight of the afternoon will be a soccer match between the Israeli Oympic team and the American League All-Stars.

Mr. Speaker, this commendable occasion will serve as an eloquent testimonial to the determination of the United States to maintain Israel's place in the free world as a sovereign and democratic state.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a message I have prepared for the occasion:

It is with a great deal of deep personal satisfaction that I join in the America Salutes Israel Celebration. An anniversary is always a great occasion, but the eighth anniversary of Israel's independence is an especially significant milestone.

It is a milestone which attests to the determination, the will to survive, the courage of the people of this bastion of democracy. It is a milestone which has particular significance to all Americans. For democracy in Israel is, like democracy in the United States, a divine incentive—the inescapable logic of her whole destiny.

This stake—the survival of a fellow democracy—forms the indissoluble bond, the moral bridge which is far more durable than that which might unite us with any other people.

America's ties with Israel are also spiritual, personal, human, and humanitarian. And as long as our Western civilization endures, the priceless heritage of the religion which was cradled in Jerusalem will bind us to her destiny.

The new nation of Israel numbers among its citizens immigrants from every modern community of the free world. Its roots are as nearly universal as those of any existing community of free men. A little of America and all the rest of the countries of the world are there and each segment merged into the whole there endures a mutual bond of understanding and affection.

Most Americans are pioneers at heart. Compared with the rest of the world, our national history is comparatively short, and most of our heritage glorifies the bold contest with nature and adversity we have been witnessing in Israel these last 8 years. Living Americans have in their memories the satisfaction of seeing wilderness change to benevolent living space, of watching homes and buildings and cities grow where nothing stood before, and of seeing deserts flower and hardy new generations rise up to populate an empty land.

These things are close to us and dear to us. We understand the problems and disappointments of Israel as other nations, much further removed from the atmosphere of the frontier, will never understand.

We applaud on this day Israel's miraculous achievements during 8 years of troubled existence. Everywhere there is progress. Everywhere the functions of government are performed with efficiency and skill. Law and order rule supreme within the borders. The humanitarian impulse and a willingness to build together a state based on justice, equality, and peace are the order of the day. This is Israel, 1956. That these conditions exist bodes well for a successful future.

We pray to God on this significant occasion for the continued progress of Israel's spiritual adventure to secure the permanent freedom of her ancient home. We pray to God that she will be able to continue to live a life consecrated to the universal vision of fraternity and peace. If Israel will continue to serve this ideal, the new era of her freedom will be worthy of the inheritance of those who have gone before.

Our hearts go out today to those many miles away who strive so sturdily and courageously for the survival of the Holy Land. We thank God for successes so far and pray for continued prosperity.

Eighth Anniversary of Israel Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the people of Israel are to be congratulated on this eighth anniversary of their independence. The road has been rough and rocky and even at times discouraging, but Israel is making great progress with a united people, and is known as one of the strongest friends of the United States among the democratic nations.

We people with friends and relatives in Israel wish to encourage them with a friendly pat on the back at this time, and reassure them that United States Secretary of State Dulles has stated repeatedly that the existence of the State of Israel is one of the basic premises of United States foreign policy.

We hope that in this period of tension, that the threats to Israel's survival will disappear, and that both sides may be able with United Nations assistance to work out agreements by which each may live in peace for the economic progress and development of the Middle East, in which both the United States and Israel can be such key factors.

Our warm regards go to you at this significant anniversary time, and with our hearty congratulations to the people of Israel on their courage and devotion to the cause of freedom.

Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein my own remarks, in part, delivered at the 135th anniversary celebration of Greek Independence Day at Fitchburg, Mass., on March 25, 1956.

This memorable event was arranged and very ably conducted by the Greek Orthodox Community at Fitchburg and was attended by the distinguished mayor of the city, Hon. Hedley Bray; the prominent and capable Greek-American leader and businessman, Mr. Charles Kotsilibas Davis; the beloved pastor of the church, Rev. John Michalides, who gave the invocation; and a large number of representative citizens of the community and city.

I was most graciously introduced on the inspiring occasion by the able radio announcer and commentator, Chris M. Nikitas, of station WEIM, which carried my address on its facilities:

REMARKS IN PART OF HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, AT 135TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE AT FITCHBURG, MARCH 25, 1956

"The forcible removal, exile, and imprisonment of Archbishop Makarios, a great spiritual leader and prelate, who exemplifies the political ideals as well as the profound religious beliefs of millions of honest, law-abiding, democratic-minded people, is shocking to the conscience of the free world," said Congressman PHILBIN at the 135th anniversary celebration of Greek Independence held at Fitchburg last night.

"This outrage parallels the cases of Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac, who were so shamefully persecuted by Red Communists. It is almost beyond belief that such ruthless persecution could occur in the free world," he said.

"It is most deplorable that our Government should have been linked to this disgraceful incident in any way, but recent events demonstrate that in the minds of many people overseas," he asserted, "we are sharing the blame with the perpetrators of this dastardly act, and other abuses of colonialism."

"The charge that communism is responsible for Cyprus is ridiculous. The Greeks have fought communism with great vigor and success. Cyprus is the product of a brave people's aspirations for self-government," said PHILBIN.

"It is not enough for our Government to express sympathetic concern. If we would promote peace and collective security in the Middle East, we should move vigorously to secure the release of Archbishop Makarios, and to urge that the Cyprus question be considered on a basis of decency and fairness, and that no further violence and brutality be visited upon religious leaders and others who are seeking by legitimate means to secure the historic right of self-determination for which many nations have struggled and sacrificed.

"I have urged the State Department not only to use its good offices, but to do everything in its power to bring about the release of Archbishop Makarios and a peaceful solution to the Cyprus problem, and also to strive for collective security so urgently needed in the Middle East," PHILBIN declared.

PHILBIN hailed the Greek people in this country for their "loyal citizenship and their eagerness to serve the Nation in war and peace." "You may well be proud of your fine contributions," he said.

"Greek Independence Day brings vividly to mind," PHILBIN continued, "the tireless and unselfish devotion of the Greek people to the cause of liberty and recalls the great debt which democracy and civilization owe to Greece for its imperishable benefits to every field of our way of life throughout the ages."

Tracing world history, the Clinton congressman said: "Take the Greeks out of history and there would be no civilization. Classic Greek culture developed and gave to the world the philosophy, the ethics, the science, the art and literature, the medicine, the astronomy, the mathematics, the principles of government and politics, and spiritual values that form an indispensable foundation stone of our modern society. You must ever be proud of this heritage of grandeur. The American people will ever be grateful for it."

President Eisenhower and Agricultural Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, the American people need no assurance from anyone of the complete honesty, integrity, and devotion to the public interest of President Eisenhower.

He has demonstrated again those qualities in his courageous and unanswerable message accompanying his veto of H. R. 12.

During recent days, he has been confronted with a tremendously difficult problem. Neither he nor anyone else doubted the complete sincerity of many who supported H. R. 12. The fact that most of those Members of Congress have not joined in the specious and shallow criticism today of his action is convincing proof that they recognize his candid approach to this important problem, just as he recognizes their conscientiousness in reaching their decisions.

Any fair-minded person who will read the veto message must concede not only the President's grasp of this perplexing problem but his determination to act, so far as he can, in the best interests of those engaged in agriculture and of this Nation as a whole.

One paragraph states concisely the basic defect of H. R. 12, which was recognized by Republicans and Democrats alike when the conference report on it was before this House last Wednesday. Before quoting this paragraph from the message, I commend to all those interested a reading of portions of the RECORD of April 11, from page 6110 to page 6158,

and, particularly, the short, excellent statement of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] at page 6143. Certainly he expressed concisely and forcibly the overwhelming opinion of the farmers and consumers of New England and of the entire Northeast when he said: "Farmers do not want this bill; consumers can only be against it." There is every reason to believe that an increasing number of farmers elsewhere and the great body of American consumers will share emphatically that point of view as the President's veto message becomes more widely read and understood.

The paragraph to which I have referred is as follows:

H. R. 12 would not correct this situation. It would encourage more surpluses. It would do harm to every agricultural region of the country and also to the interests of consumers. Thus it fails to meet the test of being good news for farmers and fair to all our people.

It is depressing and regrettable that a few, who should know better, have indulged in personalities and have resorted to shabby tactics in commenting upon the President's message this afternoon.

But quite apart from these trivial, self-seeking, and defensive comments by certain persons who were primarily responsible for the monstrosity which was presented to Congress and the President, the challenge is now quite specific and inescapable. In the hope that a reading of the RECORD will assist in spreading actual information as to the President's message, I want to quote the three concluding paragraphs, which were as follows:

I now request Congress to pass a straight soil bank bill as promptly as possible. It should be in operation before fall seeding for next year's crops. It is vital that we get the soil bank authorized in this session of the Congress. There is general agreement on it. I am ready to sign a sound soil bank act as soon as Congress sends it to me. That can be accomplished in a very few days if the leadership in Congress will undertake the task.

This combined program of administrative action and legislation enactment will begin now to improve the income and welfare of all our farm families.

Here is a challenge for both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government.

The President demonstrated that the executive branch of the Federal Government recognizes both the problem and the challenge confronting it. There is an equal responsibility now resting upon the Congress, and both the farmers and the consumers have every right to insist upon the prompt legislative action recommended by the President.

The Small-Business Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker and distinguished colleagues, I would like to remind the Congress that I represent an important congressional district in which there are numerous small-business concerns. As we all know, the small-business man is the backbone of the American industrial system of free enterprise. It is the small-business man that is the very core of our economic life today—the man upon whom we have depended during the past century to elevate our Nation to a position where we now stand foremost among the earth's free republics.

Today, Mr. Speaker, quite understandably the small-business men of America are strongly concerned about their participation in the atomic-energy program on a prime contract level in the present race to develop peaceful uses of atomic energy. One of the very first spokesmen for small business to focus congressional attention on current problems of the small-business man was Mr. K. W. Van Eman, vice president of the Skinner Engine Co., of Erie, Pa.

Significantly, the Skinner Engine Co. has rendered outstanding service to our Nation since 1868 and is the builder of the world's largest marine uniflow engines. This great small-business enterprise has made outstanding contributions to the military and industrial life of our Nation now for more than 88 years.

In his testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on March 5, Mr. Van Eman made crystal clear the need for immediate action by Congress and the Atomic Energy Commission to move forward with all possible speed toward the application of nuclear power for merchant marine surface vessels. With all the emphasis at his command, Mr. Van Eman also urged the Congress to assist small business in realining our program for atomic power plants and insisted that small business be permitted to join the parade of progress in the development of peaceful uses of man's most destructive force.

However, Mr. Speaker, during the course of his testimony Mr. Van Eman also issued an important warning to the Congress, and his admonition should not go unheeded.

Listen to his sage advice which I quote:

(1) The arrival of nuclear power is making obsolete not a minor industry but a very large industry in the United States today.

(2) The use of nuclear power will mean the rebuilding of our merchant fleet due to technological changes, age, and obsolescence.

(3) Small business in the maritime and powerplant industry will die on the vine because of lack of help and assistance to realine our program for atomic powerplants and join in the progress parade of the atomic field. In other words, as we see it, we are in the living or dying era so to speak, and will perish unless the doors are open to us.

Referring to the strategic vessels on our Great Lakes, Mr. Van Eman also pointed out that: "207 larger vessels on the Great Lakes are over 35 years of age. It has been the custom and accepted practice in the maritime industry since its inception to engage in prototype development. Herein lies the key to small business participation in the field of atomic development along commercial lines."

Much to the point, Mr. Van Eman further warned the Congress of the Soviet atomic race and quoted Mr. Kurchatov who heads the Soviet atomic development. He pointed out that an atomic-powered ice breaker is scheduled to be built before 1960 that is designed so that it would be refueled only once every 2 or 3 years.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I was gratified to learn that our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, the Honorable JAMES T. PATTERSON, a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Armed Services Committee, has also focused public attention on the problems now confronting small business in the current atomic energy peacetime program. I have read with great interest the article written by Congressman PATTERSON that appears in the current issue of the authoritative Washington Atomic Energy Report. So significant is this article by Congressman PATTERSON that I wish to here include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE SMALL-BUSINESS MAN AND THE PEACETIME ATOMIC ENERGY PROGRAM

(By JAMES T. PATTERSON, Representative in Congress from Connecticut and member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee; written expressly for Washington Atomic Energy Report)

Arising from the new and glorious age in which man is transforming the most destructive force of nature into the most powerful source of energy for peaceful uses, is the problem of wider participation of American small-business men in the atomic energy program. Day by day, small-business men of America are intensifying their demands that our Government permit them to enter the current race to develop peaceful uses of the atom. We in Government cannot ignore these demands; for it was the small-business men who struggled unceasingly to elevate America to its present and unprecedented sphere of greatness.

As Representative of a congressional district that is largely industrial—and one in which small-business concerns abound—I am strongly concerned with the welfare of small business. Their economic welfare determines the livelihood of thousands upon thousands of residents of the Naugatuck Valley of Connecticut that I have represented in Congress for almost 10 years. Of equal concern to me, of course, is the welfare of our entire Nation.

Participation of small business in developing peaceful uses of atomic energy gives rise to two fundamental questions: (1) Shall we liberalize present security policies of the Atomic Energy Commission, to facilitate the participation of small business, or (2) shall we continue to rely upon a comparatively small number of companies to carry on the peacetime program?

Concerning the question of liberalizing present security policies of the AEC, it is noteworthy that during World War II when a "crash" program was needed to develop atomic weapons, there was imperative need for top secrecy and utilization of a limited number of individuals to participate in the "Manhattan Project." Also, there was need to call upon our largest industries, for they were at the time better prepared to participate in such a "crash" program. However, the situation is somewhat different today with respect to peaceful uses of the atom.

For example, there is no longer any secrecy about the fundamentals of atomic energy. The basic theory was in fact known as early as 1906 when Albert Einstein wrote his celebrated theory: $E=MC^2$. Today the average high school student knows that controlled

fission from a properly sized mass of uranium will produce almost incredible heat and energy. In fact, numerous books have been written for high-school students since 1945 that explain in detail the fundamentals of atomic energy and reactors.

Top secrecy must be maintained with regard to the further development of atomic weapons. But in the field of peaceful uses of the atom, such secrecy is no longer necessary. It is my conviction that only through participation of small business in developing peaceful uses of the atom can the manifold applications of the atom be ultimately realized. To me it is obvious that the manifold peaceful applications of atomic energy cannot be enjoyed in their greatest extent so long as we continue to rely upon a comparatively small number of companies to carry forward the program of development. Further, in my opinion, many small-business concerns will be doomed if they are denied participation in developing peaceful uses of the atom. This feeling is shared by many small-business men.

Consequently, I believe that we must reexamine our policies and set a goal that will provide for early participation of small-business men in the program for development of peaceful uses of the atom.

A Just and Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I insert in the RECORD an address I made on Easter Sunday, April 1, over Radio Station WHK, in Cleveland, on a just and lasting peace:

A JUST AND LASTING PEACE

Today is Easter Sunday. For the whole Christian world, this means that Christ, the King, has arisen. This is a period of prayerful rejoicing. It is a time when all good Christians take renewed hope for a better future for all mankind.

This year the Jewish Passover comes at the same time as the Christian Easter Holy Week. For the Jews, the season of the Passover is a time of thanksgiving for relief from the persecution of King Pharaoh. For them it is a time to remember the plagues which struck Pharaoh for his cruel persecution of the Jews. It is a time when all Jews renew their faith in the fatherhod of God and the brotherhod of man.

I believe, therefore, this to be an excellent occasion for us to take an inventory and to examine the prospects for a better future for all mankind.

Most of the people of the world yearn for an era of genuine peace. The Christian-Judean world strives for a just and lasting peace, and that is a peace built upon immutable moral principles. Other religions of the world such as the Moslems, the Buddahists, and the Hindu, seek a similar goal.

On the other hand, the leaders of world communism continue their cruel warfare against all civilization. These same leaders proclaim the doctrine that if needs be, three-quarters of all mankind must perish in order that communism may prevail throughout the world.

Against this background, I am going to explore the prospects for a just and lasting peace. Last summer, all the world witnessed what became known as the meeting at the summit. There President Eisenhower, the leaders of France and Great Britain, and the rulers of Soviet Russia met in what was described as an effort to reduce world tensions.

At Geneva hundreds of pictures were taken of the Russian rulers with President Eisenhower and other leaders of the free world. These pictures emphasized positions and postures of warm friendship. At the climax point of this so-called meeting at the summit President Eisenhower announced to the world his belief that the Russian Communists were as sincere in their desire for peace as were the leaders of the free world.

From these events which were explained over and over again to all the people of the free world, there developed a great uplift in the hopes of the American people for that era of peace to which they so ardently aspired. There was talk about a spirit of Geneva which carried with it great promises of things to come. When the Geneva Conference at the so-called summit ended, people of the free world heaved a sigh of relief. There appeared to be an almost immediate relaxation among the nations which had found it necessary to rearm, to maintain large standing armies, and to build alliances in order to hold back the tidal wave of communism.

Upon his return to Great Britain, Prime Minister Anthony Eden announced at the London Airport that the cold war was over and that a new era for all the people of the world had been ushered in. He assured the British people of peace in our time.

Upon his return to France, Minister Pinay assured the French people that the danger of war had passed and that world tensions, many of which beset the French Empire, would soon settle down. The new spirit of Geneva held out for the French people hopes which they had not enjoyed since the days between the great wars.

Here in the United States, great optimism was expressed in the belief that the Russian Communists were prepared to amend their ways and to begin acting like responsible members of civilization. Here and there a note of caution was raised that we had best await the carrying into effect of the Geneva spirit by concrete deeds rather than the platitudes of promises which had been generated at the luncheons and the press conferences attending the meetings at Geneva.

It was but a few days after the breakup of the Geneva Conference that word leaked out from Russian-occupied East Germany to the effect that Communist Party boss Khrushchev, en route from Geneva to Moscow, had made it known to the Communist elite that there was no change whatever in fundamental Communist doctrine or policy. To some, this news was shocking because Khrushchev had been one of those who took part in the Geneva Conference. Still others brushed aside this startling news, charging it off to those elements of society who are unwilling to try to find a modus vivendi with the Communist rulers.

Shortly thereafter, the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union met at the historic summit of Geneva to work out the details of the spirit of Geneva in order that the dangerous tensions which gripped the world could be eliminated and the way opened to a just and lasting peace. It was soon discovered, however, that when the conferences moved from pleasant lunches and press conferences to the business of agreeing to specific methods for removing world tensions, the spirit of Geneva burst like a toy balloon in the hands of a mischievous child. The Russian Communists made it crystal clear that what they meant by the spirit of Geneva was that the West should accept their program of peaceful coexistence—their program of peaceful coexistence being nothing short of complete surrender on the part of the free world.

Thus the Communist leaders demonstrated their complete insincerity in their claims to support a program for relaxation of world tensions and for a just world peace.

Only a few months later on, the world was shocked when Communist Party boss Khrushchev and his traveling companion, Bulganin, both of whom had been the spokesmen for the Russian rulers at Geneva, engaged in a provocative propaganda campaign against the United States, Great Britain, and France.

This was done on the occasion of their visits to India, Burma, and Afghanistan. These same rulers branded the American people as imperialists and exploiters as well as warmongers.

But still the propaganda drums of the Kremlin beat out the dirge of peaceful coexistence. The protestations of the Kremlin leaders for peace and good will become louder with each successive attack they make against the sincerity and integrity of all the leaders of the free world.

In February of this year the 20th socalled congress meeting of the Communist Party was held in Moscow. At this meeting the official policy of the world Communist movement was set forth as well as the tactics to be employed in carrying out those policies. The decisions taken at that meeting serve as instructions to members of the Communist movement everywhere in the world.

The key policy speech was given by Communist Party boss Khrushchev, and I just want to quote one small part of Khrushchev's 6-hour speech because it clearly explains the true Communist intention toward the goal of a just and lasting peace:

"Intensify our efforts in Communist education of the masses and in eliminating the survival of capitalism in the minds of men, make fuller and more active use, to this end, of all the ideological media—propaganda, agitation, the press, radio, cultural and educational organizations and institutions, science, literature, and art."

In addition, instructions were given that steps of subversion and violence were to be increased in those nations which offered the greatest resistance to Communist takeover. Thus the leaders in the Kremlin single out the United States as a specific victim of their new tactics to conquer the world for communism.

You and I can see from this summary of basic events which have taken place within the past 9 months that the Christian-Judean world is still a long way off from its goal of a just and lasting peace. It is becoming increasingly clear that the hope of all mankind which reached an almost unprecedented pinnacle in response to the proclamation of the spirit of Geneva, have been dashed upon the dangerous rocks of false promises.

It may be a bit too early to measure the full damage done to the hopes of all mankind for a just and lasting peace as a consequence of the meetings which took place at Geneva between President Eisenhower and other leaders of the West and the Russian rulers, but it is not too late for the free world to learn some valuable lessons from the broken spirit of Geneva.

In my judgment, the first lesson we must relearn is that basic Communist doctrine holds that peace in the world is only possible when all the world is under Communist rule. The Communist leaders have made it clear that they have not changed in the least this basic doctrine. Communist Party Boss Khrushchev stated that there is no more chance for change in the basic Communist doctrine than there is in developing a shrimp that can whistle.

The Communists will shift their tactics at any time in order to confuse and mislead their intended victims. Stalin once said that it is sometimes necessary to take 1 step back in order to take 2 steps forward. This is a typical example of the Russian strategy that was employed at the so-called conferences at Geneva.

The just and lasting peace which the Christian and Judean world so earnestly yearns and strives for, cannot be won by the simple utterances of high sounding phrases or by platitudinous promises sealed by a toast accompanied by the clinking of glasses filled with martini cocktails. That just and lasting peace can be won and maintained only by the acceptance of those moral principles which support civilized mankind everywhere in the world.

In the true spirit of Eastertide, we must find renewed hope for a better future for all mankind. Our faith in God demands that we never lose courage in the face of difficulties. On this Easter Sunday, man's spirits must be raised up and dedicated to the emancipation of all those nations which today still suffer the degradation of enslavement and tyranny by the Russian Communists.

With a firm faith in the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, we will somehow find our way through to that golden era of a universal, just and lasting peace.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Malcolm E. Nygren, minister, First Presbyterian Church, Champaign, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Bless our country, O Lord.

Protect it, we pray, not only from the strength of its enemies, but from the weakness of those who love it.

Guide us as we bear the dangerous responsibility of being free men. Deliver us from the temptation to degrade the freedom to do what we think right into the freedom to do as we please.

Help us to build in our country a future that is worthy of its past. Grant us Thy guidance for difficult decisions, Thy strength in times that call for courage, Thy hope when our hopes fail; that we may serve Thy will as free men ought. Amen.

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

POLISH PORK

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, upon occasion nearly all of us like ham sandwiches, but sandwiches made out of Red, spelled with a capital "R," ham coming from communistic satellite of Poland are unpalatable and leave a bitter taste in the mouth.

The majority, that is Democrat, leadership in the Congress, House and Senate, can by a very simple amendment stop the competition of Red Poland's pork with American pork products now in surplus.

With one simple amendment, the majority—Democrat—party in Congress can help not only the American farmer but the American taxpayer by making unnecessary the purchase of 20 million pounds of American surplus pork.

Without such an amendment, the administration and the Department of Agriculture are powerless to stop the flood of Polish pork into the United States of America.

In 1954, Poland pork products arriving in this country amounted to 20,305,000 pounds, valued at $17,483,000.

In 1955, the imports were 24,864,000; the value $19,173,000.

Theoretically, Poland was to use the proceeds of these sales to buy American agricultural surpluses.

In 1954, Poland bought $4,000 worth; in 1955, $700,000.

What did Poland buy with all these other millions and where did she spend these United States dollars? Your guess is as good as mine.

I hope immediate relief from this flood of Red pork is forthcoming. Were Poland free, as it once was, and we hope and pray it will again be, the situation we face would be different.

The Democrats—now in the majority—have the votes to do it, if they but have the desire and will to do so.

SMALL BUSINESS AND THE CORPORATE TAX BURDEN

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, the need for tax relief by the small business concerns of this country admittedly is not a new subject. For years we have recognized the need of these enterprises for additional funds with which to expand operations, to modernize plant and equipment, to develop new products and markets and for other legitimate business purposes. The Congress has long supported the thesis that a Federal agency was necessary to fill the gap for intermediate and long-term loans to small business which could not be supplied by private financial institutions. The volume of small business loans made by the RFC and the SBA has been clearly indicative of the need by small firms for this additional financing.

Despite the recognized need for such credit, Mr. Speaker, it does not get at the root of the financial problems of small business. The demand of small business concerns for longer-term credit is almost entirely the result of an oppressive tax burden. We must give these firms the lawful right to retain a greater portion of their earnings. If this is done, there will be a tremendous strengthening of competitive position of small business. This course of action will enable small business to make a greater contribution to the defense effort and will place our peacetime economy on a more firm foundation.

Tax benefits did accrue to small firms during the 83d Congress when we had an extensive revision of the Internal Revenue Code. Small firms have benefitted from changes in methods of computing depreciation, dividends received credit, partnership filings, handling of research and experimental expenditures, net operating loss deductions and other provisions. The Small Business Committee of the 83d Congress earnestly supported all of these revisions.

In its final report to the 83d Congress—House Report 2683—however, the Small Business Committee stated that current tax rates had acted as a major deterrent to an improved competitive status for small-business enterprises, and I quote from a portion of that report—pages 59–60:

> This committee is of the opinion that current tax rates have acted as a major deterrent to an improved competitive status for small-business enterprises. As mentioned earlier, many small concerns have been unable to retain sufficient earnings after taxes to finance necessary expansion through additoins to working capital and fixed assets. Lack of capital has, therefore, placed undue emphasis on longer-term borrowing which in itself has been difficult to obtain. It is felt that a healthier climate for small business might be achieved through further relief fom the tax burden.
>
> Many beneficial changes have resulted from congressional action on H. R. 8300 which produced revisions in the Internal Revenue Code of both a substantive and procedural nature. Financial benefits have also accrued to small concerns through reduction in personal income tax rates and in excise and sales taxes. Many small corporations also benefited by the expiration of the excess-profits tax. The committee believes, nevertheless, that a continuing study must be conducted to determine how more effective relief may be achieved, with particular attention paid to the possibility of higher exemptions or reduced income-tax rates for small firms.

I should like to point out to my colleagues that these statements were made after a careful examination of the financial problems of small concerns, through subcommittee hearings, consultation with individual small-business men and staff studies.

As we all know the corporate tax consists of a normal tax of 30 percent and a surtax of 22 percent on that part of a corporation's income in excess of $25,000 and that an extension has been passed which carries these tax rates through March 31, 1957. It is quite obvious that such high rates cannot long continue to be absorbed by small corporations in the lower income groups. We are now talking about some 80 percent of the corporate tax returns filed for 1952 which were on net income of $25,000 and less. But, it is almost as obvious for the 13.6 percent of corporations earning from $25,000 to $100,000.

Mr. Speaker, can anyone tell me that when the Federal Government takes almost a third of your $25,000 that what remains is enough to permit the purchase of even two machines, the addition of a wing to the present factory structure or the introduction of a new product into the market? It is absurd to ex-