earlier, Merrill Lynch does not take a position in any of these markets. What we are interested in is a fair and equitable contract for buyers and sellers because we know that if they are one-sided in either respect we cannot do business. We are interested in a large volume of business in order to get our percentage of it.

Mr. McINTIRE. I was getting to the fact that our responsibility under this legislation is much broader than cotton, but that is what we have spent our time on, and I was just wondering about the other commodities.

Mr. HENICAN. Let me ask you this question:

I wish you would clear up some of my ignorance because you originate from that territory. Is there such a thing as an onion processor or manufacturer?

Mr. McINTIRE. I do not know. I do not come from an onion territory.

Mr. HENICAN. Would he qualify under this?

Mr. McINTIRE. No; I do not think so.

Mr. HENICAN. I can see a possibility. There are potato processors and manufacturers.

Mr. McINTIRE. Very definitely.

Mr. HENICAN. I have handled some long contracts for a potato-chip manufacturer where the potato price was such that he could fix his cost and fix his profits. I do not think there is such an organization as an onion manufacturer or processor. So, he would not qualify under this amendment; would he?

Mr. LAIRD. We do have these french-fry potato plants which are processors.

Mr. McINTIRE. And, of course, there is likely to be more of it as time goes on. That is the direction in which marketing is moving in those commodities.

I am wondering, and I just wanted to get your thought, as to whether or not the discussion we have had here particularly on cotton has equal bearing and an equal relationship with the other commodities which are affected under this act?

Mr. HENICAN. I think so.

Mr. McINTIRE. Do you think this bill should be amended to include only cotton?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir; I am very strongly opposed to amending this to include cotton only. It should include all commodities because as you recall yesterday the gentleman from CEA mentioned the fact that the first time this came up was many years ago. It had to do with a Quaker Oats matter, and later the Corn Products matter, and it has only recently been involved with cotton.

There is another case in which I was personally involved which had to do with the Mexican Government in regard to wheat. I would be very much opposed to limiting this amendment to cotton only.

Mr. McINTIRE. Thank you.

Mr. GATHINGS. Are there any further questions?

(No response.)

Mr. Kauffman and Mr. Henican, I just wonder if you gentlemen think that the record is complete or if you had any further suggestions?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is complete insofar as the Commodity Exchange Authority is concerned.

Mr. GATHINGS. Thank you.

If there are no further questions, the subcommittee will stand adjourned to meet again at the call of the Chair.

(Thereupon, at 12 o'clock, noon, the subcommittee adjourned.)

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, June 4, 1956)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, the might of them that put their trust in Thee, amid all the subtle dangers that beset us, save us from the fatal folly of attempting to rely upon our own unaided strength and devices. The world is aghast at the revelation of the ruthless depravity of a dictator who sought to mold a system with Thee excluded, with Thy law and Thy love ignored. Such a baneful career but confirms Thy word that without Thee "The human heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked." In a world so uncertain about many things we are sure of no light but Thine, no refuge but in Thee.

The din of words assails our ears in this agitated world. Grant us an inner calm undisturbed by any outer commotion because our minds are stayed on Thee. Give us the courage to seek the truth honestly and the reverence and obedience to follow humbly the kindly light that leads us on. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 5, 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. Miller, 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 the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6024. An act to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain land at Kaakaukukui, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H.;

H. R. 6218. An act to authorize payment by the Federal Government of the cost of making certain studies necessary to assist the Menominee Tribe of Indians to prepare for the termination of Federal supervision;

H. R. 6332. An act to amend the act of October 11, 1949, to specify the fee which will be paid for services performed by United States commissioners with respect to the commitment of individuals to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7552. An act to amend sections 220 and 221 (d) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920;

H. R. 7641. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7663. An act to provide for settlement in part of certain claims of the Uintah and White River Bands of Ute Indians in Court of Claims case No. 47568, through restoration of subsurface rights in certain lands formerly a part of the Uintah Indian Reservation;

H. R. 7887. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands under certain circumstances without public auction;

H. R. 8552. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the town of Chincoteague, Va., permanent easements on certain lands for the purpose of taking subterranean water;

H. R. 9280. An act relating to the plan for control of the property of the Menominee Indian Tribe, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9593. An act to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9970. An act to provide for the disposition of the Stockton Air Force Station and the Stockton Annex, Sharpe General Depot, Calif.;

H. R. 10630. An act relating to the District Court of Guam;

H. R. 10766. An act to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II; and

H. J. Res. 511. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 6024. An act to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain land at Kaakaukukui, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H.;

H. R. 6218. An act to authorize payment by the Federal Government of the cost of making certian studies necessary to assist the Menominee Tribe of Indians to prepare for the termination of Federal supervision;

H. R. 7552. An act to amend sections 220 and 221 (d) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920;

H. R. 7663. An act to provide for settlement in part of certain claims of the Uintah and White River Bands of Ute Indians in Court of Claims case No. 47568, through restoration of subsurface rights in certain lands formerly a part of the Uintah Indian Reservation;

H. R. 7887. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands under certain circumstances without public auction; and

H. R. 9280. An act relating to the plan for control of the property of the Menominee Indian Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6332. An act to amend the act of October 11, 1949, to specify the fee which will be paid for services performed by United States commissioners with respect to the commitment of individuals to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 10630. An act relating to the District Court of Guam; and

H. J. Res. 511. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27,

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

1935; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7641. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 8552. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the town of Chincoteague, Va., permanent easements on certain lands for the purpose of taking subterranean water; and

H. R. 9970. An act to provide for the disposition of the Stockton Air Force Station and the Stockton Annex, Sharpe General Depot, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9593. An act to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 10766. An act to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and by unanimous consent, the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and consider the nomination under the heading "New Report."

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Report" will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frederick A. Seaton, of Nebraska, to be Secretary of the Interior.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to say I think the President made a very fine nomination when he named our former colleague, Fred Seaton to be Secretary of the Interior. I served in this body with him for a short time. I found him to be a man of sterling integrity and keen intellect, one who was very conscious of the obligations he owed to this country, which had done so much for him. I am very glad to see him elevated to a high position in the President's Cabinet.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should also like to commend the President for his nomination of Fred Seaton, our former colleague in this body. I have known him for a good many years, and knew him long before he became a Member of the Senate. I served briefly with him in this Chamber. I believe he has the capability to make an outstanding Secretary of the Interior. I am glad that the committee has very promptly recommended the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I voted in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the confirmation of the nomination of ex-Senator Seaton to be Secretary of the Interior because he is a man of good character, and because I believe the President of the United States is entitled, except under unusual circumstances, to have an official family of his own choosing and preference.

However, I believe the RECORD should show that many pertinent questions, asked by members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, were left unanswered by the man who is about to become the chief custodian of the natural resources of the United States.

Mr. Seaton becomes Secretary of the Interior following a regime which, in my opinion, has done more damage to true conservation values than has any other Interior Department administration during the modern era.

I believe that six major challenges face the new Secretary. They are these:

First. To halt—and possibly rescind—the widespread oil and gas drilling which perverts the original and primary purpose of our great system of national wildlife refuges.

Second. To save the Hells Canyon hydroelectric power site, the finest left on the continent of North America, from piecemeal private exploitation.

Third. To cancel the Al Sarena mining claims, which have resulted in no mining of ore, but only in the cutting of over 2 million feet of valuable public fir and pine timber in the Rogue River National Forest, and to support legislation which will in the future preserve national forest timber from going to mining patentees.

Fourth. To deny secretarial sanction to efforts to bring about commercial invasion of our scenic system of national parks and monuments.

Fifth. To reverse administration plans for choking off the migratory fish runs, elk grazing ranges, and wilderness areas of the Clearwater River watershed.

Sixth. To withhold secretarial approval from such anticonservation legislation as the Ellsworth-Cordon timber exchange bill and the Hope-Aiken grazing bill.

How Mr. Seaton measures up to these issues, Mr. President, will decide in history whether he is to be another Douglas McKay or possibly another Gifford Pinchot.

Mr. MALONE subsequently said: Mr. President, on June 5 the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported unanimously the nomination of Frederick A. Seaton, of Nebraska, to be Secretary of the Interior.

I wish to commend the committee for a unanimous report to the Senate, and the Senate for unanimous confirmation of former Senator Seaton.

It has been traditional for many years that the Secretary of the Interior should come from a Western State.

Nebraska is a Western State. As a member of the National Reclamation Association of the 17 Western States, west of a line through central Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, it is semiarid requiring irrigation. I believe that Senator Seaton understands western problems and will make a fine Secretary of the Interior. He has integrity and the experience necessary for that important position. He has served as a member of the Senate and in many other important posts of public service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nomination today confirmed.

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

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, following a brief announcement I desire to make, there may be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce, for the information of the Senate, that following the disposition of the unfinished business, which is Calendar No. 1896, Senate bill 3108, to encourage the construction of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels, on which there is a debate limitation agreement, the Senate will take up the following bills:

Calendar No. 2065, H. R. 9536, the General Government matters appropriation bill for 1957;

Calendar No. 2064, H. R. 9739, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1957;

Calendar No. 2030, S. 3149, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, in order to permit certain air carriers to grant free or reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion;

Calendar No. 2039, S. 3449, relating to the reinvestment by air carriers of the

proceeds from the sale or other disposition of certain operating property and equipment;

Calendar No. 2063, S. 3365, to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to change the requirements for obtaining a freight forwarder permit;

Calendar No. 2084, S. 3857, to clarify section 1103 (d) of title XI (Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended;

Calendar No. 2085, H. R. 9824, to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean conflict;

Calendar No. 2086, S. 1614, to amend the act entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids," title 21, United States Code, section 321c;

Calendar No. 2089, H. R. 2840, to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas;

Calendar No. 2090, S. 3907, to amend section 345 of the Public Health Service Act;

Calendar No. 2091, S. 3620, to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children;

Calendar No. 2092, S. 3958, to assist in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses;

Calendar No. 2093, S. 3430, to promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine;

Calendar No. 2110, S. 3307, to amend section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to authorize jurisdiction in Federal courts in certain reemployment cases;

Calendar No. 2111, H. R. 6274, to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran discharged under honorable conditions for furnishing him or his next of kin or legal representative a copy of a certificate showing his service in the Armed Forces;

Calendar No. 2112, H. R. 5516, to amend title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide that service as an Army field clerk, or as a field clerk, Quartermaster Corps, shall be counted for purposes of retirement under title III of that act, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 2113, H. R. 8102, to provide for the disposition of moneys arising from deductions made from carriers on account of the loss of or damage to military material in transit;

Calendar No. 2114, H. R. 8693, to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, in relation to the refund of reenlistment bonuses;

Calendar No. 2115, H. R. 8922, to provide for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services; and

Calendar No. 2076, H. R. 6376, the Alaska mental health bill.

We hope that on the disposition of the bills I have enumerated the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the social security bill. It may be that we can have a general statement on that bill by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee on tomorrow or perhaps on Friday, or it might even go over until Monday. Although there will be votes on the pending bill, and a quorum call, and perhaps yea-and-nay votes on some amendments and on the question of final passage, so far as the leadership is aware, there is no great controversy which will require yea-and-nay votes on any of the measures I have announced today.

So Members who desire to make plans for the weekend may know that we do not anticipate that we shall have before us any controversial measures requiring a number of yea-and-nay votes on either Friday or Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order entered, routine morning business is now in order.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET, 1957, FOR THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL—PROPOSED PROVISION FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY FUNCTIONS (S. DOC. NO. 127)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1957, in the amount of $889,400, for the Architect of the Capitol, and a draft of a proposed provision for the Department of Defense—Military Functions, which with the accompanying papers was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

RESOLUTIONS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on May 14, 1956, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States against accepting or taking action upon the findings and recommendations of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States against accepting or taking action upon the findings and recommendations of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions

Whereas the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions, established on January 14, 1955, under Executive Order 10588, submitted its final report, including findings and recommendations, to the President of the United States on April 23, 1956; and

Whereas the findings and recommendations of said Commission are detrimental to the best interests of all veterans; and

Whereas any action taken favoring the recommendations as submitted by said Commission would be unfair, unjust, inequitable and contrary to the concept of benefits to veterans: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the President of the United States to take no action upon the report of the Commission on Veterans' Pensions; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States reject any legislation submitted to it based upon the report of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

LUMINOUS MARKING OF RAILROAD CARS TO PREVENT ACCIDENTS—LETTERS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have received from George W. Dewey, executive secretary of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, a copy of a resolution which deserves the most careful consideration. What the Farm Bureau suggests, Mr. President, in their resolution, would undoubtedly reduce the number of deaths that occur annually from people running into freight cars because of the difficulty of seeing them at night.

I referred the question to the Interstate Commerce Commission a few weeks ago. Their position is explained by their Director of the Bureau of Safety and Service in a letter he has written in answer.

I am sure that if the board of directors of one of the Nation's railroads were to take the initiative in marking their cars with some luminous paint, as suggested in the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation resolution, that particular railroad would gain for itself not only the thanks of untold thousands but an immense amount of favorable publicity and good will throughout the country. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this letter from Mr. Dewey embodying the resolution, and the letter from C. W. Taylor, Director of the Bureau of Safety and Service of the Interstate Commerce Commission, be printed in the RECORD.

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

OREGON FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
May 4, 1956.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: At the last annual meeting of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, the voting delegates, representing 8,000 farm and ranch families in Oregon, included in the policy a resolution pertaining to the equipping of railroad cars so that they can be readily seen at night.

The resolution is as follows:

"Highway railroad crossings, at night, pose a danger to motorists due to poor visibility, and there have been a number of fatalities due to accidents at these crossings in Oregon.

"As this condition also exists in other States, we recommend that the Interstate Commerce Commissioner put into effect regulations that would compel the railroads to mark their flat, box, or log cars by means of reflectors, luminous paint, or other means."

This resolution came through the resolution process of this farm organization because of the many rural crossings in Oregon that are unlighted, creating not only a serious traffic hazard but causing fatalities as well.

Two bills have been introduced, H. R. 2399 and H. R. 8899. We would appreciate your comments as to the status of the bills as well as your own personal feeling with reference to this type of regulatory legislation.

With every good wish, I remain,

Very truly yours,

GEORGE W. DEWEY,
Executive Secretary.

MAY 23, 1956.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: This is in reference to your letter of May 17, relative to the resolution passed by the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, pertaining to the marking of the sides of railroad cars with reflectors or luminous paint to minimize the possibility of accidents at railroad-highway grade crossings.

This is a matter over which, under existing law, the Commission has no jurisdiction and accordingly I am without authority to take any administrative action placing into effect the terms of the resolution.

With reference to proposed legislation embodied in H. R. 2399 and H. R. 8899, which you mention, it is my opinion that either bill would provide the protection which the Federation seeks, as expressed in its resolution, but that H. R. 8899 more nearly coincides with our thinking for the requirements of such legislation.

I shall be glad to furnish any further information you may desire with respect to this matter.

Very truly yours,

C. W. TAYLOR,
Director.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 3681. A bill to modify certain restrictions with respect to holding more than one office under the United States (Rept. No. 2143).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

S. 3559. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1954, as amended, so as to extend the availability of emergency credit to farmers and stockmen (Rept. No. 2144).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

H. R. 10285. An act to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2145).

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

H. R. 9052. An act to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports (Rept. No. 2147).

DOMESTIC TUNGSTEN, ASBESTOS, FLUORSPAR, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM PRODUCTION AND PURCHASE ACT OF 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 3982) to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 2146) thereon. I recommend that the bill, as amended, be passed.

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

EXTENSION OF THE 1953 MALONE-ASPINALL ACT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The committee report on the bill was unanimous?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; and the committee reports the bill favorably, with two amendments.

Mr. MALONE. I understand that the bill is a simple extension of the 1953 Malone-Aspinall Act, with the addition of fluorspar and with the exception of the mineral provisions included in the 1953 act, which Dr. Arthur Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and also a member of the National Security Council, has testified before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that he can and will continue to purchase during the life of the legislation, or until the President's Cabinet Committee on Minerals presents a permanent acceptable plan.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 4002. A bill to provide for the establishment of additional animal disease laboratory facilities at or near Montana State College; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 4003. A bill to extend Federal recognition posthumously to Lt. Col. Lee J. Merkel, Air National Guard of the United States, as a colonel, Air National Guard of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 4004. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend the repayment period on certain disaster loans made under the provisions of such act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 4005. A bill to disclaim any rights of the United States to the Island of Navassa; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 4006. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yong Nak Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 4007. A bill for the relief of the Sorensen Fish Co.; and

S. 4008. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marion Huggins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 4009. A bill to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 4010. A bill to provide increases in monthly rates of compensation for service-connected disability and death, and pensions payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and to liberalize the requirements for awarding additional disability compensation to veterans who have dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim certain property in Coahoma County, Miss., to the Home Demonstration Club of Rena Lara, Mississippi, Inc.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ANIMAL DISEASE LABORATORY FACILITIES NEAR MONTANA STATE COLLEGE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of additional animal-disease laboratory facilities at or near Montana State College, located at Bozeman, Mont.

Originally it was proposed by the Department of Agriculture that these facilities be located at the Beltsville, Md., Agricultural Research Center. A budget request of $18,915,000 was included for this item. However, the Senate Appropriations Committee disallowed the request, asking that the project be reviewed by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and that specific authorization be provided for a site other than Beltsville.

Today, the Secretary of Agriculture, in accordance with the expressed wish of Congress, has taken steps toward selection of a site for the additional animal-disease laboratory facilities. A site committee consisting of representatives of the livestock industry, land-grant colleges, the veterinary medical profession, State departments of agriculture, livestock sanitary officials, and other livestock interests is to hear proposals as to prospective sites at a meeting in St. Louis on June 27. This committee will then choose from 3 to 5 locations for on-the-ground consideration. Members of the site committee will visit these proposed locations and will present their recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, the press release issued today by the Department of Agriculture, and a telegram I received this morning from Dr. R. R. Renne, president of Montana State College. The criteria to be considered by the site committee, as set forth in the press release, are amply met by Montana State College. I may add that animal-industry leaders of Montana strongly support Senator MANSFIELD's and my proposal to establish these needed facilities, which will

be of great help to the livestock industry not only in Montana and other Western States, but throughout the country. Our colleague from Montana, Representative LEE METCALF, is today introducing a companion bill in the House of Representatives.

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

The bill (S. 4002) to provide for the establishment of additional animal-disease laboratory facilities at or near Montana State College, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The release and telegram, presented by Mr. MURRAY, are as follows:

SITE TO BE CHOSEN FOR NEW ANIMAL-DISEASE LABORATORY

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today took initial steps toward selection of a site for construction of new facilities for work on animal diseases. The action is in accord with suggestions from leaders in both Houses of the Congress.

Originally, it was proposed by the Department that such facilities be located at the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Md., and $18,915,000 was included in appropriation requests for construction purposes. Congress, in considering this request generally favored the new facilities, but at a location other than Beltsville.

The suggestion was made that the United States Department of Agriculture—in cooperation with the livestock industry and allied interests—select a site located close to centers of livestock production, near or in conjunction with one of the State land-grant colleges having a strong veterinary medical program, and away from concentrated metropolitan centers. The Secretary, following these suggestions, today invited submission of site proposals and set up procedures to consider them.

Notices of interest and preliminary proposals are to be in the hands of the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service, Washington 25, D. C., by Thursday, June 21. This deadline does not, however, preclude consideration of other proposals or presentations directly to the site committee. All proposals and oral presentations will be considered by the site committee at a meeting in St. Louis, Mo., beginning on June 27 at the Statler Hotel, at 9 a. m.

The site committee will consist of leaders in the livestock industry representing beef cattle, swine, dairying, sheep, and poultry, and representatives of the land-grant colleges, the veterinary medical profession, State Departments of Agriculture, livestock sanitary officials, and other livestock interests. The site committee is to have full freedom of action in making its recommendations but will be guided by certain factors related to the functions and operating economy of the laboratory, as follows:

1. Scientific center: Near a land-grant college or university having a veterinary school or a strong animal-disease research department, which would provide the advantages of library facilities and opportunity for cooperation and association with other scientific work.

2. Human population: Near a community that could readily absorb 100–200 new families and having adequate personnel to fill 100–200 nonscientific positions; not close to an industrial, metropolitan strategic area.

3. Accessibility: Near major railroad and airline connections on a site adjacent to permanent hard-surfaced roads.

4. Land: From 200 to 400 acres is needed.

5. Construction costs: High-cost areas will be avoided.

6. Utilities:

(a) Water: 250,000 to 300,000 gallons of potable water per day required.

(b) Sewage: Provision for disposition of 150,000 to 200,000 gallons of sterile and treated effluent per day required.

(c) Electricity: 4,000 to 4,500 kilowatts per hour connected load required.

7. Availability per year of 1,000 each locally produced cattle, swine, sheep.

After hearing all proposals presented at St. Louis, the site committee will choose from 3 to 5 locations for further on-the-ground consideration. The members will then visit each of these proposed locations and will review the advantages of each of them. They will present their recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The new animal disease facility as planned will include laboratories for research simultaneously on 25 different animal diseases so arranged that there will be no possibility of exposure of animals in one section to any of the diseases on which work may be underway in another section. Complete protection for laboratory workers against diseases that may be communicable to humans will be included. Safety measures also will be adopted preventing the escape of disease organisms from the laboratory that might infect livestock herds and flocks or humans. In addition to the research, the facility will have space and equipment for testing and diagnostic work required in the livestock disease control and regulatory activities of the Department.

The livestock industry and agricultural leaders consider the need for the new laboratory to be urgent as a result of the necessary abandonment of 50-year-old inadequate facilities in Washington on July 1, 1955. This action, on the recommendation of an inspection committee of three widely known research experts on communicable diseases, resulted in the closing down of research on tuberculosis, anthrax, and other diseases of animals that also can affect humans. Similar work at Auburn, Ala., and Denver, Colo., also has had to be discontinued because of antiquated and inadequate facilities.

BOZEMAN, MONT., *June 5, 1956.*

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Reurtel Montana Veterinary Research Laboratory at Montana Agricultural Experiment Station, Bozeman, in existence since 1929 is conducting as extensive research program livestock diseases as can be found in any land-grant college in Nation. Additionally, Mr. Wallis Huidekoper recently gave research foundation at Montana State College 110-acre irrigated ranch at Big Timber with all equipment to be used exclusively for livestock disease research. Location of national animal disease research facility adjacent to research center in animal diseases much more important than location adjacent to veterinary medical school where resources heavily diverted to teaching purposes. Many strong reasons to support location national laboratory in Montana. National Institute of Health Laboratory at Hamilton would be near and could importantly supplement animal disease research center.

More important that a disease research facility be located close to strong research facilities in chemistry, biology, bacteriology, physics, or consultation than to be located close to veterinary medical teaching facilities.

Livestock disease regulatory work in Montana under Montana Livestock Sanitary Board is model for State control of infectious animal diseases and is among foremost of this type of agency in Nation and has been for many years. This also offers strong argument for effective collaboration from State agency if located in Montana.

In January 1956 meeting of some 50 representatives various organizations from 11 Western States met Salt Lalk City consider possibility establishing federally financed animal disease research laboratory in western region. Decided such laboratory of great importance and acted to explore all feasible means for its establishment. Group elected Dr. A. P. Schneider, Boise, Idaho, chairman and Dr. K. J. Peterson, Salem, Oreg., secretary. Dr. Schneider appointed committees in each of 11 Western States to work through State organizations to promote such western laboratory in all feasible ways.

Location of animal disease research facility in western range State not only would result in more adequate study of diseases peculiar to range livestock but sparsity of population would be important in disease isolation and as national security measure. Land facilities readily available and at nominal cost. If strong support for such a Federal animal disease research facility somewhere in 11 Western States exists, strong arguments can be advanced for Montana as the location. Sending airmail confirmation this wire to Montana congressional delegation.

R. R. RENNE,
President, Montana State College.

POSTHUMOUS PROMOTION OF LT. COL. LEE J. MERKEL

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend Federal recognition posthumously to Lt. Col. Lee J. Merkel, Air National Guard of the United States, as a colonel, Air National Guard of the United States, and for other purposes.

Lt. Col. Lee J. Merkel, killed on January 31, 1956, was a veteran Kentucky pilot. Born in 1918, Merkel was graduated from Du Pont Manual High School and the University of Louisville. He enlisted in the Air Force in 1941 at age 23. A year later he won his wings as a military pilot. During World War II he served as squadron flight leader in six campaigns in north Africa, Sicily, Italy, and France. Merkel flew a total of 143 missions and on 1 occasion was shot down in Italy behind enemy lines. For his combat performance he received the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with 5 Oak Leaf clusters, and 2 Distinguished Unit Citations.

In 1948 Merkel became base commander for the 123d Fighter-Interceptor Group, an Air National Guard unit located at Standiford Field. This unit was called to active duty in October 1950 and served in England as a fighter-bomber wing. It was returned to its Kentucky base in 1952. Lieutenant Colonel Merkel was widely recognized as one of the best pilots in the Air National Guard. As base detachment commander, a full-time job, he worked hard to persuade the State legislature to grant funds for lengthening runways to accommodate jet aircraft at Standiford. Prior to accepting full-time duties as base commander in 1948, Merkel was training officer in the Vocational Rehabilitation Service in the Veterans' Administration regional office. Civil defense and survival were strong interests of Merkel and he aimed to arouse public interest in the formulation of more adequate defense plans and train-

ing. In 1955 he headed the public employees division of the community chest campaign. He was president of the Kentucky Air National Guard Association.

Lieutenant Colonel Merkel's F–51 crashed near Bedford, Ind., on a test flight. Witnesses reported his plane was smoking, and he apparently attempted an emergency landing. He is survived by his wife, Catherine, and four children at 1104 Manning Road, Louisville, Ky.

Prior to his death and on July 12, 1955, Lieutenant Colonel Merkel appeared before a promotion board at Standiford Field and was approved for promotion to the rank of colonel, which grade was authorized for a T/O assignment as fighter group commander. Pursuant to the finding of the promotion board Lieutenant Colonel Merkel was promoted to the rank of colonel on State orders issued by the military department, Commonwealth of Kentucky, on July 4, 1955.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to grant Federal recognition to the late Lieutenant Colonel Merkel as a full colonel in the Air Force. In view of the unselfish and distinguished service of this officer both in peace and war, and in view of the nature of his command, it is fitting and proper that this promotion be granted.

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

The bill (S. 4003) to extend Federal recognition posthumously to Lt. Col. Lee J. Merkel, Air National Guard of the United States, as a colonel, Air National Guard of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLEMENTS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

LICENSING OF PAWNBROKERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared explaining the legislative history and purposes of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The 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. 4009) to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

STATEMENT PRESENTED BY SENATOR ALLOTT

In essence this bill, which is similar to H. R. 11002, the pawnbroker bill, is a copy of the original pawnbroker act for the District of Columbia, approved March 2, 1889 (25 Stat. 1006) as amended March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 841). From 1889 to 1913 pawnbrokers were licensed and carried on business in the District. During the same period unlicensed moneylenders carried on a very extensive business in the District, charging exorbitant rates of interest on small loans. The voracity of these unlicensed lenders was so great that the public demanded relief. The act approved February 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 657) was enacted primarily to drive these unlicensed moneylenders out of the District. It sought to accomplish this purpose by reducing the authorized interest rate on small loans to one percent per month on loans of $200 or less. In the case of *Newman ex rel Prender* v. *United States* (41 App. D. C. 37) the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia held that the act of 1913 repealed by implication the Pawnbrokers Act of 1889 and that since the 1913 act authorized the making of loans on collateral security of any kind, tangible or intangible, it covered the pawnbroker business as well as the small-loan business. The net effect of the act of 1913 was to drive legitimate capital out of the District of Columbia so far as small loans and the pawnbroker business was concerned, with the result that persons who would otherwise have patronized licensed lenders were driven to unlicensed, high-rate lenders in the District or to licensed lenders outside of the District.

The background of this legislation is as follows:

Congressman KEARNS of Pennsylvania requested the corporation counsel to assign an assistant to help him draft a small-loan bill for the District of Columbia. Mr. Chester H. Gray, Principal Assistant Corporation Counsel, was designated to assist Mr. KEARNS.

A bill was drafted to authorize loans of $600 or less in the District of Columbia on which an interest rate of 3 percent per month on the first $150, 2 percent on the next $150, and 1 percent per month on the next $300 of a loan in the total amount of $600 was provided. That bill was introduced by Congressman KEARNS as H. R. 114, 84th Congress, 1st session.

The bill was referred to the House Committee on the District of Columbia which then asked the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for a report. The Commissioners referred the bill to the Citizens Advisory Council which conducted hearings on the bill and at those hearings Deputy Chief Scott, Metropolitan Police Department, recommended amendment of the bill by adding provisions relating to pawnbrokers. Deputy Chief Scott pointed out that the Police Department had for many years been relying heavily upon evidence secured from so-called pawnbrokers (in fact dealers in secondhand property) for evidence of larceny and other felonies committed in the District of Columbia. He testified that a number of serious crimes, including murder, had been solved with evidence the starting point of which was the tracing of personal property which had been pawned. Mr. Jerome Livingston, the only licensed money lender in the District of Columbia who engages in the pawnbroker business, also testified respecting the need for regulation of the pawnbroker business, pointing out that many secondhand dealers are actually engaged in the pawnbroking business, by the process of entering into agreements with persons selling them secondhand personal property to sell the same property back to the seller at stipulated higher prices, the difference, of course, representing interest at astronomical rates.

On the recommendation of the Citizens Advisory Council, Mr. Gray, accompanied by Deputy Chief Scott reported to Representative KEARNS in substance the testimony of Deputy Chief Scott and as a result Mr. KEARNS requested the drafting of the necessary amendments to include pawnbrokers in the small-loan bill.

A study of small-loan and pawnbrokers laws revealed that these activities are entirely separate and distinct phases of the money-lending business, operating under completely different procedures. The small-loan business is conducted solely on the security of written or printed evidences of indebtedness, whereas the pawnbroker business is conducted on the security of the pledge and possession of tangible personal property.

In view of the different techniques employed it was considered desirable to rewrite H. R. 114 so as to provide one title for the small-loan business, a separate title for the pawnbroker business, and a third title for regulatory provisions common to both types of business. The bill as so rewritten was introduced as H. R. 6775. After hearings by the Subcommittee of the House District of Columbia Committee, the bill was favorably reported by the committee and was passed by the House on July 25, 1955. Nothing having occurred since the submission of H. R. 6775 to the Senate, it was considered desirable by its sponsors to have that portion of H. R. 6775 which deals with the pawnbroker business introduced as a bill separate and distinct from the small-loan bill. As many of the regulatory features common to both types of loans had been set forth in title I relating to small loans and merely incorporated by reference in title II relating to pawnbrokers it was necessary to extract those features and specifically incorporate them in the pawnbroker bill to provide complete coverage. A bill containing the pawnbroker provisions as passed by the House and as thus completed was introduced in the House on May 3, 1956, by Mr. KLEIN as H. R. 11002.

Section 1 of this bill, which I have previously indicated is similar to H. R. 11002, contains definitions of terms used in the bill.

Section 2 prohibits engaging in business as a pawnbroker without first obtaining a license from the Commissioners. It further prohibits the use of the word "pawnbroker" or the display of any symbol commonly used by pawnbrokers by any unlicensed business.

Section 3 sets forth qualifications for license, including the requirement that applicants have available for use in the business of making loans cash capital of at least $20,000.

Section 4 requires applicants to file a bond running to the District in the sum of $5,000 conditioned upon the compliance by the applicant with provisions of the act and all rules and regulations made pursuant thereto. It authorizes any person injured by noncompliance with law or regulation by a licensee to maintain suit in his own name and recover on the bond such damages as shall be adjudged.

Section 5 provides that after investigation and after satisfying the Commissioners of his qualifications the license shall be issued to the applicant and that the annual license fee shall be $500.

Section 6 provides for the revocation, suspension, and renewal of licenses.

Section 7 imposes upon the Commissioners the duty of enforcing the act; authorizes the Commissioners to investigate the business and records of licensees and authorizes the Commissioners to require by subpena the production of books, papers, and records and the attendance, and examination under oath, of all persons whose testimony they may require relative to loans or business of licensees.

Section 8 prohibits false or misleading advertising respecting the pawnbroker business.

Section 9 is the interest section. It directs the District Commissioners to investigate from time to time the economic conditions and other factors relating to the business of making pawnbroker loans; to ascertain pertinent facts necessary to determine what maximum rate of interest may be permitted upon the basis of such ascertained facts and to fix by regulation the maximum rate of interest on pawnbroker loans which will induce efficiently managed commercial capital to be invested in such business in sufficient amounts to make available adequate facilities to individuals seeking such loans at reasonable rates of interest and which will afford those engaged in such business a fair and reasonable return upon the assets.

Pending the determination of such rates by the Commissioners, the bill authorizes

pawnbrokers to charge not exceeding 2 percent per month, or fraction thereof, upon any loan not exceeding $200, or more than 1 percent per month, or fraction thereof, upon any loan exceeding $200 and not exceeding $1,000, and 8 percent per annum (the maximum statutory rate now in effect) on any loan in excess of $1,000.

Section 10 prohibits the charging of interest in excess of the existing statutory rate of 6 percent per annum, or 8 percent per annum upon an instrument in writing, by any person except a licensee under the act and declares invalid any instrument evidencing a loan made in the District in violation of the provisions of the bill.

Section 11 requires every pawnbroker to record in a book at the time of each loan an accurate account and description of the goods pawned, the amount of money loaned thereon, the time of pledging the same, and the rate of interest to be paid on such loan, the name and residence of the person pawning such goods together with a description of such person; requires that the book at all reasonable times be open to inspection by the Commissioners; and prohibits disclosure by any officer of the District of entries in such book to any person other than an official having a right thereto in his official capacity.

Section 12 requires every pawnbroker at the time of each loan to deliver to any person pawning any goods a memorandum signed by him containing the substance of the entry required to be made by him in this book.

Section 13 prohibits any pawnbroker from selling any pawned article until the same has remained 1 year in his possession, unless with the consent of the pawner. It also provides that all sales shall be made at public auction and shall be made or conducted by licensed auctioneers.

Section 14 requires that notice of every such sale be published at least 6 days prior thereto in 1 or more daily newspapers printed in the District, such notice to specify the time and place where such sale is to take place, the name of the auctioneer and a description of the article to be sold. In addition the pawnbroker is required to mail to the pawner a copy of such notice.

Section 15 provides that the surplus money, if any, arising from any such sale, after deducting the interest then due and the expenses of advertising any such sale, shall be paid over by the pawnbroker to the person who would be entitled to redeem the pledge in case no such sale had taken place.

Section 16 provides penalties for violation of the act of fine of not more than $300 or imprisonment for not more than 90 days; declares that any contract of loan from which any act shall have been done which constitutes a violation of the bill shall be void and that the lender shall have no right to collect or receive any principal or charges whatsoever on account thereof.

Section 17 authorizes the Commissioners to make and enforce such regulations as they deem necessary to carry out the purposes of the act.

Section 18 exempts from application of the act, firms, stock companies, and credit unions doing business in the District of Columbia under the supervision of the Federal Reserve System, Comptroller of the Currency, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or to loans made by them.

Section 19 repeals the act of February 4, 1913, as amended, insofar as the same applies to the business of lending money on the security of pledge and possession of tangible personal property.

Section 20 provides if any provision of the act be held invalid the remainder of the act shall not be affected thereby.

Section 21 provides that the act shall take effect at the expiration of 60 days after the date of its approval.

It is my hope and belief that this bill will assist the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to protect the citizens of this area from exorbitant interest rates when it becomes necessary for them to acquire money immediately by pledging personal property, and that it will assist the Police Department of the District to secure necessary information for the prosecution of criminals.

CARE OF MENTALLY ILL OF ALASKA—AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 6376) to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senate Committee on Finance filed its report on H. R. 7225, the social security bill, which will be before the Senate today or tomorow. In the main, it is a good bill, and contains many excellent provisions. However, I regret that the bill as reported to the Senate fails to contain some of the best provisions of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. It was the judgment of the Senate committee that all provisions relating to social security insurance for disabled persons should be stricken from the bill. It was also the judgment of the committee that all provisions relating to retirement of working women, wives, and dependent mothers at age 62 should be stricken from the bill. It was also the judgment of the committee that amendments to the public-welfare program, even though one particular amendment was sponsored by 46 Senators, should not be included in the bill as reported.

Mr. President, these amendments will be submitted. The distinguished dean of the Senate and its President pro tempore [Mr. GEORGE], who now is presiding over the Senate, intends to submit, for himself, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], an amendment restoring to the bill the disability provisions. On behalf of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], I submit the amendment, and ask unanimous consent that it be received, printed, and lie on the table.

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

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators GEORGE, BARRETT, BENDER, BIBLE, BUSH, CHAVEZ, CLEMENTS, DANIEL, DOUGLAS, EASTLAND, ELLENDER, GREEN, HENNINGS, HILL, HOLLAND, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, KEFAUVER, KENNEDY, KERR, KUCHEL, LANGER, LEHMAN, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MCCARTHY, MCCLELLAN, MONRONEY, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, NEUBERGER, O'MAHONEY, PASTORE, PAYNE, PURTELL, SCHOEPPEL, SCOTT, SMATHERS, SPARKMAN, STENNIS, SYMINGTON, WELKER, and YOUNG, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to House bill 7225, which would increase the Federal matching for State welfare purposes. I ask that the amendment be received, printed, and lie on the table.

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

Mr. LONG. Also, Mr. President, on behalf of myself, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to House bill 7225, to restore to the bill the provisions to lower the retirement age for working women, dependent mothers, and also wives of retired workers.

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

Mr. LONG. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that, although the committee report is rather lengthy, the minority views appear at the end of it. Beginning at page 127 of the committee report are the minority views of three members of the committee, namely, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], former chairman of the committee, who has had much experience with the social security and public welfare provisions of our law, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the junior Senator from Louisiana. The minority views are signed by all three.

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. WILEY:

Address delivered by him on May 30, 1956, at De Pere, Wis., Memorial Day patriotic observance.

Address delivered by him over radio station WGN, Chicago, Ill., June 3, 1956, discussing his 20-point legislative program.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SENATOR CAPEHART

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, today is the birthday anniversary of the distinguished Senator from Indiana, HOMER CAPEHART. [Applause.]

I feel that I speak for all Members of the Senate in wishing for him many happy returns of the day and a continuation of his distinguished career for many years to come.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to join the distinguished Senator from North Dakota in felicitating the distinguished Senator from Indiana on the anniversary of his birth and in wishing him many happy returns of the day.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the able Senators from North Dakota and Texas.

TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I think it is fitting to note that this is the 12th anniversary of D-day—the

day that our soldiers and our allies invaded the continent of Europe.

Just 12 years ago, American soldiers landed on the beachheads of Normandy to face the dreaded strength of Hitler's armies. It was the mightiest invasion of history—one that has no parallel in size or in courage.

To the enslaved people of Europe, it represented a glorious day, for which they had been waiting many long years. To the tyrants who had enslaved them, it represented the beginning of the end.

In the years that have passed, D-day and Normandy have become a chapter in history. But they are more than that. The sacrifice of life—American life—represented the stake this country has in freedom, and such a stake is too precious to be lost.

It is a fresh and vivid memory to thousands of Americans who participated in the heroic battle. It is also a fresh and vivid memory to two of our most distinguished correspondents, William S. White and Don Whitehead, whose coverage of the battle gained them worldwide fame.

I am proud to count both of them among my friends.

This is not just a day to recall past glory, however. It is a day in which to draw inspiration from the sacrifices of the past in order to face the problems of the present—problems fully as great as those which were before our Nation on June 6, 1944.

We can hope and pray that never again will American soldiers have to walk into the jaws of death and destruction. But we can also resolve that we will face up to the issues of the present with the same high courage that was the hallmark of the men who fought at Normandy.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR HIRAM BINGHAM

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have just learned with deep regret of the death of former United States Senator Hiram Bingham, whom I recall as an old friend of the President pro tempore of the Senate.

Hiram Bingham was a man of great distinction in my State. I first knew him when he was a professor at Yale University before World War I. I was one of his pupils. I studied under him in his courses on South American history. I also served under him when I was a private in the Connecticut National Guard and he was a captain, in 1916.

It was interesting to me that Hiram Bingham should have entered the Connecticut National Guard at that time, when our country was in danger of war along the Mexican border. Although he was a somewhat older man, he offered his services, and served with distinction in that organization.

Later he became interested in politics in the State of Connecticut. He became lieutenant governor, then governor, and then United States Senator. He served with distinction in this body for a number of years. Later he served as chairman of our loyalty board at the Federal level. I believe that his work in that field was of a high order, and commanded the respect of all who came in contact with it.

I say with deep regret that Connecticut has lost one of her great sons. To members of his family, many of whom I know and who are friends of mine, I offer my very deep sympathy, and the assurance that Members of the United States Senate mourn the passing of an eminent American and a distinguished former Member of this body.

DEATH OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE FOSTER STEARNS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on yesterday news was received in Washington of the death of the Honorable Foster Stearns, a former Representative in Congress from the Second District of New Hampshire.

Mr. Stearns had a long and distinguished career of public service. In his earlier years he served in the State Department, and later he filled various assignments in our Foreign Service—military attaché to Belgium, third secretary of our Embassy in Constantinople, and second secretary of the American Embassy in Paris. A lieutenant in the 16th Infantry, 1st Division, during World War I, he was wounded in action and received decorations for valor. A faithful Catholic, he was knighted by Pope Pius XI.

Mr. Stearns entered the New Hampshire Legislature in 1937. In 1939 he was elected to the Congress of the United States, where he served with distinction for 6 years. His background of experience in diplomatic posts made him a most effective and useful member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

It was my privilege to represent the same congressional district after his retirement, and to enjoy the benefit of his friendship and counsel. New Hampshire has lost a devoted citizen, a brave soldier, and an able public servant.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, my colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] has announced to the Senate the passing of former Representative Foster Stearns, of New Hampshire. I wish to add my word of tribute to the tribute paid him by my colleague.

Foster Stearns had a long and distinguished career. He was the son of the Mr. Stearns who was so closely associated with Calvin Coolidge. He played a part in the affairs of the years preceding and following 1920. He represented this country ably and well for many years in the Foreign Service.

He was chosen to reorganize the library of the Vatican. He served for 6 years, from 1938 to 1944, in the House of Representatives, and since that time played a prominent part in many civic activities. I join my colleague in expressing regret at his passing, and I am happy to pay this tribute to him.

THE ALASKA MENTAL HEALTH BILL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, House bill 6376, the Alaska mental health bill, has been favorably reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and is scheduled for early action by the Senate, possibly today.

I am certain that every Member of the Senate who has read the committee report—and I hope all Senators have read it—knows that the Senate committee's version of the bill strikes from the House version all of the controversial commitment and care provisions. Among the organizations that voiced strenuous objections to the provisions of the bill as it passed the House was the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, with headquarters in Chicago.

I am happy to be able to report to the Senate that the President of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons now has written to me, as chairman of the committee, expressing approval of the bill as reported to the Senate. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the association president's letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *June 2, 1956.*

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Thank you very much for your letter of May 10 and the copy of the hearing for the bill for the Alaskan Mental Hospital. I was very much pleased to see the thoroughgoing manner in which all of the material and the opinions had been worked over by the committee.

It was extremely unfortunate that there was so much intemperate expression on both sides of this matter. I believe that there were some instances in which the bill was faultily worded and I believe that these faults have been corrected. I feel quite certain also that they could have been corrected without much of the heat that has been engendered. I do not honestly feel that either side had a corner on the choice of injudicious and intemperate expressions. I don't believe that there were any points of difference that could not have been settled coolly, rationally, and in open discussion. So far as I can see, the Members of the Congress and the committee conducted themselves in a manner that might have been taken as a good example by the proponents and the opponents on the outside. I believe that the bill as it is now recorded will be satisfactory and I hope that it is passed.

Yours sincerely,

CHARLES W. PAVEY, M. D.,
President, Association of American Physicians and Surgeons.

SELECTION OF SITE FOR ANIMAL-DISEASE LABORATORY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, today the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, took the initial steps toward the selection of a site for construction of an animal-disease laboratory.

During the debate in the Senate on the agricultural appropriations bill, which was handled by the able junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], there was considerable discussion and a rather extended colloquy on voting additional funds for the construction of additional facilities at Beltsville.

I think it is generally agreed by the Congress that these new facilities should be located in the Middle West. The Department of Agriculture has taken the

same view in its release today. The Department of Agriculture in its release today mentions several items that would be given consideration in the selection of the new location for the animal-disease laboratory. Principally among them was the statement that the facilities should be located at least close or adjacent to one of the land-grant colleges or universities having a strong school of veterinary medicine or a strong animal-research program.

Mr. President, the Kansas State College, at Manhattan, is a land-grant college; it was established in 1863, and it has a veterinary school that is listed as No. 1 in the Nation. This college is already conducting a great animal-research program. It is staffed with competent persons, and has proof of the character of the education at its veterinary school. I submit only the fact that students from all over the Nation make every effort to enter this veterinary school, which at all times has a waiting list.

Every other requirement mentioned by the Department of Agriculture can be met at the Kansas State College, at Manhattan, and the community surrounding it.

Manhattan is in the geographical center of the United States; it is on a major railroad, and has major airline connections. The location of this research laboratory at the Kansas State College would place it in the center of the great livestock-producing areas of the Midwest. On the south we have the great Flint Hills pasture section, which is nationally known; and on the north and west we have the great grazing and range country of the Sand Hills of Nebraska; on the east we have the great cattle- and hog-producing areas of Nebraska, Missouri, and Iowa.

Mr. President, I and others will be giving the site selection committee this and any other additional information they need.

I had intended to ask unanimous consent to have the release issued today by the Secretary of Agriculture printed in the RECORD, but I am informed that it has already been so printed on request of the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] in connection with a bill which he introduced today.

SENATOR WILEY OF WISCONSIN

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, while we all realize it is difficult for any of us here to participate in intrastate politics in any State other than our own, I feel I want to make a few remarks with regard to the situation in Wisconsin.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I have enjoyed, and value highly, my association with our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; and with him, I have worked closely in supporting the foreign policies of the Eisenhower administration. We have been together on the Committee under the chairmanships of Senator Connolly, Senator Vandenberg, Senator George, and Senator Wiley himself. I feel that those of us who have the international viewpoint appreciate the courage and loyalty of our colleague, in representing a State such as his, which has a less international point of view, for standing by his convictions and making the fight for the principles in which he believes, irrespective of the effect on his own political future.

FORMER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR DOUGLAS McKAY

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I happened to be present in the Chamber a few moments ago when the nomination of Mr. Frederick A. Seaton to be Secretary of the Interior was considered and confirmed.

I join with other Senators in their fine statements regarding Mr. Seaton. However, in the course of the discussion, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] made some reference to a former Secretary of the Interior. I believe that Bernard Baruch once said that every man has a right to his own opinion, but no man has a right to misstate the facts.

The fact of the matter is that it was my privilege in the other body to serve on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, where it was my good fortune to come in contact with Mr. McKay and his work. I do not know of any more conscientious man who has ever served in the Cabinet. I do not know of any member of the Cabinet who has ever possessed finer qualities than he possesses.

All the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the House regarded him with high esteem. The President has been fortunate in the selection of members of his Cabinet. They are men of unimpeachable integrity and high character.

I am sure that all of us will agree that Mr. McKay was one of the best.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE DOMESTIC PARITY PLAN FOR WHEAT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, my attention has just been called to an interesting survey made by the Uhlmann Grain Co., of Chicago, in regard to the domestic parity plan for wheat, sometimes known as the two-price system.

The Uhlmann Grain Co. is one of the old, established firms in the grain trade, with offices and connections in the principal cities of the Nation, and has extensive contacts in every area of our Nation.

This company mailed a postal card to approximately 4,000 farmers, country elevator operators, terminal elevator operators, and other miscellaneous individuals and firms, such as processors, merchandisers, brokers, and so forth, expressly asking the question whether they were or were not in favor of the domestic parity plans for wheat.

On the basis of the reply cards which were returned to the company, 88.6 percent of the farmers from whom it received replies indicated their approval of the domestic parity plan; 80.3 percent of the country elevator operators, 91 percent of the terminal elevator operators, and 86.7 percent of all others indicated their approval of the plan. Overall, 86.3 percent of those who returned cards stated they were in favor of the domestic parity plan for wheat.

The survey covered the main wheat-growing areas of the United States, including the Southwest, the Far Northwest and Northwest, the Central States, and some Eastern States. Personally, I was most pleased to get the information contained in this survey, as it confirms previous surveys and studies that I have made on my own account.

During the debate on the farm bill, I stated that I did not believe that either the flexible or rigid price support would solve the wheat problem. It is my contention that wheat is one crop that must be solved on a commodity basis.

The present acreage restrictions, the present costly system of export subsidies, and the continuous building up of our wheat surpluses will completely destroy the wheatgrowers of this Nation. Under the domestic parity plan, the wheat producer would secure full parity for the part of his crop consumed at home. The natural forces of supply and demand would be the basic factors in determining production, and the huge supplies of surpluses that have been such a depressing price factor would not continue to be harvested. Acreage allotments and other Government controls would be discarded, and the American farmer would again be the master of his own production plans and desires.

It is a program that must again have consideration in the next session of Congress.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF SENATOR GORE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the new Federal highway construction bill which the Senate passed last week is a monument to the hard and dedicated efforts of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] as much as any other person. I am sure that other Senators were as impressed as I was with the tremendous knowledge and the unfailing comprehension of every aspect of the highway bill which the Senator from Tennessee displayed in guiding this bill, hour after hour, through its long debate on the Senate floor.

At the same time, while devoting untold hours to this vast project, the Senator from Tennessee has found time to display valuable leadership in such other important fields as the great necessity for Federal initiative in the development of peaceful use of atomic energy and the reform of our methods of election financing.

These accomplishments of the junior Senator from Tennessee were the subject of a column by the noted reporter of our national scene, Miss Doris Fleeson, in the Washington Star of June 4, 1956, and I ask unanimous consent to have this column reprinted in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

GORE MAY BE ON NATIONAL TICKET—LIBERAL RECORD IN HOUSE AND SENATE COULD EARN HIM VICE PRESIDENTIAL BID

(By Doris Fleeson)

When Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, assured a Massachusetts rally that the State's junior Senator, JOHN F. KENNEDY, would ornament the Presidential ticket in either spot at any time, GORE was only repaying a compliment.

Senator KENNEDY'S own answer to questions about his vice presidential ambitions has long been a suggestion that the post would go to GORE and a good thing too.

The press galleries would agree that from the standpoint of character, ability, and industry, the junior Senator from Tennessee stands very near the top of the heap. He is also very well placed geographically, being from a border State between North and South which is the political bridge Democrats like to build in a national ticket.

The care and diligence with which GORE has constructed a national liberal record in 6 terms in the House and his present first term in the Senate speak for his ambitions. But outside the circle of his associates, his political possibilities have been overshadowed by the unflagging Presidential aspirations of his colleague, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER.

KEFAUVER is 53, GORE 49. In many respects their careers have run parallel; KEFAUVER also served a long apprenticeship in the House. Both represent the new South and are internationalist. Both have an unusual degree of personal independence.

GORE'S superior standing with his colleagues rests in large part on his capacity and willingness to work at the hard, dull tasks as well as the things that make headlines. Yet GORE is no pet of the reigning Southern conservative leaders as was proved by their refusal to back his plans for the Senate Lobby Committee of which he was originally chairman. When they refused, GORE, also acting in character, quit.

GORE'S most recent achievement is the new highway bill, the biggest the Federal Government has ever undertaken. He began with the financial aspects, a probable reflection of his long and close association with Bernard M. Baruch, the economic elder statesman. GORE substituted a tax plan for the President's proposal to raise the money by floating bonds. After that he worked out the compromises.

A public power advocate, being from the Tennessee Valley, GORE has also been pushing for federally built atomic powerplants. The General Intelligence Agency has backed his contention that this country is lagging in that field behind the Soviets.

GORE and KEFAUVER have both behaved with great circumspection toward each other. GORE will no doubt stand aloof at Chicago until the senior Senator's fate is settled.

The KEFAUVER-style campaign against Adlai Stevenson has made one thing certain. Stevenson would not take the Senator in second place on a Stevenson slate. There or with Gov. Averell Harriman might be GORE'S opportunity.

AWARD OF HONORARY DOCTOR OF LAWS DEGREE TO SENATOR KENNEDY BY ROCKHURST COLLEGE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, we in Missouri are proud of our fine universities and colleges. Among our outstanding institutions of higher learning is Rockhurst College, at Kansas City.

Last Saturday, June 2, Rockhurst College honored our colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] by presenting to him the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Before Senator KENNEDY visited Kansas City, to be honored by this outstanding liberal arts college, the Kansas City Star on May 27 carried a fine article entitled "Likeable Senator KENNEDY To Speak Here Saturday," written by John Cauley, a member of the Star's Washington Bureau. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LIKABLE SENATOR KENNEDY TO SPEAK HERE SATURDAY

(By John R. Cauley)

WASHINGTON, May 26.—When JOHN FITZGERALD (JACK) KENNEDY, the junior United States Senator from Massachusetts, arrives in Kansas City for a speech next Saturday, midwesterners will have an opportunity to see one of the most attractive personalities in public life today.

KENNEDY is a man with political savvy and intellectual achievements. He is 38 years old, 6 feet tall, lean and erect as a West Point cadet. He has a boyish countenance which could enable him to pass for a man 10 years his junior. His heavy crop of brown and informally combed hair adds to the impression of boyish exuberance.

Indeed, when Jack first came to the Senate in 1953 and attempted to board the subway car which runs between the Senate Office Building and the Capitol, a guard sternly instructed him, "Stand back, son, and let the Senators get on first."

Tourists in the Senate galleries often are astonished when they are told that KENNEDY is a Senator. That lad, they remark, looks as if he just got out of college.

SPEECH ON WDAF-TV

Kansas Citians will have an opportunity for a first-hand appraisal of young KENNEDY when he delivers the principal address at the fourth annual Rockhurst Day dinner at the Hotel Muehlebach June 2. His speech will be televised over WDAF-TV.

Despite his youthful demeanor and appearance, Senator KENNEDY, a Democrat, is a rising political star. He is regarded by veteran observers here as one of the most able men in the Senate. In addition he is the author of a best seller, Profiles in Courage, a thoughtful and persuasive book about some Senators of the past who in moments of crisis staked their principles against the tides of bigotry, sectionalism, and conformity.

JACK KENNEDY is one of a family of nine children born to Mr. and Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy. The elder Kennedy, a spectacularly successful businessman, who among other projects, now operates the Chicago Merchandise Mart, was formerly Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission in the early New Deal days, and from 1937 to 1941 was American Ambassador to the Court of St. James in London. His mother is the daughter of the former mayor of Boston, John F. (Honey-Fitz) Fitzgerald.

The second child in the family, Jack attended public schools in Brookline, Mass., a suburb of Boston. He was graduated with honors from Harvard, and also took courses at the London School of Economics and at Stanford University.

When he attempted to enlist in the Army in 1941, he was rejected because of football injuries suffered at Harvard. After a series of strengthening exercises he was accepted by the Navy and wound up in the South Pacific as a PT boat commander.

HEROISM IN PACIFIC

One dark night KENNEDY'S boat was rammed and cut in two by a Japanese destroyer in a dramatic engagement off the Solomon Islands. When the boat sank, KENNEDY towed one of his wounded crewmen to a small island 3 miles away by holding a strap of the man's Mae West with his teeth.

Then, according to the Navy citation: "During the following 6 days he (KENNEDY) succeeded in getting his crew ashore and after swimming many hours attempting to secure food and water, finally effected the rescue of his men."

For this courageous action KENNEDY was awarded the Navy and Marine Corps Medal in addition to the Purple Heart. Jack himself suffered severe injuries to his spine in this engagement and during his ensuing career spent many months in the hospital and in recuperation at home. He is now fully recovered.

Originally it seemed that JACK KENNEDY was not destined for a political career. He was more the quiet, scholarly type, liked to write and some day had a hankering to be a newspaperman. However, when his brother, Joseph Kennedy, Jr., a Navy pilot, was killed in action in Europe, Jack stepped in to carry on the political tradition of the family for which Joe, Jr., had been groomed. Besides, what he had seen in the war and his travels around Europe had given him a new incentive to contribute his energies and talents to public life.

And Jack could afford to be independent. The elder Kennedy had set up million-dollar trust funds for each of his children so that they would not have to be governed by the need of money in seeking a career.

A REPRESENTATIVE IN 1946

In 1946, in his first campaign for public office, KENNEDY was elected a Member of the House from the 11th Massachusetts District by a vote of 69,093 to 26,000 for his opponent. He was reelected in 1948 and 1950.

The Kennedys, who have a fierce competitive spirit besides a shrewd political instinct, had bigger things in mind for Jack. In 1952, with the aid of almost his entire family, Jack took on another distinguished name in Massachusetts, Henry Cabot Lodge, for the United States Senate. Undaunted by the immense backing and political prestige of Lodge, the Kennedy family put on a campaign which is still the wonder of Massachusetts. Mrs. Kennedy and three of her lovely daughters gave tea parties in many communities of the State to which the women voters were invited to meet Jack and the family.

A younger brother, Robert F. Kennedy, a political comer in his own right and now chief counsel for the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee, spearheaded an organization which reached into every city and hamlet of the State.

On the occasions when the other Kennedys were mingling with voters in other parts of the State, Bob would take the platform at a meeting by himself and put the issue to the audience in this succinct manner:

"My brother Jack couldn't be here. My mother couldn't be here, my sister Eunice couldn't be here, my sister Pat couldn't be here, my sister Jean couldn't be here, but if my brother Jack were here he'd tell you that Lodge has a very bad voting record. Thank you."

When the returns were in, KENNEDY had unseated Lodge by 69,000 votes, a remarkable feat because Eisenhower carried the State by 208,000 against Adlai Stevenson, and another Republican, Christian Herter, defeated the incumbent, Paul A. Dever, a Democrat, for the governorship.

In recent days there has been considerable speculation in Washington and in the East about the possibility of KENNEDY'S being

drafted as a running mate for Adlai Stevenson, should the former Illinois governor win the Democratic presidential nomination. KENNEDY is a strong supporter of Stevenson.

Jack would seem to have many qualifications for the job. He is a liberal, but no radical. He is young and handsome, articulate, intelligent, makes a good appearance on television. He's an extremely effective campaigner.

In this connection it is interesting to note that a document is being quietly circulated among Democratic leaders pointing out that a survey shows that 7 percent of President Eisenhower's vote in 1952 was made up of Catholics who had voted Democratic in preceding national elections. This analysis contends that if this vote had remained Democratic, Stevenson would have won.

The purpose of this document is obvious: KENNEDY is a Catholic and as a vice-presidential nominee might be able to bring back that part of the Catholic vote which switched to Eisenhower in 1952, especially the heavy Catholic support in the Northern States where KENNEDY would run strongest.

The analysis furthermore points out that KENNEDY attracts young voters and appeals especially to the women.

"I'M STILL YOUNG"

As he leans back in his office chair, stretches out his long legs and tilts his glasses back into his bumper crop of hair, Jack philosophizes about his political future.

"I'm still young and I like it here in the Senate," he says. "I would take it (the Vice Presidency) if I were asked, but I don't think I will be asked."

Without putting it into so many words, KENNEDY gives the impression that perhaps the times are not yet propitious for a Catholic on the Democratic ticket, and that if he accepted the post and Stevenson, for example, was defeated, the onus might be on him.

KENNEDY'S strongest attribute as a Senator is that it is difficult to pin a label on him. He tackles every issue with an open mind and there is no one who can say that he has JACK KENNEDY'S vote in his pocket. KENNEDY is reluctant even to suggest in what category he might be placed in the Senate because he votes his conscience and best interests of the country and his State, but he explains, "I suppose you might class me with such men as ALBERT GORE, LISTER HILL, and MIKE MANSFIELD," all of whom are liberals with wide flexibility and on the moderate side.

Jack is a prodigious worker. He keeps his office doors open to all comers, travels extensively and answers his correspondence faithfully—all hallmarks of a good Senator.

For several years he was considered the most eligible bachelor in Washington, but this state of affairs was ended in September 1953, when he married Jacqueline Lee Bouvier, a pretty, dark-haired Vassar alumna and a former member of the staff of the old Washington Times-Herald.

He is a voracious reader, specializing in history and biography. He drinks sparingly and he and his wife entertain occasionally in their colonial-style home in nearby Langley, Va., the former residence of Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Senator KENNEDY in turn honored Kansas City and Missouri by his presence and acceptance of this degree. At the annual Rockhurst Day banquet on Saturday night, in a statesmanlike address, Senator KENNEDY urged that this Nation speak out boldly for the freedom of all people.

Since that address, I have received from Kansas City and other places in Missouri many telephone calls and letters commenting on the fine impression made by our distinguished colleague.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his stimulating address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY, FOURTH ANNUAL ROCKHURST DAY BANQUET OF ROCKHURST COLLEGE, KANSAS CITY, MO., SATURDAY, JUNE 2, 1956

In recent years, key farm States such as Missouri have been visited by an increasing number of politicians from all over the country. But I must confess that this is my first trip to this State—and I am thus deeply gratified for the honor that Rockhurst College has bestowed upon me in presenting me with an honorary degree.

Much is different between Missouri and Massachusetts. We live on a beachhead on the cold Atlantic; you live deep in the heartland of America. We harvest the rolling sea, you harvest the rolling prairie. You send us hogs and corn; we send you carnations and cranberries.

Yes, much is different, but much is the same—the same sense of self-reliance, the common determination to see our country progress, the mutual recognition of the responsibilities as well as the privileges of self-government. Indeed, many citizens of your State and mine are descended from the same hardy forebears who forged the Union in which both States now unite.

I have not been unfamiliar with the history of Missouri and her statesmen—and I think one episode is of considerable relevance to those of us commemorating this fourth annual Rockhurst Day. It was little more than 88 years ago today that Senator John Brooks Henderson, of Missouri, faced a decision more difficult than any he had ever known and more far reaching in its consequences than any he would ever have to make. That issue was the impeachment of President Andrew Johnson by the radical Republican movement dedicated to his destruction and to the exploitation of the defeated Southern States. Senator Henderson, then but 41 years old and the second youngest Member of the Senate, had already achieved national prominence. He was one of the most influential leaders in keeping the State of Missouri in the Union and the sponsor of the 13th amendment to the Constitution abolishing slavery. He was in 1868 no stanch follower of Andrew Johnson—on the contrary, he was a supporter of the Tenure-of-Office Act which had led to the impeachment charges and a severe critic of Johnson's conduct of office. He was, on the other hand, noted for his political independence—he had, for example, defied his party by becoming the only regular Republican to vote against the bill restricting the President's authority as Commander in Chief of the Army.

Thus the radical Republicans knew that John Henderson's vote was not as certain as they might hope, and every effort was exerted to obtain from him an advance committal to vote guilty. Only Edmund G. Ross, of Kansas, endured more pressure and abuse than John Henderson. Missouri newspapers assailed him, party leaders bullied him, spies hounded him during his every waking hour. Finally the full delegation of Republican Congressmen from Missouri, accompanied by a prominent State legislator, called upon the Senator and demanded that he vote for the President's conviction. To do otherwise, they warned, would be to rebel against the nearly unanimous wishes of his party and State, and insure his own defeat for reelection the following year. Beset by doubts as to his proper responsibility under a representative form of government, and feeling trapped in his own office by his friends and associates, Henderson wavered. He meekly offered to wire his resignation to the governor, enabling a new appointee to vote for conviction; and, when it was doubted whether a new Senator would be permitted to vote, he agreed to ascertain whether his own vote would be crucial.

But an insolent and threatening telegram from Missouri restored his sense of honor, and he swiftly wired his reply: "Say to my friends that I am sworn to do impartial justice according to law and conscience, and I will try to do it like an honest man."

John Henderson voted for the President's acquittal, the last important act of his senatorial career. Denounced, threatened, and burned in effigy in Missouri, he did not even bother to seek reelection to the Senate. Years later his party would realize its debt to him, and return him to lesser offices, but for the Senate, whose integrity he had upheld, he was through.

It seems to me that, as the people of Missouri and indeed the Nation look back upon the courageous but tragic career of Senator Henderson, they will better appreciate the special contribution to our society made by Rockhurst and similar institutions. For in 1956, as in 1868, the individual citizen has an urgent but difficult responsibility to determine the facts and the policy decisions to be based upon those facts. And yet he knows that his political leaders, and most of his newspapers, are stating the facts from their own point of view—not dishonestly, not carelessly, and frequently not even knowingly—but simply because their role is the role of the advocate, not the judge. Even Government finds it difficult to present the truth in an age when truth has become a weapon in the struggle for power—truth that is bent, twisted, and subverted to fit the pattern of national policy. Frequently we in the West feel ourselves forced by this drumbeat of lies and propaganda to be discriminating in our selection of what facets of the truth we ourselves will disclose.

Thus the responsibility of a free university to pursue its own objective studies, to carry on the continuing search for the truth—both for its own sake and because only if we possess it can we really be free—is even more important today than ever before. Rockhurst College has succeeded in carrying out this mission, so that today it stands as a bulwark on the North American Continent in the battle for the preservation of Christian civilization.

I would like to discuss with you today in more detail an example of one of those issues where the truth and the right frequently are very difficult to determine—and where the use of catchwords and equivocal terms has made more possible the misunderstanding of this issue by American citizens. The issue to which I refer is the growing and recurrent problems of colonialism, nationalism, and the attitude of the United States and her allies.

Since World War II rudely shook our attitude of isolation, we have, for the sake of our own security, found our destiny to be closely linked with that of the British and the French, the Dutch and the Belgians—nations which still hold under their subjugation large areas of the world upon which they feel their ultimate security depends.

And thus we have been caught up in a dilemma which up to now has been insoluble. We want our allies to be strong; and yet quite obviously a part of their strength comes from their overseas possessions. We want the uncommitted peoples of the Middle East, Asia, and Africa to remain free from the ever-reaching tentacles of Soviet influence and responsive to the leadership of the United States and our allies—and yet those uncommitted peoples look upon those allies with at least as much suspicion in most cases, and more in some, as they do the Soviet Union. We fight to keep the world free from Communist imperialism—but in doing so we hamper our efforts, and bring suspicion upon our motives, by being closely linked with Western imperialism. We want—indeed we

desperately need, if the deterrent power of our Strategic Air Command is to have any meaning—to maintain Western bases in Cyprus, in North Africa, and in all the other areas around the borders of the Soviet Union—and yet we stand to lose those bases if the Communists are able to captivate the nationalistic movements that seek to drive out all vestiges of Western domination. We have permitted the reputation of the United States as a friend of oppressed people, in short, to be hitched to the chariot of the conqueror; because we have believed we could have it both ways.

As a result, our policies and statements on these matters have too frequently been characterized by indecision, confusion, haste, timidity and an excessive fear of giving offense. In the United Nations we have abstained on some key issues, vacillated on others, and prevented others from being even placed on the agenda. Our Secretary of State has spoken of Goa, and our Ambassador to France has spoken of Algeria, in terms which have led our motives and our sympathies to be questioned by those who seek the end of colonial rule. This is not a new pattern—our course in Indochina under the Democratic as well as the Republican administrations antagonized the Vietnamese people, refueled the propaganda machines of the Vietminh Communists and in the long run proved to be a disservice to the free world as a whole and even to France itself.

This policy—if it can be called a policy—of trying to look both ways at once, of trying to bury our heads in the sand when a colonial issue arises, of trying to please everybody and displease nobody—this is the policy which our Department of State likes to call "neutrality" on colonial issues. And when asked about it at a recent news conference, Secretary Dulles had this to say: "We expect to continue to take a position of neutrality because that is our general policy with relation to these highly controversial matters which involve countries both of whom are friends and where we ourselves are not directly involved."

I must respectfully disagree with the able Secretary, though I stress again the fact that this is no partisan matter. We are directly involved, deeply involved in these issues. They may not involve our possessions—they may not involve our treaties—they may not always even involve our military bases. But we are directly involved—our standing in the eyes of the free world, our leadership in the fight to keep that world free, our geographical and population advantages over the Communist orbit, our prestige, our security, our life, and our way of life—these are all directly involved. How then can we be wedded to this do-nothing policy called "neutrality." How can we be afraid to touch these "highly controversial" disputes between two friends, when their continuation—and our reluctance—only serve to strengthen the hand of the mutual enemy of us all?

I do not wish to oversimplify an endlessly complex problem. Nor do I wish to deny the success we have had in helping free countries remain free, and the value of the steps we have taken in the right direction on this subject. But the time has come for the United States to take a more forceful stand.

I urge, therefore, that this Nation, acting within appropriate limits of judgment and discretion, inform our Allies and the world at large that—after a reasonable period of transition for self-determination—this Nation will speak out boldly for freedom for all people—whether they are denied that freedom by an iron curtain of tyranny, or by a paper curtain of colonial ties and constitutional manipulations. We shall no longer abstain in the United Nations from voting on colonial issues—we shall no longer trade our vote on such issues for other supposed gains—we shall no longer seek to prevent the subjugated peoples of the world from being heard. And we shall recognize that the day of the colonial is through.

Of course such a stand will displease our allies—but it will displease the Soviets even more. For whether our allies like it or not, and whether they act to impede it or not, sooner or later, one by one, the traditional colonies of the western powers are breaking free. The primary question is whether they will then turn for association and support to the West—which has thus far too often hampered and discouraged their efforts for self-determination—or turn to the Communist East—which has (however hypocritically, in view of its own colonial exploitation) inflamed their nationalistic spirits and assumed the role of freedom's defender. I emphasize again that I do not fail to appreciate the difficulties of our hard pressed Allies—but I feel that their present colonial policies only serve to make easier the way of the Communist transgressor.

The path I suggest for this Nation will not be easy. We will find our policies hailed by extremists, terrorists and saboteurs for whom we could have no sympathy—and condemned by our oldest and most trusted friends who will feel we have deserted them. We will encounter the most difficult problems of government and justice known to man—the fate of the large and justifiably alarmed European minorities in North Africa—the lack of preparation for self-government on the part of many peoples eager to govern themselves now—the likelihood of this Nation being forced to take the place of the present colonial powers in providing the economic assistance which these new nations will need for many years—and the danger to western naval and air bases located in these key areas.

But we have faced difficult problems before—and we have faced them successfully whenever we were resolutely determined to take the hard, bold steps necessary for their solution.

If we are to secure the friendship of the Arab, the African and the Asian, we cannot hope to accomplish it solely by means of military pacts and assistance. Neither can we purchase it through extensive programs of economic grants and subsidies. We cannot win their hearts by making them dependent upon our handouts. We cannot keep them free by selling them free enterprise. Describing the perils of communism or the prosperity of the United States will be to no avail. No; the strength of our appeal to these key populations—and it is rightfully our appeal, and not that of the Communists—lies in our traditional and deeply felt philosophy of freedom and independence for all peoples everywhere. Whatever restraints may have been imposed upon this philosophy in our foreign policy pronouncements during the past decade, there can be no doubt that it still represents the basic attitude of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Today this issue confronts us in Algeria, Cyprus, West New Guinea, and elsewhere. Tomorrow it may be in Portuguese Goa or Singapore—and the next day it may be in Tagoland or Tanganyika.

There are some who recognize these issues but dismiss them as unimportant. What has all this to do, they say, with the threat of war in the Middle East or the deterioration of our position in the Far East? The answer is, I believe, that these issues are fundamental to practically every crisis now occurring or which will occur in the next generation. For whatever the dispute may be that creates the headlines—we can never escape the fact that we are dependent upon the decisions of people who have hated, as their ancestors before them for centuries hated, the white men who bled them, beat them, exploited them, and ruled them. Perhaps it is already too late for the United States to repudiate these centuries of ill will, and to firmly but boldly press for a new generation of friendship among equal and independent states. But we dare not fail to make the effort.

NEED FOR MANDATORY POULTRY INSPECTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, 2 persons died and 62 became extremely ill in a severe psittacosis or parrot fever epidemic in Oregon during February and March. This terrible outbreak, as I reported to the Senate on March 29, was caused by diseased poultry on farms in rendering plants and in processing plants in the Portland area.

Most Americans do not realize that poultry which is served on their family tables is not at the present time subject to careful inspection. This is creating a serious health problem. We find that this practice does not meet with the favor of poultry raisers. Poultry raisers, who are very desirous of protecting their industry, wish to have much more careful supervision, from the health standpoint, of the slaughterhouses which prepare poultry for the family table.

I believe there is involved such a serious threat to the health of the Nation that we in Congress should take the necessary steps to bring to the poultry raisers the assistance for which the economic welfare of the threatened industry is crying out.

Reports from the Salem region indicate that Oregon may suffer still more from this dread poultry-caused illness. For 16 more men and women who processed poultry in the Salem area are now ill with what is suspected to be psittacosis. Health authorities are currently checking further.

Mr. President, these epidemics are not something about which we can shake our heads, say how terrible it all is, and then forget. These outbreaks can happen anytime and anywhere, spreading death and destruction. The International News Service carried a story on April 2 in which scientists of the Department of Agriculture make this point clear. INS said:

> Agriculture Department scientists have warned that the Nation's turkey industry is now threatened by an epidemic that has already led to two human deaths and sickness to 62 poultry workers * * * according to one official, "there is no doubt as to the potential danger to other turkey-producing States." He emphasized that the deadly virus could now erupt in any State anywhere at any time.

A further reason why the Congress cannot forget about this epidemic, and similar ones in other States, is that much of the human suffering can be prevented. The use of the mandatory poultry inspection, as outlined in the bill introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], S. 3176, of which I am a cosponsor, would minimize, if not completely end the human dangers coming from psittacosis-infected poultry.

I believe, Mr. President, we in the Congress must act and act fast on this measure. We must enact it in this session. The experience of Oregon has duplicated the previous experience of Texas, Nebraska, New Jersey, Virginia, and Iowa.

Epidemics in other States may in the future duplicate the experience of Oregon.

An excellent on-the-spot report of the Oregon epidemic has been published in the Butcher Workman, the official publication of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL–CIO. Many of the persons who were made ill in the Oregon psittacosis outbreak are members of that union who work in poultry processing plants.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Butcher Workman entitled "Death Lurked in the Turkey Feathers," be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

DEATH LURKED IN THE TURKEY FEATHERS

A mysterious outbreak of psittacosis among Oregon poultry flocks during March has dramatically demonstrated why Congress should pass the Amalgamated-backed Murray-Priest-Hayworth bill which provides for Federal poultry inspection.

Before the antibiotic, aureomycin, stopped the pneumonialike disease, the sudden psittacosis epidemic had created havoc among Oregon's turkey handlers, many of them Amalgamated members, and was threatening to cripple the State's multi-million dollar "gobbler" industry.

In its wake the disease left this casualty list: some 61 human illnesses, including many Amalgamated members, 2 human deaths in which psittacosis was a "factor"; loss of more than 2,500 turkeys, an embargo on Oregon turkeys, and a virtual consumer boycott of the gobblers.

Yet, as this report will point out, the entire epidemic could have been prevented by proper inspection.

Instead, what happened was the worst psittacosis outbreak since the infamous Texas epidemic of 1954. And it happened in a State where poultry standards are high and in a situation in which the turkey industry itself was not to blame.

The "villain" was ignorance, which resulted in failure to recognize the baffling virus before it was too late. It would have been discovered had a proper inspection program been in effect.

This doesn't help the many turkey handlers who were stricken with the vicious virus—and the two men who died after handling the diseased birds. It doesn't help Mrs. Josie Phillips, a member of Local 231, Egg, Candle and Poultry Workers, who is fighting for her life today in a Portland hospital after being stricken with psittacosis in the turkey-picking room at Portland's Fresh Foods Co. Mrs. Phillips' blood count still is low, and she has been responding to treatment with painful slowness.

But this case does offer graphic and conclusive proof that the Nation's health will be further endangered if Congress does not enact the legislation advocated by Senator JAMES MURRAY, of Montana, Representatives J. PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, and DON HAYWORTH, of Michigan. Their bill would establish a Poultry Inspection Service under the United States Food and Drug Administration. It would inspect poultry before and after slaughter and guard against outbreaks such as the Oregon epidemic.

"This case clearly demonstrates the desperate need for this legislation," declared Oregon's two United States Senators, WAYNE L. MORSE, and RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, after conferring with Amalgamated leaders and other officials on the psittacosis situation. "While no one actually was at fault, it is evident that proper inspection would have prevented the outbreak."

Senator MORSE, a cosponsor of the Murray Senate bill along with seven other Senators, plans to use the Oregon case to show other solons the need for proper Federal poultry inspection.

To get a clear picture of exactly what happened, the Butcher Workman carefully investigated the Oregon case and uncovered these facts:

The two infected turkey flocks which precipitated the outbreak had been losing birds for more than 3 months before the disease was recognized and reported to State authorities.

Had the disease been recognized and the aureomycin treatment given 3 months earlier, the following could have been avoided:

1. Suspected human cases of psittacosis placed at 61 by the Oregon State Board of Health with 2 deaths in which psittacosis is listed as a "factor."

2. Loss of over 2,500 birds, plus heavy loss of income from hatching eggs to both of the sick flocks.

3. An embargo by the State of Washington against all Oregon turkeys, poults and hatching eggs.

4. A sharp slump in sales of dressed turkeys as a result of public reaction, virtually knocking out a "turkey for Easter" campaign planned by the turkey industry. One grocery chain placed 2,000 gobblers on sale and sold only 6 birds.

The first contact with the diseased birds was made on November 8, 1955, at the State animal disease control diagnostic laboratory at Oregon State College. A group of birds from the Lyons Triple B turkey ranch at Sauvies Island in the lower Columbia River were being given a routine blood test for pullorum disease; it turned up a suspicious reaction on three turkeys.

But an autopsy examination showed no symptoms of any disease. The birds were found normal except for parasitic worms and the flock pronounced pullorum clean.

A week later, on November 15, Loren Johnson, a turkey grower from Scapoose in northwestern Oregon, brought six dead birds to the same laboratory and reported 20 were sick. Examination showed severe hemorrhagic, enteric and air sac conditions. A tentative diagnosis of fowl cholera was made, and sulfa drugs were prescribed.

During January, the Oregon State laboratory ran bacterial cultures for cholera on several batches of turkey legs from birds that had died in the Johnson flock. On January 31 a dead bird from the Lyons flock on Sauvies Island showed peritonitis and enteritis and sulfa was prescribed.

But in these cases, bacterial checks for cholera turned out to be negative—and the turkey losses continued.

By February the losses had increased to a rate of 30 to 40 birds daily, and truckloads of them were being hauled to a Portland rendering plant to be boiled down for tallow, feed, and fertilizer. Laboratory veterinarians at the Oregon State Laboratory continued to double check for cholera with negative results.

At this stage the situation started to erupt. On February 24 Dr. Samuel Osgood, epidemiologist for the Oregon Board of Health, received a call from a physician at the Portland Veterans' Administration hospital to report "a patient under treatment for pneumonia of an unusual character." The doctor suspected psittacosis, since the patient had been handling sick turkeys on Sauvies Island.

Dr. Osgood called Dr. Kermit Peterson, Oregon state veterinarian, who then called the State laboratory which had been investigating the mysterious malady. Tissue from the dead birds was put into mice. The diagnosis was psittacosis. This later was confirmed by United States Public Health Service laboratories in San Francisco and Montgomery, Ala.

Oregon health officers immediately swung into action, checking turkey handlers for signs of psittacosis infection. They found a remarkably high rate of human illness, particularly in the rendering plants. At 1 plant out of 32 employees, 24 became ill, a dozen were hospitalized. At other plants there were 29 cases. Two died, and Dr. Osgood credits psittacosis as a factor in their deaths. Confirmation of other suspected cases is awaiting the outcome of blood tests being made by the United States Communicable Diseases Center.

Amalgamated members, of local 231, Egg, Candle, and Poultry Workers, who were stricken by the disease included Ida Jackson, Gladys Bradley, Ida Miller, Josie Phillips, Johnnie Mae Hastings, Mary Murphy, Heber Holtorf, Ruth Beck, Mina Farris, Ruth Curtis, Fred Di Filippo, and Syble Enquist.

The diagnosis of psittacosis and the epidemic were announced to the press on March 9, and the Oregon Department of Agriculture promptly quarantined the diseased flock. Both flocks were placed on a heavy diet of aureomycin—which can cure both men and birds of psittacosis. (Before aureomycin, 20 percent of human cases ended in death.)

Within a week the psittacosis outbreak was cured by putting almost a pound of aureomycin in every ton of turkey feed. Most of the human victims (with a few exceptions, such as the Amalgamated's Josie Phillips) were cured with aureomycin treatments.

But, in the wake of the mysterious malady, one big question remained: Why weren't the Oregon State College veterinarians able to spot the disease which they first came in contact with on November 8, 1955?

The answer to that question is one main reason why Federal poultry-inspection legislation is needed now. The fact is poultry diseases are difficult to diagnose, as this case clearly proves. Although Oregon State College boasts one of the West's finest veterinary laboratories, it was unable to discover the disease in 3 months of diagnosis of the dead birds.

What does this reveal? For one thing, it clearly demonstrates that poultry diseases are so obscure that highly trained specialists—such as would be provided by the proposed United States Poultry Inspection Service—are needed to diagnose them. You wouldn't ask a general-practice doctor to diagnose a rare human disease. Yet this is what the Oregon State technicians were attempting to do with the diseased turkeys.

The Oregon veterinarians offer these theories as to why the disease was not discovered earlier:

1. It was camouflaged by other diseases. Erysipelas was present in one flock, and there also was a question of cholera.

2. Many facets of psittacosis still are unknown. This was the first known case in turkeys in Oregon (California, incidentally, had a similar outbreak at the same time).

3. The psittacosis virus may be fairly common in turkeys and other fowl, but in a mild form. It became virulent as it was able to attack birds weakened by other diseases or by exposure to severe winter weather. This virulence increased—became "hotter"—as it spread through the flock until finally healthy birds were succumbing. Tests are under way in California to find out if the mild virus from other birds can be "made hot" by passing it through turkeys.

Just how the disease happened to hit the Sauvies Island and Scapoose flock still is a mystery. Dr. Sam Osgood, Oregon State epidemiologist, believes that psittacosis may have been present in the area as long as 1946 and existed in latent form.

But the most prevalent theory is that the psittacosis microbe was transmitted to the turkeys by wild birds—principally ducks and seagulls—which swarm along the lower Co-

lumbia. These birds frequently mooch food from the turkey runs.

Recently United States Public Health Service specialists ran tests of wild game at Sauvies Island. They took out the internal organs of 20 wild ducks and from another 30 birds—ducks and seagulls—they took blood samples. These tests were repeated on seagulls in Portland garbage dumps.

"The problem," said Dr. Donald Mason, United States psittacosis specialist, "is to determine how this virus is being introduced into a flock of domestic birds." He suspects water birds because the 1954 Texas outbreak, which he investigated, indicated the infection came from gulls and willets in that area.

But, on the basis of his Texas experience, Mason admits that it may be hard to actually pinpoint the culprit. "We may never know," he told the Butcher Workman, "whether ducks or gulls gave it to turkeys, or vice versa."

Mason and other United States specialists point out that psittacosis is more than just a passing problem. Turkey psittacosis has been recorded in 6 States and outbreaks have occurred among other poultry species.

Human cases—in which the microbe is passed from bird to man—also appear to be on the increase. So far this year the State of Washington has recorded seven psittacosis cases—more than in several previous years.

The one encouraging development in the Oregon case was the prompt way that United States and State health and agricultural officials, the Amalgamated, and the industry moved to set up safeguards against future ravages from psittacosis.

Prevention of a repetition of the situation, with its hazards to human health, now seems assured, thanks to the effective leadership taken by amalgamated representatives, headed by W. R. (Bill) Davisson, secretary of Portland local 231, and Shirley Barker, international poultry director, who flew in from Chicago to investigate the epidemic.

Davisson and Barker demanded an antemortem inspection of all turkeys by the State department of agriculture. Dr. Kermit Peterson, State veterinarian, agreed that this was a just request. He has promised to provide licensed veterinarians for antemortem inspection of all turkeys grown in Oregon.

Other points of the control program adopted by the State, the Amalgamated, and the turkey industry:

1. Wide dissemination of information about the disease among all interested groups, including turkey handlers, so an outbreak may be recognized and reported immediately.

2. An immediate hold order on suspected flocks, with a strict quarantine following laboratory confirmation.

3. Prescription for aueromycin treatment, with safeguards to prevent spread of the disease through hatching eggs and poults. (The use of 50 to 100 grams of an aureomycin compound per ton of turkey feed will prevent the microbe from taking hold in flocks.)

The two recovered flocks will be handled in accordance with the procedures set up in this new control program. Eggs can be hatched in any Oregon hatchery that handles only eggs from those two flocks. The poults can be sold for raising as market birds by any Oregon grower. Neither eggs nor poults can be shipped outside the State.

At the end of the hatching season, turkeys from the two flocks must be slaughtered in an approved processing plant, having veterinary inspection approved by public health officials. Any sign of infection means that processing will be halted and the birds returned to the farm until lesions disappear.

In conclusion, the Oregon outbreak proves two points:

1. It demonstrates that psittacosis, or other baffling poultry diseases, can happen anywhere—not merely in a State where poultry conditions are substandard, such as Texas. Conditions in Oregon are excellent, yet psittacosis occurred anyway.

2. It shows that there is a definite nationwide need for a United States Poultry Inspection Service, as advocated by the Amalgamated. This situation would have never happened had such an agency existed.

The next move is up to Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the factual coverage of this article leaves no doubt about the serious nature of the epidemic in the poultry industry and it emphasizes the urgency of immediate action on the part of the Government to deal with the dangers incident to diseased poultry. The article supplies strong supporting evidence in favor of the immediate enactment of the bill S. 3176.

Mr. President, I close with this plea to the committee which has jurisdiction of S. 3176: "The health of your fellow Americans calls for an immediate report of the bill by your committee, so that the Senate may take action very quickly on this health-protecting measure."

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN GREAT LAKES BULK CARGO VESSELS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further morning business to be transacted, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 3108.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3108) to encourage the construction of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, so that the Senate may take action on the nomination previously passed over.

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

ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the nomination passed over.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles J. Lowen, Jr., to be Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination? [Putting the question.]

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

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.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allott	Gore	Monroney
Barrett	Green	Morse
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bender	Hennings	Murray
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Jackson	Purtell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Scott
Clements	Knowland	Smathers
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Laird	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Langer	Sparkman
Douglas	Lehman	Stennis
Duff	Long	Symington
Dworshak	Magnuson	Thye
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Frear	McCarthy	Williams
Fulbright	McClellan	Wofford
George	McNamara	Young
Goldwater	Millikin	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

POLITICAL SITUATION IN WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at his press conference this morning President Eisenhower, in reply to a question asked by a member of the press, said that he does not believe the Chief Executive should intervene in primary elections. I fully agree with the President. I adhered to the substance of that statement

when I was interviewed in Wisconsin during the week following the convention. The people of any State would resent being told how to vote. This was clearly demonstrated in past administrations when attempted dictation boomeranged in a number of instances.

On the other hand, the people of a State are interested in a President's factual evaluation of a public servant's services. Such evaluation—very kind and favorable—has been made by the President of my services, including three of his past letters which I reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And on other occasions, the President has been kind enough to express his warm, personal regard for my loyal efforts. Perhaps he may choose to do so again in the future without, of course, attempting to interfere.

I do not believe that a candidate such as myself should put the Chief Executive of our country in a corner, and I would never do so.

I reiterate that it is the function of the people of my own State of Wisconsin to make the choice. I am campaigning as a loyal supporter of the President who believes in him as a great statesman. And I shall continue to fight for his policies, come what may.

I repeat the plain fact that the people of Wisconsin overwhelmingly support the President. They know, however, that the minority in our State, which consists of Eisenhower haters, is behind my opponent.

In any event, I am confident that I will be overwhelmingly renominated in September.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9720) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FOGARTY, Mr. FERNANDEZ, Mr. LANHAM, Mr. DENTON, Mr, CANNON, Mr. TABER, Mr. HAND, and Mr. JENSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1866. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton;

H. R. 8123. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; and

H. R. 9390. An act asking appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN GREAT LAKES BULK CARGO VESSELS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3108) to encourage the construction of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has the morning hour been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning hour has been concluded, and the unfinished business has been laid before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Do I understand correctly that the Senate is now operating under a time limitation in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the time limitation is 30 minutes on each amendment and 1 hour on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield the floor.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 4, after the word "in", it is proposed to strike out "the lowest cost foreign yard" and insert in lieu thereof "a foreign shipbuilding center which is deemed by the Secretary to furnish a fair and representative example for the determination of the estimated foreign cost of construction of vessels of the type proposed to be constructed, and".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I have discussed the perfecting amendment with the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. It is an amendment which brings the determination of the cost of construction of vessels built in foreign shipyards into conformity with the formula for determining the cost of constructing salt water vessels. I shall use the time allocated for the amendment to discuss the bill briefly.

Senate bill 3108 was introduced jointly by myself, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. Hearings were held before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the bill was reported unanimously by that committee.

With the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway, a new element will be brought into the Great Lakes shipping area. At present, shipping in the Great Lakes consists of movements between American port and American port, or between Canadian port and American port. The Welland Canal makes it impossible for foreign shipping to enter the Great Lakes in an attempt to take over that trade.

It is well known that there has been a shift in the use of ore deposits in North America. There are great ore deposits in the Labrador area, and there has been a shift from the use of ore from the Mesabi Range to the use of Canadian ore. That shift will become more intensive as the years go by.

As I stated previously, after the St. Lawrence Seaway is completed, it will open up the Great Lakes to foreign ore carriers, which will be able to move in and engage in the freight traffic between Canada and the United States. During peacetime that is of little consequence, other than as it affects the domestic industry. But we know that today, on the drafting boards of many foreign shipyards there are plans for construction of ships for that particular trade.

We are all conscious, I am sure, of the great part the Great Lakes ore-carrying fleet played in the successful prosecution of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. We know that foreign-flag ships would, in time of emergency, seek to stay within their own national waters, and would not be available for the very necessary shipments of ore in time of emergency.

If it were not for its national-defense features, I would say the bill should not be before the Senate of the United States; but it is necessary that the bill be enacted into law because of our defense needs. In the event of a national emergency, we would have to call upon the Great Lakes ore-carrying fleet to maintain the lifeline in bringing ore from the mines to the mills.

What does the bill do? The bill simply does for the Great Lakes that which we now do for salt water operators. The domestic ship operators know that the future is not bright, and that it is not feasible for them to compete, on an economic basis, with foreign-built and foreign-operated ships in this particular trade. The bill allows American ship operators who are forced to construct ships in American yards to receive a cost differential as between the actual cost of constructing ships in American yards and the cost of construction in foreign yards. That determination is to be made by the Maritime Commission, and the differential will vary, but, normally, it will be between 40 and 45 percent of the cost of construction.

Mr. President, that arrangement is nothing new. It is the same type of formula which is now used for offshore shipping. It will afford shipping operators on the Great Lakes and yards which will build ships for the Great Lakes trade the same protection afforded salt water operators who have the same competition with foreign operators and foreign ship manufacturers. That is the national maritime policy.

Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the debate for any length of time. Therefore, I shall conclude my remarks on the amendment. If the Senator from Delaware wishes to speak on the amendment or on the bill, he may do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a few moments to me on the amendment?

Mr. POTTER. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment with the Senator from Michigan. We are in complete agreement. I think the amendment should be adopted, and I certainly support it. Without the adoption of the amendment, the bill would provide that one of the determining factors, in arriving at the cost of ships constructed abroad, would be based not on a bona fide bid submitted by a responsible yard, but on a bid from any yard which used to build ships and which may not be in the shipbuilding business now. The amendment does nail the formula down to a more realistic basis. It is the same formula provided in the shipping act. Therefore, I think the amendment certainly improves the bill.

I may have other objections to other features of the bill which I shall state later; but I am in complete agreement with the Senator from Michigan on this amendment, and I hope the Senate will adopt it.

Mr. POTTER. Is it agreeable to the Senator from Delaware that the amendment be disposed of at this time?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I yield back the time remaining to me on the amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to speak on the amendment, I yield back the remainder of the time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The Senator from Tennessee yields back all the time remaining to him.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield back the time remaining to him?

Mr. POTTER. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time remaining on the amendment has been yielded back.

The Chair understood the Senator from Tennessee to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. GORE. I withdraw the suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee withdraws his suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

No credit shall be allowed under the provisions of this subsection, and no credit shall be allowed or payment made under any other provision of this act or of any other act providing Government assistance in the acquisition or construction of vessels, with respect to any vessel the contract for acquisition or construction of which is entered into after the effective date of this subsection, unless such contract shall have been entered into as the result of competitive bidding and awarded to the lowest responsible bidder.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have discussed the amendment with the Senator from Michigan. I think he is willing to accept the amendment. It merely provides that any contract issued for the construction of any ships which are subsidized by the United States Government must be awarded on a competitive-bid basis and to the lowest responsible bidder. I think the amendment should certainly be part of this or any other bill dealing with a similar subject.

I understand the Senator from Michigan has no objection to the amendment, in which event I shall not speak further on it.

Mr. POTTER. If the Senator from Delaware will yield, I should like to say I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield back the time remaining to me on the amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield back the time remaining to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time remaining on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have one further amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. I might say that if the Senator from Michigan will agree to it as easily as he did to the last amendment, we shall soon dispose of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. *Provided, however,* That the trade-in allowance shall be the original cost of the ship to the purchaser minus usual or recognized depreciation rates.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes on the amendment.

I agree with the Senator from Michigan that we do need an American merchant marine. But if we are going to subsidize it, let us do so aboveboard, spell out the formula, ascertain what the cost will be, and see if the American people want to pay for it.

The Senator from Michigan pointed out that the bill would extend to the Great Lakes shipping industry the same formula now applied to the salt water shipping industry. That statement is partly true, but not quite completely. I think the Senator will agree with me that there can be no question if we adopt the principle of subsidizing the Great Lakes shipping industry by allowing it the differential between cost of ships constructed in this country and abroad, we shall later be asked to adopt the same formula with regard to operational subsidies. If one is worthy of subsidy, the other one must be given consideration. They go together. There can be no question about that. This bill is just an entering wedge and embraces a principle which will ultimately cost the taxpayers millions if approved.

Likewise I point out that the bill contains a vastly different formula. The formula for the oceanic shipping industry provides that the trade-in allowance shall be the fair and reasonable value of the ship. Then there is an additional formula which provides that the Government shall pay the shipping company the differential between the cost of building the ship in an American shipyard and the cost of building it abroad. But those are two separate formulas.

The formula contained in the pending bill has no connection with the formulas which apply to the oceanic shipping industry. The pending bill merely provides that a shipping company may make use of any old hulk and, if it is able to tow it into a port—regardless of the condition of the ship, regardless of whether it still has any machinery in it, and regardless of the additional cost of placing the ship in usable condition—may have that ship qualify under the provisions of the bill, and be given an allowance of three to four million dollars. This may be many times more than the original cost. I think the Senator from Michigan will agree with me that that is the effect of the bill.

The Maritime Commission has pointed out that the average subsidy paid under this formula would be approximately from $3,500,000 to $4 million a ship. Some of these ships were sold originally to the Great Lakes shipping industry by the United States Government for as little as $102,000 apiece. After the company has operated such a ship for a number of years, should the Government now pay $4 million for it?

If we are going to give subsidies to the American merchant marine, let us do it openly, not in the concealed manner provided by the bill.

I point out that 302 ships of various types in the Great Lakes fleet are eligible for the proposed subsidy; and if the proposed subsidy is carried to its extreme, it would cost more than $1 billion.

Let me also point out that 58 of the eligible ships are owned by the United States Steel Corp.; and I think we can agree that the United States Steel Corp. is able to build the ships it needs and is able to pay for them. Fourteen ships which will be eligible for the subsidy provided for in this bill belong to the Bethlehem Steel Co.

Three of the ships belong to the Hanna Coal & Ore Co.; 4 of the ships belong to the Inland Steel Corp.; and 2 of the ships belong to the International Harvester Corp. Others are owned by various ore companies. All these companies are able to pay the proper prices for the ships they need. Certainly those companies are able to pay the necessary differential and are able to pay for the construction of any ships they need.

The subsidy program proposed by the pending bill is a new one. It would be a grave mistake for us to adopt it here without proper study.

If we are to adopt the principle of subsidizing shipping on the Great Lakes,

let us do so in an open manner, and let us state what subsidy shall be paid.

In answer to the Senator's argument that the bill is in the interest of the national defense, I remind the Senate that that is always a good argument to make, but it so happens the Secretary of Defense is not in favor of the bill. Every Government agency has recommended against enactment of the bill and has done so on the basis that there is no justification for its enactment. Certainly those agencies have some responsibility for the national defense and are in a position to know what is good for the country.

Again I say that if the pending amendment is not agreed to, the potential cost of the bill to the American taxpayers will be in excess of $1 billion, and, furthermore, we shall have no real control over the program after it goes into effect, because then it will be said that we have authorized the Maritime Commission to make these contracts, and that therefore the Appropriations Committee must recommend the necessary appropriations. We have heard that argument made time and time again.

Therefore, now is the time to make the proper decision.

Mr. President, either my amendment should be adopted, or the bill should be defeated.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Does this amendment apply to the building of vessels in the coastal shipyards, or does the amendment apply only to Great Lakes shipping? It does not apply to transports built in the coastal shipyards, does it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The present amendment applies only to the Great Lakes shipping industry. But I point out that the law applicable to the oceanic shipping already provides a similar formula, by means of which the owners of oceanic ships traded in to the Maritime Commission are allowed the fair and reasonable market value of the ships, and then the construction differential subsidy is paid as such. It is defined as such; and no back-door "gimmick," such as is proposed in the pending bill, is used.

Under the pending bill, it is conceivably possible that the construction differential subsidy would be less than the trade-in allowance, in which event the manufacturer could, unless the formula were more carefully spelled out, get a larger differential subsidy than would actually be justified. The bill does not provide any limit on it.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield at this point?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. It is indicated, then, that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware goes beyond the requirements—even though similar to them—for ships built in the Atlantic coast shipyards and receiving the subsidy from the United States Government. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It goes beyond that, to this extent: If this amendment is adopted—and I wish to be perfectly frank about the matter—it will delete from the bill the subsidy provisions, because there is no other section of the bill which provides that the Government shall pay to the Great Lakes shipping industry a construction differential subsidy computed as such, and one which could be audited by the General Accounting Office as such. It is my argument that that is an entirely different question. If we are going to adopt such a subsidy provision, then let it be incorporated in a separate bill, and let the proper committee hold hearings on it and then report it to the Senate. But let us not bring in such subsidy formula through the back door in such a manner as would be done by means of the pending bill. That same point was emphasized by the Comptroller General. Under the provisions of this bill, there would be no control over the extent of the subsidy. The subsidy would be the loosest kind of subsidy authority ever made.

Mr. McNAMARA. Then the practical effect of the amendment would be that no ships would be built on the Great Lakes. Instead, and logically, the ships would be built only in places to which the amendment did not apply.

Let me say that I think the amendment is a most unfair one.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I do not think it follows that if the amendment is adopted ships would not be built on the Great Lakes. Is the Senator from Michigan attempting to tell me that the steel companies will not build ships in which to transport their ore? Such a statement would be ridiculous. All of us know that the steel companies will build the ships they need. They must do so. But if we are to provide a subsidy for the steel industry, let us recognize it as such; and if that is what you want, say so.

We should remember that the companies bought many of these ships from the Government in the first instance. I have called attention to the case of a company which bought for $102,000 apiece, three ships which were only about 4 years old when the company bought them. They had cost the Government an average of more than $7,500,000 apiece. The Government sold the ships to the company for $102,000 apiece. How much more subsidy does the company want? Instead of having my amendment apply, the company now wants the Congress to pass a bill under which the company will be paid approximately $3,500,000 for each of the ships, after the company is through with them.

Mr. McNAMARA. If the Senator from Delaware is asking me how much further subsidy the companies want, let me say that I think the Great Lakes shipbuilding industry should be entitled to the same subsidy that the coastal shipbuilding industry enjoys. I understand that is the aim of those who framed the bill.

In reply to the question, "What do they want?", let me say that I want the Great Lakes shipbuilding industry to receive the same treatment as that received by the coastal shipbuilders.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then a bill to that effect should be introduced separately, and should be considered by the appropriate committee, and should be reported as such. Then you can explain to your constituents, who will be paying the bill, just where their money goes and who gets it.

It is said that the bill applies only to ships operated on the Great Lakes. However, the bill contains no provision which would prevent ships to which the bill applies from later being placed in the oceanic shipping service and perhaps even operated there under foreign flags.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware is 100 percent in error.

In the first place, when an American operator turns his ship in to the Government, the Government does not pay him for the ship. He turns it in for the American fleet, without costing the Government one nickel for that. The cost to the Government is the differential between the cost of construction in an American yard and the cost of construction in a foreign yard. That forces our operators to build their ships in American yards. The distinguished Senator from Delaware knows that in the case of ships for the oceanic service, the companies can obtain a Government allowance, and then can turn around and have the Government pay the differential between the cost of construction in an American yard and the cost of construction in a foreign yard.

I may add that, so far as the Department of Defense is concerned, we had no testimony on the bill. We received testimony from the Department of Commerce, which said, "We recognize that there is a problem. We recognize that there must be an American-owned flag fleet on the Great Lakes in case of national emergency. We do not know the answer."

It so happens that our committee includes among its membership the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is probably one of the best informed Members of Congress on maritime matters, and other Senators who have been very diligent in this field. We have a competent staff. It is the best judgment of the committee that this is the type of legislation which is needed to assure and safeguard an American-flag fleet on the Great Lakes.

By 1960, more than 213 vessels, or 62 percent of the fleet, will be 50 years of age or older. The Senator from Delaware knows that a serious problem of obsolescence confronts us at the present time.

The Senator from Delaware sets up a straw man when he says that some 300 ships will be turned in. The Senator knows that we do not have facilities on the Great Lakes to handle construction in such numbers. I predict that in the next 5 years not more than 20 ships will be built under the provisions of the bill.

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

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is there anything in the bill which provides that the ships must be built in the Great Lakes area?

Mr. POTTER. Yes; there is.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The provision is that they must be built in American shipyards.

Mr. POTTER. I invite the Senator's attention to the language on page 2, beginning in line 10:

A vessel shall be considered a "new vessel" for purposes of this subdivision if it (A) is constructed after January 1, 1956, in a Great Lakes shipyard within the United States——

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will yield, I respectfully remind him that the amendment which was agreed to, and to which the Senator assented, provides that the construction of all ships must be based upon competitive bidding by American shipyards, and that covers the entire United States.

Mr. POTTER. I had assumed that the Senator's amendment, which we discussed, included Great Lakes shipyards.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The amendment provided for competitive bidding by American shipyards. It was not limited to Great Lakes shipyards. There would be no bona fide competitive bidding if it were limited to certain areas.

Mr. POTTER. There is a limitation at present. Competitive bidding is limited to east-coast shipyards with respect to east-coast construction, and to Pacific-coast shipyards with respect to Pacific-coast construction. There are at least five shipyards on the Great Lakes. It is the intention that under the terms of the bill, ship construction will be confined to the Great Lakes shipyards. I am sure the Senator did not plan to be devious, and that he will accept an amendment confining the construction to the Great Lakes shipyards.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; it was my intention—as it was in connection with the amendment I previously offered—that there should be bona fide competitive bidding. It is not bona fide competitive bidding if we say that the competitive bids must be based upon construction in certain yards. Some of the shipyards are owned by the companies which are to operate the ships. The steel for the ships will be furnished by companies which will be beneficiaries of the subsidies. Surely we are not going to say that the United States Government can accept a bid only from a certain company which may be even going to operate the ships.

Mr. POTTER. I know of no shipyard which is owned by one of the companies which is operating on the Great Lakes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator will admit that the steel for the ships will be furnished by the companies just referred to, will he not?

Mr. POTTER. Perhaps so; but the steel companies do not own the shipyards.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair assumes that the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Michigan have been yielding themselves time by agreement with the acting majority leader.

Do both sides yield back the remaining time?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, if there is no further debate, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator mean to yield back the remaining time?

Mr. McNAMARA. Not at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There must be some agreement with respect to the time consumed by the quorum call.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I withdraw my unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator's withdrawing his request to rescind the previous order? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will continue the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Delaware has 4 minutes remaining, and the opposition to the amendment has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I personally have no objection to the Senator's unanimous-consent request. However, I know that there is a standing objection on this side of the aisle to requesting a yea-and-nay vote by unanimous consent. Therefore, if the Senator persists in his request, I shall have to object.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I realize that there are not enough Members on the floor to have the yeas and nays ordered without unanimous consent. Therefore I renew my request for a quorum call. I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that the time be not charged to either side.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I did not hear the Senator's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have suggested the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 4 minutes remaining, and the opposition has 9 minutes remaining. Does the Senator from Delaware request that the time consumed in the quorum call be not charged to either side?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I make that request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, what is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 4 minutes remaining on the amendment. The opposition to the amendment has 9 minutes remaining. The Senator from Delaware has suggested the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed in the quorum call be not charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from Delaware is that a quorum call be had, and that the time be not charged to either side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has all time for debate on the amendment been consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes remain for debate in favor of the amendment, and 9 minutes remain for debate in opposition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Why not consume all the time on a quorum call? Then the Senate can proceed in the regular order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. So far as I am concerned, all I shall require is 1 or 2 minutes when more Senators have come into the Chamber.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We are prepared to yield back the remainder of our time. I suggest that both sides yield back the remainder of their time and that then there be a quorum call.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection, if we may have a few minutes for debate on the bill when more Senators have come into the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no objection to the Senator's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will call the roll. The time consumed in the quorum call will not be charged to either side.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 4 minutes remaining, and the majority leader has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I merely wish again to point out that my amendment simply proposes, with reference to trade-in allowances, that there be allowed the fair and reasonable market value, taking into consideration the cost of the ships to the persons who originally bought them, minus the usually recognized depreciation rates.

If the amendment is not adopted it will be possible, under the bill, to allow an average of approximately $3½ million or $4 million for each ship, regardless of its age and condition. I previously pointed out, as one glaring example, the fact that 3 ships cost approximately $7½ million apiece to build, and after they were 4 years old they were sold to one of the Great Lakes operators for

$102,000 apiece. If the pending amendment is not adopted we shall be authorizing the Government to pay from three and a half to four million dollars apiece for these same ships after they are worn out. There is no justification for that.

Mr. President, I again ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. After all time has been yielded back, will it be in order to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the majority leader yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware would completely destroy the bill. It would introduce a new factor. Under the bill, the Government would not pay one nickel for the ships traded in. The allowance given would represent the cost of construction in an American yard, where American operators are forced to build their ships, as compared with construction in a foreign yard.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. POTTER. I cannot yield; I do not have the time.

Under existing maritime policy with reference to salt water ship construction and operation, the Government does give an allowance for the ship which is turned in and does give a differential between the cost of constructing a ship in an American yard as against constructing it in a foreign yard. The bill makes no provision for any allowance for a turned-in ship. It is turned over to the Government for a reserve fleet. Even with the passage of the bill our Great Lakes operation would not be on a parity with the generous, and, I think, necessary action in the handling of our salt water maritime problem.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In the event a ship is not acquired by someone who wishes to operate it on the Great Lakes, it might well be anchored somewhere as surplus, declared to be obsolete, and probably towed out and sunk. There is before us now the question as to what we shall do with surplus vessels. I think it would be sound economics to put them into the fleet on the Great Lakes rather than to anchor them in some harbor further to deteriorate as the years go by.

Mr. POTTER. The Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct. He knows that during times of emergency we must have all the cargo ships we can obtain. It is not always possible to have a ship-construction program during an emergency. It will be remembered that during World War II we did not have the necessary ship construction.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware provides that an allowance shall be made on the actual cost of the vessel, minus depreciation. Sixty-two percent of the vessels are 50 years of age or over. Ship construction 50 years ago was considerably different from ship construction today. Most of the vessels have already been depreciated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does the Senator from Delaware desire to answer the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to read what the Comptroller General said about this bill. He likewise approves bringing this subsidy out into the open.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield myself 2 minutes. The Comptroller General said in his letter to the committee:

> To the extent that the credit allowances computed under the bill exceed the fair and reasonable values of the obsolete vessels traded in, the Government's payment of the difference will constitute a subsidy—a hidden subsidy. The 1936 act was conceived with the sound idea of putting an end to the hidden or disguised subsidies contained in the old ocean-mail contracts. Accordingly, we recommend against favorable consideration of this measure and urge that any subsidization of the costs of constructing new Great Lakes vessels or preferential treatment to Great Lakes shipyards which is deemed necessary or desirable by Congress be provided in express terms.

That is exactly what I have been saying all afternoon. If we are to pay a subsidy for these ships, let us do it openly and aboveboard, and not hide it under some little "gimmick" by which an allowance would be made far in excess of what a particular wornout ship was worth.

Regardless of what the Senator from Michigan says, there is an average trade-in value of from $3,500,000 to $4 million a ship. A broken-down, wornout ship can be towed into port or one in good condition can sail into port under its own power, and there is absolutely no difference at all in the trade-in allowance. There will be no relationship to the original cost, the age, or the condition of the ship. That certainly is an unsound practice and is not recommended by any agency of the Government.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time. Before I suggest the absence of a quorum I renew my request for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader still has time under his control. Does he yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will yield back the time on this side provided the Senator from Delaware will yield back the remainder of his time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we ascertain if we can have the yeas and nays ordered?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allott	Gore	Monroney
Barrett	Green	Morse
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bender	Hennings	Murray
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Jackson	Purtell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Scott
Clements	Knowland	Smathers
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Laird	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Langer	Sparkman
Douglas	Lehman	Stennis
Duff	Long	Symington
Dworshak	Magnuson	Thye
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Frear	McCarthy	Williams
Fulbright	McClellan	Wofford
George	McNamara	Young
Goldwater	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have one further amendment which I should like to submit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to say to the Senators that I shall take only a few minutes to speak on the amendment, and I should like to have the yeas and nays on the amendment. I shall then have no further amendment to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

> SEC. 2. That the Shipping Act of 1916 is amended by adding a new section, as follows:
>
> "SEC. 45. No common carrier by water subject to this act (the Shipping Act of 1916)

shall directly or indirectly issue any ticket or pass for the free or reduced-rate transportation of any passenger in foreign commerce or in commerce between the United States and its Territories and possessions, or directly or indirectly give any free or reduced rate transportation to any such passenger, except, under such terms and conditions as the Federal Maritime Board may prescribe, to its directors, officers, and employees and their immediate families; witnesses and attorneys attending any legal investigation in which such common carrier by water is interested; persons injured in accidents at sea and physicians and nurses attending such persons; persons rescued at sea; and any person with the object of providing relief in cases of general epidemic, pestilence, or other calamitous visitation. Nothing contained in this section shall prohibit any common carrier by water, under such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe, from interchanging with any other common carrier by water free tickets, free passes, or free or reduced-rate transportation for the directors, officers, and employees and their immediate families. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any common carrier by water with respect to any vessel that is both documented under the laws of a foreign country and owned, leased, or chartered by a person who is a citizen of a foreign country."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Delaware yield to himself?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays on the amendment, while there are a sufficient number of Senators present on the floor of the Senate. Certainly, the Members of the Senate will not mind voting on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested by the Senator from Delaware.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is very simple. It incorporates into the Shipping Act of 1916 the same language and same provision which is applicable now to railroads and airlines; namely, that no Member of Congress, nor any other official of the Government working in any capacity, nor any member of their families can be given free transportation or sold transportation at a reduced rate by any shipping company which has been the recipient of the benefit of any construction differential subsidy or any operational subsidy on its ships.

This will apply to any shipping company affected under the provisions of this act or those affected by any other act previously enacted by Congress wherein that company would be the beneficiary of a Government subsidy.

Simply stated, it prohibits the American shipping industry from subsidizing the vacations of any Government official.

The Senate, by its previous action, has approved the subsidy provision of the pending bill. I recognize that the ships involved are mostly cargo carriers, and that passengers will not be involved to any great extent. However, the amendment offered is applicable to all water transportation, oceanic or on the Great Lakes. Any passenger-carrying ship which is being subsidized by the American taxpayers will not in the future, if the amendment is adopted, be permitted to carry at reduced transportation fares any Member of Congress, or any Government official in any capacity, or any member of their families.

Certainly the amendment should be adopted. Years ago Congress recognized the danger of the practice whereby railroads were giving free passes to public officials who were in a position to vote on the amount of railroad subsidies. Congress has extended a subsidy to the shipping industry and the same rules should apply. Let us provide that no one in a position to rule on the amount of the subsidy a company will get shall obtain from that company a reduced fare either for himself or for members of his family.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I have no objection to accepting the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If this amendment can be adopted——

Mr. POTTER. The Senator is referring now to passenger fares; is he not? The amendment has nothing to do with cargo.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly; a person goes as a passenger, not as freight. The amendment affects only passenger rates. However, while the language is not contained in the amendment, it would be the intent of the amendment that if a person carried any freight with him, he would have to pay the same rates for freight that everyone else had to pay. I have never heard of a reduction being put into effect in that manner, but if so, it would be prohibited.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the time remaining to him?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield back the time remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan if he has an understanding with the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. POTTER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does that make the bill acceptable to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The amendment is certainly acceptable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Delaware still oppose the bill? Does the acceptance of the amendment clear up the Senator's objection to the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. I am not in favor of extending subsidies to the Great Lakes shipping industry, but acceptance of the amendment will greatly improve the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the time remaining to me with the understanding that there will be a voice vote on the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is satisfactory. All that I want is the passage of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield time to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have been very happy to be a cosponsor of Senate bill 3108, because I know something of the situation facing the Great Lakes vessels operators today.

I should like to take these few moments to summarize the situation.

A large majority of the vessels comprising the Great Lakes fleet were built prior to 1920, many during the period from 1905 to 1910. The hulls of these vessels are structurally sound and well maintained, but by modern day standards they are relatively inefficient and obsolete, and should soon be replaced. Yet vessel operators are reluctant to undertake new construction, for good reason.

Mr. President, the backbone of Great Lakes commerce is iron ore. Last year better than 23 million tons of iron ore were imported for consumption in the United States. Most foreign sources are producing in excess of estimated rates, so that the supply of foreign ore will be more than sufficient to take care of the increased demand brought about by our expanding economy. Where these ores move to seaboard ports in low-cost, foreign-flag vessels, such ships are in competition with Great Lakes vessels in the movement of Lake Superior ore.

Great Lakes vessels must also compete with Canadian vessels in the international commerce in bulk commodities between the United States and Canada. This commerce already totals nearly 30 million tons annually, and is growing from year to year. Already American operators are losing out to their Canadian competitors because Canadian costs are only about two-thirds of ours. Once the seaway is completed, the vessels of other nations will be able to engage in this trade. Because of the decided cost advantage which such vessels will have, it seems reasonably certain that they will drive the American-flag vessels from this trade entirely.

Consequently, with the shifting trade picture and increased emphasis upon international trade with Canada, American operators are reluctant to assume the high cost of constructing vessels in Great Lakes shipyards. Without Government aid which will enable them to

obtain new vessels at a price comparable to that paid by their foreign competitors, American operators cannot survive in the international trade with Canada.

S. 3108 is designed to accomplish two things. First, it will enable American operators to turn in uneconomic vessels in exchange for an allowance of credit which will put the cost of a new vessel on a parity with foreign cost. Second, it will establish a reserve fleet for use in an emergency, when, in an all-out war, foreign or overseas sources of iron ore and other strategic materials will undoubtedly be cut off.

Mr. President, my colleagues know that I have long been a stanch advocate of freer international competition. The one exception—a clearly demonstrable one, in my opinion—is in the case of national defense. Considerations of the national defense require that we maintain sufficient bulk-cargo vessel capacity to move over the sheltered route of the Great Lakes the quantities of iron ore and other basic bulk materials required by heavy industry.

At the minimum, the Great Lakes fleet should be maintained at a level where it is capable of moving at least 185 million tons of bulk commodities annually. On the basis of peacetime requirements alone, experts predict that by 1960 the Lake Superior district will be producing about 81 million tons of iron ore, Canada will be producing 20 million tons, and other foreign sources an additional 21 million tons. The Great Lakes fleet should be capable of moving not only our domestic ore, but at least half of that normally produced in Canada. Moreover, sufficient excess vessel capacity should be maintained to absorb the increased demand which would be thrown on the lake fleet in the event overseas sources of ore were cut off. When we add to this at least 73 million tons of other essential commodities, such as coal, limestone, and grain, it becomes readily apparent that a seasonal capacity of 185 million tons is, indeed, conservative.

At the present time in a normal navigation season—that is, from April 15 to November 30—vessels of the Great Lakes fleet, if employed in their usual trades, have a theoretical, maximum seasonal capacity of about 178 million tons. Last year, better than 3 million tons of seasonal capacity were retired because of obsolescence. It is not to be expected that this anual rate of retirement of old vessels will remain constant. The ages of the vessels are such, however, that it will continue, so that, as of now, it may be said that by 1960 the minimum need for new vessels will be about 19 million tons of annual carrying capacity. It is interesting to note that this need will be only slightly less than one-half the probable Great Lakes United States-Canadian commerce in bulk commodities at that time.

If our Great Lakes vessels are unable to participate in this international trade, it is not to be expected that the old vessels which are retired will be replaced. The result will then be that our fleet will diminish to a point where it will be sufficient only to transport our domestic peacetime Great Lakes commerce. In the event of war, there would be a tragic shortage in United States vessel capacity. Among other things, S. 3108 would prevent this shortage by encouraging the construction of new vessels and creating a reserve for the old vessels.

Mr. President, these are the reasons why I believe that pasasge by the Senate of S. 3108 is in the national interest. I think enactment of this bill is essential to the maintenance and development of privately owned United States-flag vessels on the Great Lakes in the quantity and quality necessary to supply the demands of essential industries with basic bulk commodities, both in peacetime and in the event of a future national emergency.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Minnesota will remember that 4 or 5 years ago the Government turned 10 vessels over to Great Lakes operators.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I recall that.

Mr. LANGER. And the Senator from Minnesota will also remember that shortly thereafter, an effort was made to ship wheat in the vessels, but the statement was made that they could not be used for that purpose, because they were under contract with the ore companies. As a result, no space was available for the shipment of wheat.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that I was one of the cosponsors of the so-called package-freight bill or less-than-carload-lot shipment bill, which was passed. At the time when the freighters to which the Senator from North Dakota refers were to be placed in operation, the Korean war broke out, and, therefore, the ore companies had to utilize the ships for the shipment of the urgently needed iron ore. That is the only reason, let me say, why the incident the Senator from North Dakota brings to our attention was not taken care of in the manner for which the bill was originally designed.

Mr. LANGER. Then am I to understand that if the pending bill is enacted, and if in the future some of my constituents wish to ship wheat, and if no war is in progress, I have the guaranty of the Senator from Minnesota that it will be possible to ship the wheat on the Great Lakes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assure the Senator from North Dakota that no one is more interested in the shipment of such commodities on the Great Lakes than I am, and I assure him that I share his view regarding the desirability and necessity of such use in the case of the ships authorized under the pending proposal. I respectfully assure him that wheat will be shipped and will be well cared for.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require on the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wish to say that I have just received the assurance of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that we shall be able to ship our wheat. May I have the same assurance in regard to flour?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in reply, let me say that, although I will not be owning the ships, nevertheless, I am happy to state that I feel sure that the owners of the ships will be glad to cooperate in all matters of commerce.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I remind the Senators that no provision of the bill requires the owners of the ships to transport 1 pound of agricultural commodities. Instead, the ships could be used entirely for the shipment of ore, if that were desired, and the owners of the ships would still be able to receive the subsidy.

Do not let anyone be confused that this billion-dollar new subsidy program is being supported as a benefit for the farmers. All that the farmers get out of this bill is the right to pay taxes and underwrite the cost.

The large steel companies are the major beneficiaries and every Member of the Senate knows that is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I respect the judgment of the Senator from Delaware, of course. But for one who believes as much as the Senator from Delaware does in free enterprise, I cannot imagine that he would wish to attempt to dictate to the owners of the ships as to what would be hauled in them. I assume that they will use the ships legitimately, in legitimate commerce.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the free-enterprise system must be willing to assume its own responsibilities. The free-enterprise system cannot remain free and continue to unload on the Government all its obligations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We only ask that the Great Lakes shipping industry be allowed the opportunity it needs. We are sure that the Great Lakes shipping industry will operate the ships in the proper way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time available to me, if the other side is prepared to do likewise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Delaware desire to have 5 minutes yielded to him?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assume that the Senator in charge of the time for the other side will yield time to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think the Congress will be making a great mistake if it adopts a new principle of a subsidy for the Great Lakes shipping industry without giving it more study. I think there is no question but that if the bill is passed and is enacted into law, in a few months we shall be asked to subsidize not only the construction but also the operations

by paying the differential in the cost of American labor and foreign labor.

Furthermore, the bill contains no limit. It provides a subsidy of about $3.5 million or $4 million for each ship; and according to the Department of Commerce approximately 300 ships are eligible for the subsidy. If the subsidy were carried to its extreme, ultimately it would cost the Government over $1 billion.

Nor can it be claimed that the bill is in the interest of the national defense, because the defense agency and every other agency have testified that the bill is not needed in the national defense.

Certainly the steel companies do not need such a subsidy in order to transport their own ore.

The adoption of the two amendments—one providing for the awarding of the contracts to the lowest responsible competitive bidder and the other amendment prohibiting further subsidized vacations for Government officials—did greatly improve the bill. However, the rejection of the other amendment still leaves the bill providing for a multimillion dollar new subsidy program, and in my opinion this cannot be justified.

I think it is ridiculous that we are being asked to subsidize the operations of these companies to that extent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all unused time yielded back?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I will yield back the remainder of my time on condition that the acting minority leader do likewise, following which I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. POTTER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been consumed or yielded back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 3108) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized (subject to the provisions of this section) to acquire any obsolete Great Lakes vessel or vessels in exchange for an allowance of credit to be applied upon the purchase price of a new vessel. A vessel shall be considered an 'obsolete vessel' for purposes of this subsection if it (1) is enrolled and licensed under the laws of the United States for trade on the Great Lakes and has been so enrolled and licensed for a period of at least 10 years; (2) is designed to transport in such trade dry bulk commodities such as iron ore, limestone, grain, or coal; (3) is of not less than 3,000 gross tons; and (4) is owned by a citizen or citizens of the United States and has been so owned by such citizen or citizens for at least 3 years immediately prior to the date of acquisition hereunder. A vessel shall be considered a 'new vessel' for purposes of this subsection if it (A) is constructed after January 1, 1956, in a Great Lakes shipyard within the United States; (B) is capable by reason of design of transporting bulk commodities such as iron ore, limestone, grain, or coal between ports on the Great Lakes, including the whole of the St. Lawrence River and the Gulf of St. Lawrence as far east as a line drawn north and south through the west end of Anticosti Island; and (C) is documented under the laws of the United States.

"The allowance of credit for an obsolete vessel or vessels acquired under this subsection may equal but shall not exceed the excess, as determined by the Secretary, of the fair and reasonable cost of constructing the new vessel (excluding the cost of any features incorporated in the vessel for national defense use, which shall be paid by the United States) over the fair and reasonable estimate of cost of constructing the new vessel, if it were constructed under similar plans and specifications (excluding national defense features as above provided), in a foreign shipbuilding center which is deemed by the Secretary to furnish a fair and representative example for the determination of the estimated foreign cost of construction of vessels of the type proposed to be constructed, and where vessels have been built or are likely to be built, as found by the Secretary, for engaging in the transportation of any bulk commodity in competition with any Great Lakes United States vessel, whether the movement of such commodity be over the Great Lakes or other waters. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as restricting the trade in which such new vessel may be used. With respect to a new vessel, the construction of which was contracted for after January 1, 1956, but before the effective date of this subsection, such allowance may be paid to the owner notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b). The full credit on the cost of the new vessel shall be allowed only upon the trade-in of an obsolete vessel or vessels having gross tonnage at least equal to or greater than that of the new vessel: *Provided*, That the gross tonnage of such obsolete vessel or vessels may exceed the gross tonnage of the new vessel in a ratio of not in excess of 1.25 to 1, if the Secretary finds that the new vessel, although of less tonnage, will provide utility value equal to or greater than that of the obsolete vessel or vessels. If the gross tonnage of the obsolete vessel or vessels is less than that of the new vessel, the allowance of credit shall be reduced proportionately. If the gross tonnage of such obsolete vessel or vessels exceeds the gross tonnage of the new vessel, then, subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, an additional allowance of credit shall be determined with respect to such excess in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of this section.

"Any obsolete vessel acquired by the United States under the provisions of this subsection shall be placed in a national defense reserve fleet of Great Lakes vessels, subject to the provisions of section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 App. U. S. C., sec. 1744), unless, in the opinion of the Secretary, it is of insufficient value for commercial or military operations to warrant its further preservation.

"Except as they may be inconsistent with this subsection, all the provisions of subsections (a) through (g) shall be applicable to the acquisition of an obsolete vessel or vessels as provided in this subsection.

"No credit shall be allowed under the provisions of this subsection, and no credit shall be allowed or payment made under any other provision of this act or of any other act providing government assistance in the acquisition or construction of vessels, with respect to any vessel the contract for acquisition or construction of which is entered into after the effective date of this subsection, unless such contract shall have been entered into as the result of competitive bidding and awarded to the lowest responsible bidder."

SEC. 2. That the Shipping Act of 1916 is amended by adding a new section as follows:

"SEC. 45. No common carrier by water subject to this act (the Shipping Act of 1916) shall directly or indirectly issue any ticket or pass for the free or reduced rate transportation of any passenger in foreign commerce or in commerce between the United States and its Territories and possessions, or directly or indirectly give any free or reduced-rate transportation to any such passenger, except, under such terms and conditions as the Federal Maritime Board may prescribe, to its directors, officers, and employees and their immediate families; witnesses and attorneys attending any legal investigation in which such common carrier by water is interested; persons injured in accidents at sea and physicians and nurses attending such persons; persons rescued at sea; and any person with the object of providing relief in cases of general epidemic, pestilence, or other calamitous visitation. Nothing contained in this section shall prohibit any common carrier by water, under such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe, from interchanging with any other common carrier by water free tickets, free passes, or free or reduced-rate transportation for their directors, officers, and employees and their immediate families. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any common carrier by water with respect to any vessel that is both documented under the laws of a foreign country and owned, leased, or chartered by a person who is a citizen of a foreign country."

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9536, the General Government matters appropriation bill for 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9536) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry General Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this is the first of two appropriations involving General Government matters and independent offices.

House bill 9536 provides funds for the Executive Office of the President, under various items; for the American Battle Monuments Commission; for the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission; and for the Subversive Activities Control Board.

As reported to the Senate, the total amount of the bill is $14,969,975. This is $44,500 under the budget estimate, and represents an increase of $120,700 over the House allowance. Seventy thousand dollars of the increase is to restore the budget estimates for the Council of Economic Advisers in the Office of the President, expenses of management improvement, and for the expenses of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. Fifty thousand dollars was added over the budget estimate for the American Battle Monuments Commission, for starting a program to furnish the next of kin a photograph of the cemetery and grave where a deceased veteran is buried.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill, as thus amended, be considered, for the purpose of amendment, as original text; provided, however, that no point of order against any amendment shall be deemed to have been waived by the adoption of this unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading "Title I—Executive Office of the President—Council of Economic Advisers—Salaries and Expenses," on page 4, line 9, after the figures "$300", to strike out "$350,000" and insert "$365,700."

Under the heading "Funds Appropriated to the President—Expenses of Management Improvement", on page 7, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$50" and insert "$75", and at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "$350,000" and insert "$400,000."

Under the heading "American Battle Monuments Commission—Salaries and Expenses", on page 8, line 1, after "$1,140,000", to insert "of which $10,000 shall be immediately available for printing relating to the dedication of World War II memorials."

Under the subhead "Construction of Memorials and Cemeteries", on page 8, line 24, after the word "travel", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,050,000."

Under the heading "Foreign Claims Settlement Commission—Salaries and Expenses", on page 9, at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$10,000"; in line 15, after the word "Commission", to insert "and employment of aliens", and in the same line, following the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$795,000" and insert "$800,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, let me say very briefly, in connection with the American Battle Monuments Commission, inasmuch as some inquiry may be made relative to that item, that the program is underway. It should be completed sometime this year, so that the families of American veterans who gave their lives on foreign soil and whose bodies have not been brought back to this country will receive from the Government at least photographs of some of the beautiful cemeteries and parks all over the world where deceased veterans from past wars are buried.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, it is my good fortune to be a member of the Battle Monuments Commission. One of the complaints we have received is that the parents or loved ones of deceased veterans have not been able to receive any documents or pictures relating to the burial grounds where veterans have been interred. This new program of the American Battle Monuments Commission is a program which I know will be appreciated by the families and relatives of the deceased servicemen.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We also suggested to the Commission, that it might explore the possibility of having the pictures in color, and they are doing that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 9536) was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. KNOWLAND conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 9739.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the pending bill makes appropriations for the independent offices of the Government, and provides funds for 17 agencies and five Government corporations. As reported to the Senate, the bill totals $5,916,997,258. That amount is $93,546,032 under the House allowance, and $265,052,642 under the appropriations for 1956, but is $133,293,258 in excess of the budget estimates for 1957.

The principal item accounting for most of the differences is the payment to the civil service retirement and disability fund. For this item the estimate of the Budget Bureau was $295 million; the House provided $600 million and the Senate committee recommends $440,438,000.

Other items accounting for the difference are $6 million for disaster relief; $50,000 for the Federal Trade Commission, $610,108 for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and $1,221,000 for the Veterans' Administration.

The remainder of the bill is $12,144,742 under the budget estimates.

Restoration to the full budget estimates are provided for the following items: Federal Civil Defense Administration, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Federal Power Commission, Housing Administrator, Public Housing Administration, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, National Capital Housing Authority, National Science Foundation, National Security Training Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, Selective Service System, and Veterans' Administration medical funds.

There are two amendments which I shall offer, and which I shall explain.

With that brief preliminary statement, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc; and that the bill, as thus amended, be considered for the purpose of amendment as original text; provided, however, that no point of order against any amendment shall be deemed to have been waived by the adoption of this agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment at this time on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]. I have discussed the amendment with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and with the ranking minority member of the full committee. It involves 2 hospitals, 1 at Nashville, Tenn., and the other at McKinney, Tex. If the Senator from Washington will accept the amendment, we can include it in the bill at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; we discussed the amendment at some length in committee. Personally, I see no objection to taking the amendment, which is in the language of the House bill, to conference. There was some suggestion made in committee that we ought to appropriate the money in a general way for the veterans' hospital construction program. However, I see no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? Without objection, the Secretary will state the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] on behalf of himself and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 32, line 2, in the committee amendment it is proposed to strike "$48,135,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "$51,635,000, of which $2 million shall be used for technical services for the major alteration, rehabilitation, and modernization for the continued operation of the hospital at McKinney, Tex., and $1,500,000 shall be

available for technical services for rehabilitation of the general medical and surgical hospital at Nashville, Tenn."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that the language of the amendment is agreeable to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; it is agreeable to me. I have not discussed it with all the members of the committee, but I have talked to some members about it, and it is agreeable to them. The Senator from Illinois is a member of the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it occurs to me that at least a brief legislative record should be made with respect to the pending amendment. I should say at the outset that I have not the slightest objection to taking the amendment to conference. I know the language of the amendment appeared in the House bill as it came to our committee.

I believe I should say, Mr. President, that as early as 1950, when the veterans' hospital at Dallas, Tex., was authorized, the Veterans' Administration had in mind that when that hospital was completed, the hospital at McKinney, Tex., would be deactivated. It is entirely possible that the Veterans' Administration will need these additional beds at McKinney. However, I have learned from the Veterans' Administration that there will be no deactivation of that hospital at least for a period of 2 years, because it will take that long for the Dallas hospital to be constructed.

In any event, on the basis of the testimony which has been presented by the Veterans' Administration, but notwithstanding that fact, and in conformance with the desires of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, I am agreeable to taking the amendment to conference, to see what can be worked out in conference in connection with it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate what my friend, the Senator from Illinois has said. I should like to say that this hospital performs a vital role in a section of Texas where the population is increasing rapidly and where veterans in need of hospitalization have great difficulty in finding hospital beds open to them. There is already a long waiting list for both the McKinney and for the Dallas hospitals.

In the words of the American Legion department service officer in Dallas, it is a continuous fight to get sick veterans in either the McKinney or the Dallas hospital.

Each of these hospitals has a long waiting list. Only dire emergency cases are admitted on application.

I quote further from a letter I have received from the Dallas department service officer of the American Legion:

> There are plenty of veterans who the VA admits need hospitalization, but not on an emergency basis, and they are thus placed on the waiting lists. It takes them forever to get in.

Mr. President, I am not one who feels that every appropriation of money asked for in the name of American veterans should automatically be granted by the Congress. I strongly believe that every such request should be backed up by facts proving conclusively that it is justified.

This, in my considered opinion, is such a request.

The need for the services offered by the McKinney Hospital is real and urgent.

Nor does any person familiar with the situation deny the pressing need for major repair and rehabilitation of the hospital.

Mr. President, I respectfully urge in the strongest possible terms that the Senate act to restore the $2 million for this purpose as approved by the House.

It is my understanding that the modification is agreeable to the committee, and if so, I should like that it be made prior to action by the Senate on the chairman's motion. The modification would restore $2 million for repair, rehabilitation, and modernization work at the McKinney, Tex., Veterans' Hospital. In effect, it is simply a restoration of the language in the bill as it passed the House.

I thank the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], on behalf of himself and the junior Senator from Texas, to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendments will be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments, agreed to en bloc, including the one on page 32, beginning in line 2, which was amended and agreed to on motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, are as follows:

Under the heading "Title I—Independent Offices—Civil Service Commission", on page 2, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$29,000", and in line 20, after the word "amended", to strike out "$17,282,500" and insert "$17,532,500."

On page 2, line 25, after the numerals "1943", to strike out the comma and "or for the compensation or expenses of any member of a board of examiners (1) who has not made affidavit that he has not appeared in any agency proceeding within the preceding 2 years, and will not thereafter while a board member appear in any agency proceeding, as a party, or in behalf of a party to the proceeding, before an agency in which an applicant is employed who has been rated or will be rated by such member; or (2) who, after making such affidavit, has rated an applicant who at the time of the rating is employed by an agency before which the board member has appeared as a party, or in behalf of a party, within the preceding 2 years: *Provided*, That the definitions of 'agency', 'agency proceeding', and 'party' in section 2 of the Administrative Procedure Act shall apply to these terms as used herein."

On page 3, after line 14, to strike out:

"No part of appropriations herein shall be used to pay the compensation of officers and employees of the Civil Service Commission who allocate or reallocate supervisory positions in the classified civil service solely on the size of the group, section, bureau, or other organization unit, or on the number of subordinates supervised. References to size of the group, section, bureau, or other organization unit or the number of subordinates supervised may be given effect only to the extent warranted by the workload of such organization unit and then only in combination with other factors such as the kind, difficulty, and complexity of work supervised, the degree and scope of responsibility delegated to the supervisor, and the kind, degree, and value of the supervision actually exercised."

On page 4, line 12, after the word "organizations", to strike out "$450,000" and insert "$525,000."

On page 5, line 17, after "(5 U. S. C. ch. 14)", to strike out "$600,000,000" and insert "$440,438,000."

On page 5, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$186,700."

Under the heading "Federal Civil Defense Administration", on page 6, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$10,000", and in line 17, after the word "conclusive", to strike out "$15,560,000" and insert "$21,700,000."

On page 7, line 9, after the word "prescribe", to strike out "$42,000,000" and insert "$64,000,000."

On page 7, line 16, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$14,500,000."

On page 7, line 25, after the word "thereto", to strike out "$1,540,000" and insert "$6,000,000."

At the top of page 8, to strike out:

"No part of any appropriation in this act shall be available for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed specifically for the use of the Federal Civil Defense Administration."

Under the heading "Funds appropriated to the President—Disaster relief", on page 8, line 11, after the word "disasters", to strike out "$5,386,030" and insert "$6,000,000", and in line 12, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That not to exceed $6,000,000 shall be expended in any one State."

Under the heading "Federal Communications Commission", on page 8, line 25, after the word "travel", to strike out "$7,800,000" and insert "$7,828,000."

Under the heading "Federal Power Commission", on page 9, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "$5,200,000" and insert "$5,250,000", and in line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$325,000."

Under the heading "Federal Trade Commission", on page 9, at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "$227,000" and insert "$237,000", and in the same line, after the word "travel", to strike out "$5,400,000" and insert "$5,550,000."

Under the heading "General Services Administration", on page 11, line 7, after the word "travel", to strike out "$122,694,200" and insert "$128,084,500."

On page 12, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "$42,565,550" and insert "$42,638,000."

On page 13, line 16, after the words "exceed", strike out "$81,000" and insert "$160,000", and at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "$2,809,400" and insert "$2,959,400."

On page 14, line 9, after the word "travel", to strike out "$14,270,000" and insert "$14,770,000."

On page 14, line 21, to strike out "$6,818,650" and insert "$6,893,650."

On page 14, after line 21, to insert:

"Survey of Government records, records management, and disposal practices: For necessary expenses in connection with conducting surveys of the records of Federal agencies and of records management and

records disposal practices in Federal agencies, pursuant to section 505 (c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, $100,000."

On page 15, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,351,000", and in line 25, after the word "the", to strike out "purposes" and insert "purposes,".

On page 17, at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "$9,278,200" and insert "$9,802,550."

On page 18, after line 15, to strike out:

"During the current fiscal year, no part of any money appropriated in this or any other act shall be used during any quarter of such fiscal year to purchase within the continental limits of the United States typewriting machines (except bookkeeping and billing machines) at a price which exceeds 90 percent of the lowest net cash price, plus applicable Federal excise taxes, accorded the most-favored customer (other than the Government, the American National Red Cross, and the purchases of typewriting machines for educational purposes only) of the manufacturer of such machines during the 6-month period immediately preceding such quarter: *Provided,* That the purchase, utilization, and disposal of typewriting machines shall be performed in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended."

On page 19, after line 5, to strike out:

"The Administrator is authorized, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to place ten positions, in addition to those otherwise authorized, in grade GS–16 in the General Schedule established by said act, and the salary of the Comptroller shall be at the salary rate of grade GS–18 so long as such position is occupied by the present incumbent."

Under the heading "Housing and Home Finance Agency—Office of the Administrator", on page 19, line 22, after the word "Agency", to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$6,450,000."

On page 20, line 19, after the word "amended", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

On page 20, line 24, after "(40 U. S. C. 462)", to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$9,000,000."

Under the subhead "Public Housing Administration", on page 21, line 7, after the word "Administration", to strike out "$9,700,000" and insert "$10,700,000."

On page 21, line 13, after "(42 U. S. C. 1410)", to strike out "$90,000,000" and insert "$96,000,000."

Under the heading "Interstate Commerce Commission", on page 21, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "forty-five" and insert "sixty"; in line 22, after the word "and", to insert "not to exceed $1,049,000 for"; in line 23, after the word "travel", to strike out "$13,900,000" and insert "$14,610,108", and in line 24, after "(a)", to strike out "not less than $1,939,000 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety and locomotive inspection activities, and" and insert "not less than $1,230,178 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety activities and not less than $849,500 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection activities, and."

Under the heading "National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics," on page 22, line 24, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$61,475,000" and insert "$63,200,000"; and in line 25, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$600,000" and insert "$1,500,000."

On page 23, line 6, after the word "Committee", to strike out "$13,000,000" and insert "$15,000,000."

Under the heading "National Capital Housing Authority," on page 23, at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "$37,000" and insert "$39,000."

Under the heading "National Science Foundation," on page 24, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "$35,915,000" and insert "$41,300,000"; and in line 6, after the word "expended", to strike out the colon and *"Provided,* That of the foregoing amount not less than $9,500,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for high-school science and mathematics teachers."

On page 24, after line 9, to insert:

"NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the National Security Training Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of $50 per diem; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; $75,000."

Under the heading "Securities and Exchange Commission," on page 25, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$750" and insert "$1,500"; in line 5, after the word "law", to insert "purchase of one passenger motor vehicle;" and in line 8, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$5,700,000" and insert "$5,749,000."

Under the heading "Selective Service System," on page 25, line 15, after the word "of", to strike out "nineteen" and insert "thirty-eight"; in line 21, after the word "Specialists", to strike out "$28,442,000" and insert "$29,050,000"; and in the same line, after the word *"Provided",* to strike out "That of the foregoing amount $20,586,050 shall be available for registration, classification, and induction activities to local boards; *Provided further."*

On page 26, after line 4, to insert:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the officer of the Army now serving as Director of the Selective Service System shall, effective upon the day preceding his retirement, be considered to hold the grade of lieutenant general for all purposes, without regard to any limitations on the number of officers in that grade, and shall receive the pay and allowances of an officer of that grade and his length of service, and when retired under any provision of law shall be advanced on the retired list to such grade and shall receive the retired or retirement pay at the rate prescribed by law computed on the basis of the basic pay which he would receive if serving on active duty in such grade."

Under the heading "Veterans' Administration," on page 27, line 9, after the word "employees", to strike out "$162,118,260" and insert "$163,936,000"; in line 10, following the amendment just above stated, to strike out "of which not less than $17,640,042 shall be available for such expenses as are necessary for the loan-guaranty program", and in line 13, after the word "of", to strike out "twenty" and insert "fifteen."

On page 28, line 8, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$16,099,600" and insert "$16,453,000."

On page 32, line 2, after the word "expended", to strike out "$50,935,000" and insert "$51,635,000."

On page 32, line 12, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$4,447,000" and insert "$4,533,000."

Under the heading "Title II—Corporations—Federal Home Loan Bank Board," on page 36, line 24, after the word "of", to strike out "$978,400" and insert "$1,095,000", and on page 37, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$42,400" and insert "$51,500."

On page 38, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$532,000" and insert "$596,000."

Under the subhead "Housing and Home Finance Agency," on page 40, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$318,000" and insert "$418,000."

On page 41, at the beginning of line 2, strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,310,000", and at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "$7,900,000" and insert "$8,400,000."

On page 41, at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "$3,700,000" and insert "$3,850,000."

On page 43, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$11,550,000" and insert "$12,800,000", and in line 22, after the word "travel", to insert "purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131)."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, lines 23 and 24, it is proposed to insert "$14,797,196" in lieu of "$14,610,108"; on page 22, line 4, to strike out "and"; and on page 22, line 6, after the word "law", to insert the following: "and (c) $187,088 shall be available for salaries and travel and other expenses for 22 additional inspectors for the Bureau of Motor Carriers."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the committee has held long hearings on the work of the Interstate Commerce Commission with reference to the question of safety and both motor-carrier and railroad inspection. The appropriations have been inadequate for some years, and the committee saw fit to increase the number of safety inspectors so that they can handle more work than could be handled in times past.

In the field of motor carriers the growth of the industry has grown so rapidly that the inspectors have not been able to catch up.

The effect of this amendment would be to add $187,088 to the bill for the Bureau of Motor Carriers in the Interstate Commerce Commission. I consider this increase to be absolutely essential if this agency is to carry out its responsibility to the public in the field of motor safety, in the field of safety on our highways.

This $187,088 will provide for 22 additional safety inspectors. The bill as reported to the Senate allowed for a total of 78. This additional sum will bring the total force to 100.

Unless this amount is added there will be at least 12 field offices in the United States with no safety inspectors, and another 10 offices will be badly undermanned.

Since my committee marked up this bill new information has come to light which more than justifies the action I am requesting. Had this new information been fully available to the committee at the time we were marking up the bill I am certain this additional amount would have been in the bill when it came to the floor.

The new information to which I refer comes as a result of a nationwide safety check made by the Bureau of Motor Carriers.

I quote from a news release by ICC which presents a summary of their findings. The lead on the story reads: "ICC

road check finds defects in 90 percent of vehicles."

I read from the release:

The Bureau of Motor Carriers of the Interstate Commerce Commission announced today its nationwide road check of interstate motor vehicles showed that 7,021 vehicles or 90.8 percent of the 7,734 checked had one or more defects or deficiencies.

The 5-day check by 131 district supervisors and safety inspectors of the Bureau's field staff was made to obtain information for the commission on the extent of noncompliance with ICC safety regulations. Each vehicle was checked as to 58 possible violations.

In its preliminary findings, the bureau noted that the relatively small number of vehicles checked and the random method of selection did not provide a true cross-section of the estimated 1,150,000 interstate trucks.

The Bureau found, however, that the study developed valuable information as to leads for further investigation of carriers or classes of carriers which are permitting their trucks to operate on the highways in an unsafe condition or without proper regard for safety practices. It also provided information on which the Bureau may base future educational activities or punitive action.

Of the total inspected, 4,603 vehicles were operated by carriers holding ICC operating authority while 3,131 were operated by private or "exempt" carriers—under the so-called agricultural exemption—which are subject only to the Commission's safety and hours-of-service regulations.

Mr. President, the lives of people are involved. It is imperative that motor vehicles, subject to the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Motor Carriers, be in safe operating condition when they are on the highways.

I move the adoption of the amendment to add $187,088 to the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Since the committee marked up the independent offices appropriation bill the Senate has considered the Federal highway bill. In connection with that bill, I notice that if fatalities on our highways continue at the rate experienced in the first few months of 1956, probably 42,000 men, women, and children will lose their lives in traffic accidents this year. That is a ghastly total, which probably comes into better perspective when we think of it as 10 times the number of persons who were killed in the bombing of Pearl Harbor in December 1941.

The additional money requested by the chairman of the committee relates to only one facet, namely, motor carriers licensed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Notwithstanding that fact, it is a component in the overall safety picture. The insane death and accident toll on our highways simply cannot be ignored, because some day there will be real revulsion on the part of the American public. In prior years we have appropriated inadequate funds with which to carry on the work.

I have no objection to the amendment, and I shall be glad to have the proposal go to conference for final adjudication.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington a question or two. I ask, first, for information, whether this is the proper time at which to raise an appropriation question relative to an increase in the number of personnel for the Interstate Commerce Commission for policing the use of boxcars.

As the Senator from Washington knows, the committee has held rather extensive hearings with reference to the boxcar shortage, and the testimony showed very clearly that so-called service agents are in such short supply that in Portland, Oreg., for example, there is only one service agent acting for our State, and he has not been supplied with even a stenographer, so that he has to sit down to his typewriter and spend a great deal of time typing his own reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Thus, has little time for policing boxcars.

I am convinced that one of the major reasons for the shortage of boxcars is the gross inefficiency of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

If ever there was an independent agency of the Government which needed a shaking down or a shaking up, it is the Interstate Commerce Commission. Each year when a boxcar shortage occurs, and there arises the issue of getting an adequate number of service agents to police the distribution of boxcars, I get a little weary of having the Interstate Commerce Commission tell me, "Mr. Senator, we do not have enough help to do the job."

My reply has been, "Have you asked for the help, in the first place; and have you been denied the help after you have asked for it?"

I ask the Senator from Washington two questions: First, is this the place to raise the issue in regard to additional service agents for the Interstate Commerce Commission; and if it is, has the Interstate Commerce Commission asked for additional service agents? Second, what did the Senator's committee do about it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That matter was looked into by the committee. I feel as the Senator from Oregon feels about the situation, probably a little more keenly, because every year in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce we are confronted with the same situation.

Congress has supplied a tax incentive. The committee has brought railroad and Interstate Commerce Commission representatives before it. We have tried to do something to remedy the condition. But the result has been that there are fewer boxcars in operation today than there were when the matter first came to our attention.

The committee held hearings about 2 weeks ago on a bill which would give the Interstate Commerce Commission the authority to move the boxcars around with greater flexibility. I have learned from figures which have been supplied to me that we in the West feel the impact of this situation more than do the people in the East.

The cost of building a new, modern boxcar is about $8,000; and of a reefer, about $12,000. The demurrage rate now as between railroads is $2.40 a day. The president of the Northern Pacific Railroad, for instance, told me only a few weeks ago that he could not justify spending $8,000 of the railroad's money and getting back only $2.40 a day in rental.

The movement of freight cars from east to west runs in a ratio of about 60–40. The Pennsylvania, for instance, keeps on its line more cars of other railroads than it turns back to the western railroads. The same thing is true, I believe, of the New York Central and other large eastern roads.

So the committee has before it a bill which would allow the Interstate Commerce Commission to take some action to remedy that condition. I think the committee will act on the bill at its next session. What the Senator from Oregon has stated is correct. Another facet of the situation is the failure of the Interstate Commerce Commission to make sufficient car inspections. The committee added $165,000 to the Interstate Commerce Commission appropriation to provide for 20 additional car service agents. The senior Senator from Washington thought the Commission should have 30 agents. But the Interstate Commerce Commission took the position that it requires a little time to train such persons, and the Commission thought it could operate satisfactorily this year with 20 additional service agents. I do not know whether that number will be sufficient, but it will be a start; and for that purpose we have added $165,000 to the appropriation.

Mr. MORSE. I made a pretty fair investigation of this question myself. In my judgment, the argument of the Interstate Commerce Commission that they cannot use more than 20 additional agents is about as phony as are most of the arguments which have been made to us in connection with the boxcar shortage matter. The country would be in a better position with respect to the boxcar shortage if the Interstate Commerce Commission staff were not so honeycombed with former railroad employees. That is one aspect of the problem in connection with the boxcar shortage.

The shippers of the Nation have not been getting from the American railroads the cooperation they are entitled to receive; and in part the difficulty lies in the Interstate Commerce Commission, where too many of the personnel are heavily saturated with the railroad point of view rather than with the public point of view.

It is not true that trained personnel are not available to the Interstate Commrce Commission. Do not forget that during the war there were considerably more than 100 boxcar service agents throughout the country. I have gone into the matter sufficiently to satisfy myself that the agents are available to the Interstate Commerce Commission if the Commission will only employ persons who are not saturated with the railroad point of view, but who can be hired to represent the public point of view.

The Commission's own communications, in response to requests which have

been made to them in recent years to get more help in order to relieve the boxcar shortage, are replete with repetition after repetition of the statement that the difficulty is that the Commission has not had sufficient appropriations to enable it to employ an adequate number of persons to do the work.

If the Commission is asking for only 20 additional persons this year, let me say that that will not make a dent; it will not begin to solve the problem. I think this is a matter which calls for at least some discussion in conference.

May I ask the Senator from Washington if he would be willing to accept an amendment to increase the amount in the bill to equal the cost of 30 rather than 20 additional car service agents, to be made available to the Interstate Commerce Commission?

I would not speak so emphatically on this subject if I had not been engaged in this fight for several years on behalf of the shippers of my State, shoulder to shoulder with the Senators from Washington and the Senators from California, because those three Western States, particularly, have had to sustain great losses by reason of the failure of the railroads to provide an adequate number of boxcars.

I see on the floor the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. The shippers of his State have been in the same tight fix experienced by the shippers of the west coast, so far as the boxcar shortage is concerned.

I think this is the year to make the record so crystal clear to the Interstate Commerce Commission that never again will they give to a single Senator the alibi that they are not doing a better job of servicing the boxcar supply because they do not have the personnel.

I have asked them in numerous letters, "Did you ask for them? Did you request appropriations for them?" I have gone to the Senator's committee in the past and have found that the Commission had not begun to ask for appropriations in sufficient amounts to provide them with the number of agents they need.

I say most respectfully that an additional 20 are not enough when the whole Pacific area—Zone 25—today is being served by three service agents, and they are not supplied with even a stenographer to help them with their reports and other clerical work. That ought to serve as an example of why there is a boxcar shortage.

The Senator from Washington stated that the Congress had helped the railroads by establishing a tax amortization program. I am for that. I will vote for more of it if only the railroads will build more cars. But that is not what they have done. They have decreased the number of cars under the tax amortization program. While they have built new cars, they have taken out of operation old cars which ought to have had slight repairs made to them in order to keep them on the tracks.

The railroads admit this. They admit, when they are confronted with the question, that as a result of the tax amortization program, amounting to many millions of dollars, there are fewer boxcars in America today than there were when the program started.

I do not know why Senators, because of this condition, should have to take a beating year after year from irate shippers—and they have reason to be irate. But the Interstate Commerce Commission keeps passing the buck to us, for the correspondence which the shippers send us is to the effect that Congress did not give the Interstate Commerce Commission the personnel necessary to do a proper police job.

I say that the addition of 20 agents is not sufficient. I ask the Senator from Washington if he would be willing to take to conference an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Appropriation which would provide for 30 instead of 20 additional agents.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. In my section of the country a continuous boxcar shortage has existed ever since the close of the war. Conditions are no better today than they were 3 years or 5 years ago.

While we have a surplus of wheat, during most of the year our wheat cannot be shipped out, thereby causing our farmers to lose a large sum of money on the premiums they could have received on the top-quality wheat.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suppose the Senator from Washington can be said to be taking a beating, because day after day, for at least 10 days, I sat in the committee listening to testimony relating to this situation.

I thought the addition of 30 persons would be a good start. I am perfectly willing to add 30 to the bill. It will be necessary to have a conference with the House anyway. This matter is very vital to all of us.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I sympathize with those who are confronted with the problem of the boxcar shortage. When the Senator from Washington proposed an increase of 20 in the number of such employees——

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from New Hampshire thought I was going a little too high then, did he?

Mr. BRIDGES. I thought the Senator was going a good distance then. I thought we were making an excellent start when we agreed upon an increase of 20. But when the distinguished Senator from Oregon rose and proposed 10 more, he somewhat startled me, because I thought we were going a long way when we proposed 20.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We shall have to have a conference with the House, anyway. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will not oppose the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not intend to object. I was saying I thought we had made a major start when we provided 20 additional service agents. I thought a good enough job had been done so that next year it would not be necessary to ask for more.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to say, in support of the amendment, that we have an extraordinary situation on the Pacific coast. We are approximately 2,000 miles away from the center of population and the center of distribution of merchandise in the United States. Most of our forest products and agricultural products have to be shipped over half the width of the continent in order to be sold. That is an unusual condition. People in the South, in New England, and even in the Middle West, are not confronted with that problem. It does seem to me that anything which will enable the use of more freight cars will help our people in the West. It is extremely urgent that the problem be met. Many persons in our State have to send their products 2,000 miles to find a market for them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may add that our western railroads are penalized economically because of the impractical way the cars are moved about.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Of course, the whole transportation system of the Far West often is penalized. For instance, the 10 percent tax on freight transportation may not be very important to other areas of the country. But in the State of Oregon, and I am sure it is true in other Pacific Northwest States, the transportation tax on products amounts to actually more than the net return received by some farmers, when one considers the taxes paid, the cost of the land, and the cost of irrigation pumping, if it is arid land. The situation is critical. We have lumber operators and farmers in our State whose whole solvency is imperiled when we encounter a critical shortage of freight cars.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be taken to conference, with the understanding that the amendment has to do with the empoyment of more car service agents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Oregon proposing to amend the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is a separate amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has not acted on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered is an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Washington. My amendment simply changes the figure on page 21, line 23, from "$14,797,196" to "$14,879,696", for the purpose of adding 10 additional car-service agents to the 20 already added by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall certainly not object, I should like to say

that I do not concur in the sentiments uttered by my distinguished friend from Oregon with respect to the point of view of the personnel in the Interstate Commerce Commission. I think in the main they have served the country and the Government eminently well. I have served on the subcommittee on independent offices for years, indeed, I believe it is all of 18 years ago that I first encountered the appropriations and the requests for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

It should not be forgotten that, in connection with those requests, first they must go to the Budget Bureau. After the Budget Bureau makes its determination, the requests come to the Congress, and the figure so transmitted is the one on which Congress takes testimony. I have, in all of the 18 years, had no occasion to believe that the employees and the Commissioners of the Interstate Commerce Commission did not have a thoroughly public viewpoint, and that they did not undertake to do that which was in the interest of the public, and particularly in the interest of the shippers of the country.

They have a full understanding of the fact that in proportion as freight is moved, as commerce is generated, it is reflected in the tax receipts of the Treasury. They are not insensible of that fact. So I should not like to see them charged with an oblique view.

I remember, from earlier experiences, that they were practically starved in the appropriations for a good many items, and I think, as a matter of fact, the junior Senator from Illinois, who is now speaking, has on occasion used the surgeon's scalpel in order to cut back some of their appropriations. I still believe the Commission serves the country well, and that its viewpoint is one of essential public interest.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The important thing, in my judgment, is that the Senator from Illinois and I agree that we as Senators ought to do the best we can to supply a sufficient number of agents to service the business of the shippers. The Senator from Illinois and I may disagree on the kind of job the Interstate Commerce Commission is doing. I do not fully share his views with regard to that matter, but I am delighted to have the assistance and support of the Senator from Illinois in regard to the amendment. His assistance is always cherished.

In fairness to the RECORD, I think I should say the criticism I have made of the Interstate Commerce Commission in regard to boxcar policing is the result of information I have obtained from within the Commission itself, when members of the staff who have visited me have stated that the difficulty has arisen, at least in part, because of an attitude to see to it that the railroads get what they want rather than what the public ought to have.

Therefore it is important, when providing for personnel such as service agents, that those hired have not been previously in railroad employment. It does not follow that, in order to understand the problem of boxcar service, the agents must be persons who have formerly been employed by railroads.

Be that as it may, I daresay that if the Senator from Illinois will read the criticisms from shippers in my part of the country, and read the answers which the Interstate Commerce Commission has sent to them, his blood will boil when he interprets the replies as simply passing the buck to the Congress, and alibiing to the shippers that the reason why they do not get better boxcar service is that the Congress has not appropriated enough money for that purpose.

For these reasons the amendment ought to be taken to conference and there thoroughly discussed. I believe the 30 additional boxcar service agents will be less than the number needed to serve adequately the shippers of the country.

I respect the fact that the Senator from Illinois does not agree with my view of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Unfortunately I have not had too many happy experiences with the Interstate Commerce Commission affecting shippers in my part of the West.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Probably no Member of the Senate or of the House has not harassed—politely, of course—the members of the Commission in the peak shipping seasons, because of boxcar shortages. That statement applies to the Fruit Belt, the Potato Belt, the Cereal Grain Belt, the Corn Belt, and other areas. I know that over a long period of years I have contacted the Commission time and time again, in an attempt to get the necessary rolling stock so that perishables could be gotten to market. I think the Commission has done a good job under the circumstances. If the service can be improved by the addition of personnel, I am delighted to go along with the proposal.

I think the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] stated the case well when he said he thought we were making a substantial start when we added 20 new service agents; but I say, let us agree to the additional 10 sought by the Senator from Oregon. Then the amendment can be taken to conference, additional data can be obtained from the Commission, and we shall then be able to determine what ought to be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], on page 21, line 23.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in view of the adoption of the amendment as amended, it will be necessary, on page 21, line 23, to strike out the numeral "$1,049,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,085,000." That is the limitation on travel expenses. The amendment will not add to the cost of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to some legislative language on page 26 of the bill. It relates to the Selective Service System. Even though the language is legislative in character, the committee included it in the bill because the committee sought to express to a very distinguished public servant its appreciation for the long and faithful service he has rendered in a highly sensitive position. I refer to General Hershey, who for 16 years has been Director of the Selective Service System.

The committee thought it should follow the precedent of a pattern which was established many years ago, and should make provision for General Hershey, so long as he is the incumbent, to receive some additional retirement benefits.

Since this provision was written into the bill, I understand that an announcement will soon be made, and probably will care for this matter without having this provision included in the bill.

I yield now to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, in order that he may make the announcement.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the other Members of the Senate that I concur in the general objective of the provision. General Hershey has rendered long and distinguished service to the country in a very difficult role. I believe that service warrants his promotion as he reaches the retirement age and passes out of the active service.

As the Senator from Illinois has said, there is precedent for making a promotion in the way proposed, although it is not the usual way to make it.

On yesterday at the White House this matter was under discussion. This morning, at a conference in the Pentagon, the matter was also under discussion. I think I am at liberty to say that at the White House meeting the President authorized the statement I am making. This morning the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Brucker, authorized—although not in the specific words I shall use—a statement to the effect that it would be preferable to handle this matter in the manner in which promotions are usually handled.

I understand that if this provision is deleted from the bill, within the immediate future there will be forthcoming from the Department of the Army, to the White House, and from the White House to the Senate, a nomination. In fact, I understand that while I have been speaking the nomination from the President has been received here. I now read it:

THE WHITE HOUSE.

Nomination sent to the Senate on June 6, 1956:

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated

by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Lewis Blaine Hershey, O6530, United States Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Therefore, Mr. President, there is no need for me to speak further about the matter; the nomination is an actual fact.

Consequently, I suggest to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that the language of the committee amendment on page 26 be eliminated, and that the nomination be handled in the usual manner.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment: On page 26, strike out the language in lines 5 to 16, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is an agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I have known General Hershey for a long time. In the past 22 years I have known many administrators. I doubt that I have ever encountered any who knew his business so well and who knew so well the statutes under which he was operating, and who operated with such a firm and fair hand. I think it is only proper that we testify to the efficient services of General Hershey in one of the most sensitive spots in the Government. Mr. President, this advancement, with the additional retirement benefits, is a richly deserved honor for him.

I merely wished to make this additional statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say that personally, and in conjunction with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and other Senators, I suggested this language. I am glad the nomination has now been made, and that the matter has been handled in that way. I could not say whether the nomination would not have been made if we had not suggested this language. However, we have now served our purpose, and I think the honor to General Hershey is a well-deserved one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I wish to use 30 seconds to add my voice in expressing appreciation of the service General Hershey has rendered his country.

When I first came to Washington, I took up with General Hershey a number of problems. I have never found anyone in the Federal Government more understanding, more sympathetic, or more anxious to be of service than General Hershey. So I am delighted that he has been given this recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio, who has an amendment to submit.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, after line 8, it is proposed to insert: *"Provided,* That the construction of the hospital at the Wade Park site is to furnish not less than 800 G. M. and S. beds."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I took up this matter with the chairman of the subcommittee and its ranking minority member. I believe the amendment is satisfactory to them.

As I understand, it was intended to have the bill provide for 800 beds. In fact, in the House of Representatives it was the feeling that certainly the Cleveland area needs this consideration more than does any other area in the country—as has been testified to amply by experts in the medical profession.

I believe we are, by means of this amendment, merely taking out a little insurance. I hope the amendment will be taken to conference. I shall appreciate it very much if the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will accept the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall be glad to accept the amendment and take it to conference. As the Senator from Ohio has said, it relates to language already in the bill. So I think the matter can be worked out with the conferees on the part of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota, who wishes to submit an amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment: On page 15, line 3, strike out "$100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$200,000."

Mr. President, the amendment would restore the amount of the budget estimate.

Let me say that because of the conflict of committee work, it was not possible for me to be present at the meeting of the Appropriations Committee when this item was considered by it.

This amendment relates to the item for a survey of Government records, records management, and disposal practices, which constitute one of our major and most extensive problems. This work results in the compilation of documents and the saving of hundreds of millions of dollars. According to the Hoover report, in the first year this work would save up to $15 for every dollar spent on it, and thereafter the ratio would be approximately 50 to 1.

I think such work should continue, and I was sorry to see a cut made in the amount of the budget estimate.

I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am not inclined to disagree with the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota. The committee held rather long discussions regarding the value of this work. It is true that the General Services Administration's representatives testified regarding the matter, and there is before us a record to the effect that they feel they will save approximately $14 for every dollar that is spent on this work.

The increase called for by the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota is not a large one, when we consider the billions of dollars' worth of appropriations with which we are dealing.

I personally think this has been a good program. The House had some doubts about it. I do not know whether it included anything for this item; but I think the House struck it all out. So obviously we shall have a little trouble with our friends on the other side of the Capitol. I am perfectly willing to accept the figure of $200,000, which is the budget estimate, and see if we cannot convince the House conferees that this work should continue. The General Services Administration feels that it is a fine work.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared in support of my amendment.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YOUNG

Could I have been present as a member of the committee when the Independent Offices bill was considered, I would there have moved an amendment to increase from $100,000 to $200,000, the money available to GSA for its further promotion of the program to weed out more of the tremendous waste involved in the management of Government records, said by the Hoover Commission to be costing us $4 billion a year. I respectfully ask the committee to accept such an amendment now. It would only restore the budget estimate.

Two years ago we appropriated $300,000 for the initiation of this program to give GSA help in its program to fight these costs. The result of that expenditure is revealed by the printed hearings on the pending bill, from page 260 to 285. Included in these pages is a letter and papers submitted to the committee by our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Government Operations Committee, urging the continuation of the records management work. He has submitted with his letter a report on the subject by the staff director of his committee, along with a letter from the Administrator of GSA, which letter is found on page 278 of the hearings. A breakdown of the report on results of our earlier expenditure of $300,000 on that page, reveals that the money bought actual and immediate savings of about $15 for every dollar spent, and that once all the recommendations made were implemented the saving would be close to $50 for every dollar spent. I am advised that much of this annual saving is recurring, a saving coming each year as a result of this single expenditure.

I trust my amendment may win the approval of the committee and that there will be insistence upon holding the item in conference and making the full budget estimate available to GSA for the effective work it wishes to continue. Any thoughtful reading of the hearings on the subject seems to dictate enthusiastic approval of the full amount. Certainly the hearings constitute an overwhelming justification for continuation of these projects. Indeed, they would appear to justify larger appropriation and broadening of the approach by GSA with outside expert help.

This is a showing of accomplishment revealing that there are ways to spend money in Government to ends that actually save money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has an amendment to offer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 31, line 2, immediately before the period it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That payment received from Federal funds for a fellowship from the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Academy of Science, the National Institutes of Health, the United States Public Health Service, or any other agency of the Government shall not constitute duplication of benefits under section 232 (h) of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 for persons whose graduate studies were interrupted by service in the Armed Forces during the period beginning June 27, 1950, and ending February 1, 1955."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I must reserve a point of order on this amendment. I think it is legislation, and clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Minnesota explain his amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this amendment is a proviso such as is incorporated in bills of this type time after time.

The amendment would permit those who, because of unusual talents, have been granted fellowships or scholarships for postgraduate study, to retain their privileges and rights under the GI benefit program. If a student goes to a college or university under the provisions of the GI bill of rights he is entitled to certain allowances as a matter of right and law. However, if the same veteran is given a scholarship for graduate study, a scholarship based upon the merit or quality of his basic background and intelligence, he is denied the opportunity to receive benefits under the existing veterans laws.

More succinctly, this amendment would have the effect of permitting graduate students whose graduate studies were interrupted by military service during the Korean conflict and who are entitled to education allowances under Public Law 550, 82d Congress, the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, to receive payment from Federal funds for a graduate fellowship in any of the several Federal fellowship programs. Among these programs are those of the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Academy of Science, the National Institutes of Health, and the United States Public Health Service.

I offer this amendment because the law, as it now reads, penalizes some of the most brilliant of our young scientists and engineers who are undergoing graduate training today.

The shortage of scientific and engineering personnel has now reached crucial proportions. There are many proposals before the Congress to deal with the problem, and I again want to express my deep interest in these proposals. By comparison with the Soviet Union's program of training such personnel, our own program is dangerously lagging.

This amendment, Mr. President, offers a small and partial, but nevertheless real and immediate, solution to the problem of this growing shortage of scientific personnel.

Furthermore, this amendment would remove a serious injustice to certain young men whose graduate studies were interrupted by military service during the Korean conflict.

For example, let me cite the case of a young man of my acquaintance, in Minnesota, who has been forced to relinquish his educational allowances under Public Law 550 because of his acceptance of a research fellowship from the Public Health Service. This young man, like so many other graduate students whose careers were interrupted by military service between 1950 and 1955, is married and has children—a burden which is exceedingly difficult to carry through graduate school.

This young man has won his fellowship because he is a brilliant student. He is a promising scientist. Yet because of his talent, because the Federal Government sees in him the possibility of important research on problems of public health, he and his family are forced to exist on a far smaller income than they would have had if he had taken other employment.

This young man could have chosen work as a shoe salesman or a ribbon clerk or any number of perfectly good jobs which carry no research responsibilities and contribute nothing to the advance of science. In each case he could have retained his GI benefits.

Mr. President, I ask whether this is either just or intelligent. So far as I am concerned, to deprive a young man whose brilliance is first rewarded by a Federal research fellowship and then penalized by removal of his GI benefits, simply does not make sense.

How many other cases like this exist, I do not know. Presumably they are relatively few. The category is rather narrow—graduate students whose graduate studies were interrupted by military service between 1950 and 1955. Yet by this amendment we have the opportunity to correct a hardship and to right an injustice. We have an opportunity to encourage, rather than discourage, the development of at least one group of promising young scientists.

I am confident that there must be hundreds of such cases. The situation boils down to this: If the Government of the United States sees in a man great qualities and promise in the field of research and science, and he is given a Federal research scholarship, he loses all his GI benefits. Yet he could take a job in private industry, as a research student or as a scientist, and still retain his GI benefits. I am sure there must be a sense of justice adequate to meet this situation. It seems to me that the place to meet it is in the pending bill. That is why I have offered the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that I am thoroughly in sympathy with what he is trying to accomplish in this connection. However, I must say to him that the proposed amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill, and that it is subject, I believe, to a point of order.

I would be willing to take the amendment to conference. I am afraid that the House might insist on taking it out of the appropriation bill, but it would at least highlight the situation. No one is more interested in the subject than I am, because I was the author of the Science Foundation legislation. I know that in some cases men who are brilliant enough to receive scholarships become pinched.

If the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has no objection, we might discuss the amendment in conference, and it might lead to a modification of the veterans legislation which would take care of the injustice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should greatly appreciate it if that were done, even if it were done only by way of highlighting what I consider to be a gross inequity in the law. Whether or not an agreement could be reached on the amendment in conference may be problematical. However, at least something should be done for the long-term future. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have no doubt that injustices such as those described by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota arise from time to time. I can clearly see the injustice in the case he cites. However, we have had no testimony on this subject. There is no way of determining how many persons may be involved. Hundreds of thousands of veterans have had the benefit of the GI Assistance Act. We have not the slightest information as to the number of persons who might be affected, or the degree to which they might be affected. Consequently the amendment enters an undefined field, which should be legislatively explored.

I quite agree that something should be done; but this is not the place to do it, because it involves a question of policy, which has no proper place in an appropriation bill.

Reluctant as I am, and distressed as I always am when I depart from the footsteps of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Washington, I must renew my point of order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator from Illinois will yield while the Senator from Minnesota is present, let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that as a result of discussing this question in the conference, we might, in the report, call attention to the situation and call upon the Veterans Bureau to bring the facts before us. Then we could correct the situation legislatively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). The present occupant of the chair regrets that the amendment is not in order. He would personally

favor it if the parliamentary situation were such that it could be considered. However, the amendment is clearly legislation. It would change the existing law. Under paragraph 4 of rule XVI, the Chair regrets that he must sustain the point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota understands the ruling of the Chair, and he will subsequently offer the amendment in the form of new legislation, so that it may receive proper consideration. I hope that the committee in its report on the overall bill will allude to this injustice and thereby highlight it, so that we may get further consideration of the subject.

I should like to call to the attention of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee language in the pending bill at page 10, lines 4, 5, and 6. At that place in the bill it is provided: *"Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for a statistical analysis of the consumer's dollar."

That language relates to the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission.

Is it not correct that this provision is legislation on an appropriation bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct that it is legislation. However, that language was placed in the bill by the House. Therefore it is not subject to a point of order in the Senate. If it had been inserted by the Senate committee, it would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then I offer an amendment to strike from the bill the language I have read on page 10, beginning on line 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have just a word or two to say on the amendment. If anything is necessary today in terms of statistical analysis by the Federal Government, it is an objective and responsible statistical analysis of the consumer's dollar.

We heard a great deal about the consumer's dollar during the debate on the farm bill, and we heard a great deal about the problems the American farm producer faces. We heard the charge made that his problem was primarily due to labor costs. We heard rebuttal from labor to the effect that that was not true. Then we heard the statement from industry that industry was not responsible.

It is about time the Government of the United States discharged its responsibility by providing an economic analysis and showing what is happening to the consumer's dollar, and how the consumer's dollar is being divided.

It will be recalled that the Federal Trade Commission is authorized to make such an analysis, provided that there is not a specific limitation placed on the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission.

This subject was brought before us some years ago and was debated very vigorously in the Senate. By a very close vote, as I recall, the language contained in the bill was sustained. Since that time, however, there has been a considerable amount of rethinking about the subject. Certainly, in the light of what has been happening in terms of inflation and in terms of our agricultural problems, there is a great need for a study of the consumer's dollar.

If the language had been inserted by the Senate committee, it would be interpreted as legislation on an appropriation bill and as not germane. Merely because the language I have referred to was inserted in the bill by the House is no reason why we should let it stand. Therefore, I offer my amendment to strike that language from the bill, because it should not be a part of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for some words of commendation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am always glad to yield for such a purpose. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. There are many words of commendation I could say to the chairman and to the other members of the subcommittee.

I went over the bill very carefully. I wish to say particularly that there are many provisions of the bill which deserve special credit, but special testimonial statements on the bill would take too much time today. Therefore, I will say that it is a source of great satisfaction to me to learn that the Subcommittee on the Independent Offices Appropriation Bill and the Committee on Appropriations have restored in H. R. 9739 the figure requested for the National Science Foundation in the President's budget, $41,300,000. The amount approved by the House of Representatives was $35,915,000, and was $5 million less than the figure requested, and I am personally most happy that the Senate committee has restored the full amount.

The problem of the shortage of scientists and engineers has been a problem which I have frequently discussed on the Senate floor. It was my concern with that problem which originally led me to be particularly interested in the appropriations this year for the National Science Foundation. I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in my remarks a letter that I sent to Dr. Alan T. Waterman, the Director of the National Science Foundation, in which I requested the compilation of the accomplishments of that Foundation.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On that point I wish to say that every member of the committee is concerned by the lack of scientists in this country. In the past few months it has become apparent that Russia is moving far ahead of us in many fields. The National Science Foundation, as the Senator well knows, makes awards mainly of graduate fellowships in connection with projects which require men who have been trained for a long time and who are doing fine work.

The House reduction would not allow the Foundation to go ahead with some of the projects.

We also get down to the real problem of basic scientists and teachers. We feel that the National Science Foundation should award fellowships to help persons become teachers of science. I am almost of the opinion that in order to develop basic scientists we will first have to do something about getting them to go to school. I believe the best way to do that is to give parents who have children who are pursuing their education in these fields an exemption in their income taxes. I believe it would pay us in the long run to do so. I hope the House will accept our figures.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thoroughly agree with the figures the committee has inserted. The Senator from Washington was the original sponsor of the National Science Foundation, and has had an abiding interest in it.

I have asked unanimous consent that my letter to Dr. Waterman, the Director of the National Science Foundation, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

JANUARY 6, 1956.

Dr. ALAN T. WATERMAN,
Director, National Science Foundation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. WATERMAN: The problem of the shortage of scientists and engineers concerns me as I am sure it does you. Its complexity is such—extending as it does all the way back to our secondary schools—that I think it really can be dealt wtih only in a large way. For that reason I suggested to the President a few months ago that the appointment of a Presidential commission might be the best approach to the problem.

However, I would like to do whatever can be done in a legislative way to alleviate the shortage. If you have any recommendations I would be most interested in learning of them.

There is one other matter which I have been thinking of for some time; I would like to place in the RECORD a compilation of all the accomplishments, so far, of the National Science Foundation. If this is agreeable, I wonder if you could have someone on your staff prepare such a report for me. There is no hurry, of course, though it might be helpful if I could have it before the time when appropriations for the Foundation are being considered. Use your best judgment on what should be included. I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress a full account of the fine work the National Science Foundation has been doing over the years.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Dr. Waterman replied to my letter on January 16, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that his reply be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1956.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Thank you for your letter of January 6 in which you refer to the shortage of scientists and engineers and indicate that you would like to place in the RECORD a compilation of the accomplishments of the National Science Foundation.

We shall develop a statement of the kind you suggest and send it to you shortly. If we have any recommendations with respect to legislation, we shall also certainly keep in mind your kind offer of assistance.

We are sincerely grateful for your understanding and continuing support of science and the National Science Foundation.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN T. WATERMAN,
Director.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on April 11, 1956, Dr. Waterman wrote me again, enclosing a copy of a letter written by him to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the independent offices appropriation bill, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I ask unanimous consent that the copy of the letter be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1956.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee in Charge of the Independent Offices Appropriation Bill, 1957,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: In reply to your letter of March 2, 1956, the National Science Foundation requests the following changes to H. R. 9739 entitled, "Independent Offices Appropriation Bill, 1957":

Page 23, line 6, delete "$35,915,000"; insert "$41,300,000", the amount contained in the President's budget.

Lines 6–10, delete that portion which reads: *"Provided,* That of the foregoing amount not less than $9,500,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection wtih a program of supplementary training for high school science and mathematics teachers."

The total appropriation approved by the House is $5,385,000 less than the amount recommended for the Foundation in the President's budget. As indicated by the Committee Report No. 1847, the House strongly endorsed the Foundation's program for the training of high school science teachers, which is one part of the education in the sciences program, and increased this item over the amount requested in the budget.

The net reduction in the appropriation was apparently accomplished by increasing that part of the education in the sciences program related to the training of high school science teachers by $5,650,000; and by reducing the allowances for other programs of education in the sciences by $1,025,000, the activity "National science policy studies" by $50,000, the subactivity "Grants for research facilities" by $3,500,000, and the subactivity "Grants for research projects" by $6,460,000.

The amount, $41,300,000, contained in the President's budget provided for a balanced program directed to the several problem areas in science now confronting the Nation. This should be noted in considering the House action, i. e., the programs of the Foundation are all closely related and are directed to the common objective of improving the national position in science. Although some parts of the total problem may have become more urgent than others, we believe it is imperative to maintain a balanced program that will permit us to move forward in all essential areas to the maximum extent that our resources—both manpower and money—will permit.

Progress in science depends in the long run on the supply of trained scientists; on a strong national effort in basic research; and on the availability of necessary research facilities. The training of an adequate supply of competent scientists for the immediate future depends to a considerable extent upon the opportunities available to younger scientists to continue their studies through graduate school and by participation in research projects. In the long run, for the maintenance of an adequate level of research, and for the training of a sufficient number of skilled scientists to fill our technological needs, we must depend upon a full supply of competent science teachers in our high schools and colleges. More able college teachers are needed to train more able high school teachers. Together they provide the stimulation and the quality of instruction necessary not only to improve the scientific education of our students, but also to motivate more students of high ability to pursue careers in science.

SPECIFIC EFFECT OF HOUSE ACTION

Education in the sciences

The Foundation's program, "Education in the sciences," is directed to the long-range problem of increasing our scientific and technical manpower both in numbers and in competence. The program is divided into three principal subprograms:

1. Strengthening present science teachers (p. 94 of the budget justification): This program is directed to improving the quality of science teaching through providing year-long training for high school teachers at universities and through summer institutes for both school and college teachers. The House bill apparently limits such training to high school teachers.

2. The improvement of science curricula (p. 99 of the budget justification): The provision of improved courses of study which will contribute to better teaching is fundamental to the problem of securing more highly competent scientists and science teachers. The Foundation proposes to attain this objective through such means as the development of science curricula, subject matter syllabi, and supplementary teaching aids for science teachers.

3. Motivation of able students to consider careers in science and science teaching (p. 104 of the budget justification): This program is directed toward identifying young people with aptitudes for science and encouraging them to study science either for careers in research or in teaching. Included in this program are programs for the support of student participation in science activities and provision for distinguished scientists to serve as visiting lecturers at schools and colleges.

The limitation proposed in the House bill requires that $9.5 million of the appropriation be expended for the supplemental training of high school science teachers only as compared with the $3,850,000 contained in the President's budget for such training of high school and college teachers. Furthermore, the President's budget contained $1,525,000 for the two other subprograms of education in the sciences; the House action would apparently allow only $500,000, a reduction of $1,025,000.

The Foundation concurs with the House committee that there is need for accelerating the high school science teacher training program. We believe, however, that if we are to be successful in attacking the serious scientific manpower problem now confronting the Nation, we must move ahead with vigor in several areas simultaneously. If we are to assure that the Nation is adequately supplied with capable scientific personnel, efforts to improve the quality of science teachers at the high school level alone are not sufficient. We must insure that the quality of science teaching in our colleges will be adequate to develop further the potentialities of the high school students who will be the scientists and science teachers of tomorrow. We must develop and support programs which will give to the teachers better curricula, and more effective teaching aids. We must not only stimulate our present teachers to become better teachers of science, we must also increase the number of science teachers for the future. Therefore, we must encourage a larger number of our most capable youth to enter science as a career both in teaching and in research. Finally, we must insure that a young research scientist, on completing his academic work, is provided with the opportunity and the necessary tools to use his talents for the conduct of research.

The net effect of the limitation in the House bill is to concentrate our effort on the supplementary training of secondary school science teachers. Important as this is, it is strongly felt that the long-range problem of increasing our scientific manpower potential requires more attention also upon the other aspects just discussed.

Grants for support of research projects (p. 49 of the budget justification)

The programs carried on under this subactivity make two significant contributions to the scientific potential of our Nation through the support of individual research projects:

1. The support of basic research projects provides the means for increasing the fundamental knowledge which underlies our technology and, therefore, the national security, welfare, and economy.

2. It also provides advanced training in science for students who have already chosen science as a career, thereby providing prompt increase in our output of scientific manpower.

The reduction proposed by the House would eliminate the support of approximately 500 individual basic research projects and the advanced training of approximately 1,200 graduate students in science and engineering.

Grants for support of research facilities (p. 59 of the budget justification)

The President's budget requested $7 million for the construction and support of research facilities, including the following: $3,500,000 for the construction of a radio astronomy facility; $1,900,000 to partially support the procurement by universities of nuclear reactors and electronic computers; $600,000 for studies preliminary to the construction of a modern optical astronomical observatory; and $1 million for the support of biological field research facilities. The House recommended that the amount be reduced to $3,500,000 for all facilities. The report further stated that the committee "expects that the Foundation will not start a project unless it has all the funds available that are required for it to be completed."

Although the report stated that "the committee does not want to specify approval as to specific projects" the net effect of the language would, for example, prevent the Foundation from beginning construction of the radio astronomy facility. Restoration of the total amount of the appropriation request would permit the Foundation to proceed with the research facilities requested and urgently needed for the advancement of science and for the training of additional scientists.

National science policy studies (p. 10 of the budget justification)

The House report states "the budget estimate includes $800,000 for making national science policy studies. The committee reduced the item by $50,000, which is indeed a very small amount and it will expect the agency to greatly reduce this item next year."

While the reduction recommended by the House is small, the Foundation is seriously concerned that the House committee expects that these studies be greatly reduced in future years. The studies carried out under

this activity provide necessary factual information and analyses for the determination of policies with respect to the role of the Federal Government in science.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Foundation strongly recommends that—

(1) the appropriation be restored to the $41,300,000 requested in the President's budget; and

(2) the limitation providing "that not less than $9,500,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for high school science and mathematics teachers" be eliminated.

In making these recommendations, the Foundation does not propose that each item discussed above be restored to the specific amount requested in the President's budget. Approval of these two recommendations will enable the Foundation to conform to the spirit of the House action and the committee recommendations and will provide the balance and flexibility necessary for the development and conduct of well-balanced programs in all areas important to the national scientific effort.

It is requested that the Foundation be granted a hearing before your subcommittee to discuss these matters in greater detail.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN T. WATERMAN,
Director.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Finally, Mr. President, the National Science Foundation in answer to my request has prepared an excellent summary of its record to date. This summary is so important and helpful to the growing number of people in the Senate and in the country who are interested in the activities of the Foundation, that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks, together with the accompanying letter from Dr. Waterman.

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

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., April 11, 1956.

The Honorable HUBERT M. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Enclosed is a statement on the activities of the National Science Foundation which you suggested that we send you some weeks ago. You indicated that there was no hurry about it but that it might be helpful if you could have it before the time when our appropriations are being considered.

As you may know, the House increased our appropriation this year to $35,915,000 from last year's figure of $16 million. This is still $5 million less, however, than the figure requested for the National Science Foundation in the President's budget—which we are asking the Senate to restore. Enclosed is a copy of our letter on the subject to Senator MAGNUSON.

I should like to say again that we are really grateful to you for your interest in the program of the Foundation.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN T. WATERMAN,
Director.

ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

INTRODUCTION

Dr. Vannevar Bush, wartime Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, recommended in 1945 the establishment of a National Science Foundation as the essential part of an action program to meet the crisis in scientific research existing at the end of World War II. He said, in part, in his report entitled "Science: The Endless Frontier":

"The Government should accept new responsibilities for promoting the flow of new scientific knowledge and the development of scientific talent in our youth. These responsibilities are the proper concern of the Government, for they vitally affect our health, our jobs, and our national security. It is in keeping also with basic United States policy that the Government should foster the opening of new frontiers, and this is the modern way to do it. For many years the Government has wisely supported research in the agricultural colleges, and the benefits have been great. The time has come when such support should be extended to other fields.

"The effective discharge of these new responsibilities will require the full attention of some overall agency devoted to that purpose. There is not now in the permanent governmental structure receiving its funds from Congress an agency adapted to supplementing the support of basic research in the colleges, universities, and research institutes, both in medicine and the natural sciences, adapted to supporting research on new weapons for both services, or adapted to administering a program of science scholarships and fellowships.

"Therefore, I recommend that a new agency for these purposes be established. Such an agency should be composed of persons of broad interest and experience, having an understanding of the peculiarities of scientific research and scientific education. It should have stability of funds so that long-range programs may be undertaken. It should recognize that freedom of inquiry must be preserved and should leave internal control of policy, personnel, and the method and scope of research to the institutions in which it is carried. It should be fully responsible to the President and through him to the Congress for its program."

The new agency recommended by Dr. Bush was established by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950.

During the 5-year period when legislation concerning the Foundation was being considered by Congress, support of basic research was undertaken by such agencies as the Office of Naval Research, the National Institutes of Health, and the Atomic Energy Commission. Outbreak of the Korean war in 1950 resulted in increased emphasis upon applied research and end-item development with a relative decrease in emphasis on basic research. Increased support for basic research now being provided by the National Science Foundation is tending to decrease this imbalance in the Nation's scientific effort. Other activities of the Foundation, described below, are proceeding in consonance with the objectives outlined by Dr. Bush and the functions outlined in the National Science Foundation Act of 1950.

Activities of the National Science Foundation

"To develop a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences:"

1. From its inception, the Foundation has had the purpose of planning and administering its research-grant program in such a way as to stimulate the Nation's production of significant scientific knowledge and at the same time to expand the Nation's potential scientific resources. The scientific merit of proposed research projects is critically evaluated in each case by outstanding scientists in the appropriate field. On the basis of these evaluations and recommendations of the Foundation staff, final selection of those proposals to be supported within limits of available funds must be approved by the National Science Board—the Foundation's 24-member governing body. The primary concern of the Foundation is that granted funds be used in a manner which will make maximum contribution to the progress of science.

By this careful review process critical and impartial judgment is thus brought to bear on all proposals for research support—assurance that Foundation funds are directed toward support of the broad requirements of the Nation's economy, welfare, and defenses. Some promising areas of basic research which meet these requirements and which the Foundation has supported during fiscal years 1952–55 are: Radio astronomy, enabling scientists to observe and measure phenomena of outer space, to "see" by means of radio waves what has heretofore not been visible with optical telescopes; new sources of power, energy from the atom nucleus, supplementing the basic research of the Atomic Energy Commission, and from the sun, each of which, when probed more deeply by research in basic science, may yield better sources of heat and power; photosynthesis, basic research into the problem of how plants convert the energy of sunlight to food and fuel, out of which may derive vast benefits for mankind; solid-state research, the mechanical properties of solids, what holds the atoms together in a solid, and the electrical and magnetic properties of solids, high-speed computation, present-day advances in several science disciplines have outdistanced methods of calculation, calling urgently for wider accessibility of the modern, but costly, facilities in high-speed computation; geochemistry, with its promise of new methods of detecting ore deposits through research in the fluids and solutions of matter during geologic processes; geophysical research, using the world as an observing laboratory as in the international geophysical year program. Because none can predict where such promising areas of research may push into the advancing frontier of science, the Foundation supports a comprehensive program of grants for basic research across the science spectrum in the best interests of the Nation's economy, welfare, and defense.

2. Each year the Foundation sponsors scientific conferences in special areas of unusual interest. During the 1952–55 period the Foundation helped underwrite more than 50 such conferences. Proceedings and papers are usually published at the conclusion of the conference so that the value of the proceedings to scientists extends well beyond the limits of the conference itself.

A complete listing of all Foundation-sponsored conferences would be impractical, but the following titles indicate their scope: Astronomical Research and Photoelectric Techniques, High-Energy Physics, Methods of Determination of Steroids, Utilization of Solar Energy, Photosynthesis, Cosmic Rays, Low Temperature Physics and Chemistry, International Arid Lands Symposium, Man's Role in Changing the Face of the Earth, Mechanics in Engineering Education, Radio Astronomy, Mathematical Tables, Evolution of Behavior, Molecular Quantum Mechanics, Problems in Human Communication and Control.

Widely diversified subject matter is indicated by the foregoing titles, covering many areas of physical and life sciences. Often attracted to the conferences were leading scientists of other countries who shared their knowledge with associates in the United States.

3. While vigorously supporting efforts of investigators to dig the known out of the unknown, the Foundation seeks more precise knowledge about the state of scientific activities as a whole in order to obtain intelligent data on the nature and amount of national resources expended in scientific pursuits. Such information is best acquired through the cooperation of panels and committees of experts representative of each field, and often subfield, of a scientific discipline. Four fields of science are currently more formally being surveyed with support

by the Foundation—physiology, psychology, mathematics and demography. In physiology, the survey is analyzing data from 3,500 American physiologists with reference to their educational, social, economic and geographical background; their activities, division of time among research, teaching and administration; personal and motivational factors; in psychology, the survey seeks to evaluate the status of psychological knowledge and an analysis of occupations in psychology; in mathematics, the survey seeks data on research potential and training in the field as a whole; and in demography, the basic objective of the survey is to determine gaps and deficiencies in the fund of knowledge and demography, its theory and methodology, and in its resources and facilities for research and training. Similar comprehensive studies are being considered in other scientific disciplines, complementing and supplementing the above-described conferences in special areas of unusual interest.

4. Since its establishment, the Foundation has been concerned with problems of national science policy, especially the role of the Federal Government in support of science. In attempting to carry out this responsibility, it found that most basic data essential to sound planning were not available. The Foundation, therefore, began the painstaking task of accumulating necessary data concerning the national effort in scientific research and development. Industry, educational institutions, private foundations and laboratories, and Federal agencies supporting research all cooperate in these studies. The studies will provide a firm basis for policy recommendations to strengthen the national scientific effort and furnish guidance to define the responsibilities of Government in the conduct and support of research.

For example, Federal Funds for Science, published annually, provides detailed information on the extent of Government-sponsored scientific research and development, and shows important trends in the level and direction of Federal expenditures for science.

Recently published, the study, Science and Engineering in American Industry, shows that private industry's annual budget for research and development is close to $4 billion ($3.7), and enabled the Foundation, on the basis of accumulated data, to state clearly that total United States expenditure for research and development is more than $5 billion—nearly half of which is supported by the Federal Government.

The Foundation's just-published study, Scientific Research Expenditures in the Larger Private Foundations, covering the 77 largest privately endowed foundations, removed guesswork from assumptions about the amount of support such foundations extend for scientific research. The study indicates that the percentage of support from this source for basic scientific research has declined steadily for the years studied—1939, 1946 and 1953. Medical sciences and social sciences are the fields of first interest to private foundations, at the present time.

Similar fact-finding studies, many nearing completion, will provide a solid base on which the Foundation can build recommendations for future action. These include (a) a report on organization of the Federal Government for scientific activities showing the structure of Federal units and functions performed in science; (b) a survey of Government-university relationships analyzing sources of support for research at colleges and universities and the nature of such research; (c) a survey of research by trade associations and similar organizations; (d) a survey of research at nonprofit institutes and commercial laboratories; (e) a survey of research supported by selected State governments; (f) a survey of the financial support of graduate students and Federal stipends to undergraduate and graduate students in the sciences; (g) a survey of Federal scientific manpower; and (h) a history of science in the Federal Government.

5. The Foundation was asked by the Bureau of the Budget to make a study of indirect costs practices among Federal agencies on research grants and contracts at universities and colleges and to recommend a uniform Government policy. The Foundation recommended to the Bureau of the Budget as follows:

"The National Science Foundation recommends that in supporting research in institutions of higher learning, agencies of the Federal Government, if requested, reimburse these institutions for those indirect costs of research supported."

6. The Foundation enunciated the principle that in making grants for unclassified basic research it will not pass judgment on the loyalty of an individual on the basis of unsupported charges but will make grants upon the judgment of scientists having a working knowledge of his experience, competence, and integrity. The Foundation, however, will not knowingly make a grant in support of the research of one who is an avowed Communist, or anyone established as being a Communist by a judicial proceeding, or anyone who avowedly advocates change in the United States Government by other than constitutional means, or one who has been convicted of sabotage, espionage, sedition, or a similar crime involving the Nation's security.

"To support basic scientific research and to appraise the impact of research upon industrial development and the general welfare":

7. All scientific advances are ultimately dependent on basic research. The Foundation awards grants to support the work of qualified scientists who desire to engage in such research. Grants are given only on the basis of recommendations by advisory panels of specialists in the various scientific fields.

During the period 1952 through 1955, the Foundation made 1,232 grants in the amount of $14.3 million for the support of basic scientific research. These grants helped able scientists in over 250 American colleges and universities to explore new frontiers in the biological, medical, mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences. Requests for support of research submitted to the Foundation during this period totaled more than $66 million. During fiscal year 1956, more than $10 million will be granted in support of about 900 additional projects for basic research. The President's budget for 1957 included $22.8 million to support of this program by the Foundation in fiscal year 1957.

8. In keeping with the Foundation's responsibility for encouraging and stimulating development of the Nation's scientific resources it should be noted that funds in the average Foundation grant support 1 or 2 graduate student research assistants. This support enables young men and women, who might not otherwise have the opportunity, to make their own contribution to research, to become trained in ways of research under direction of experienced research leaders, and to continue their formal academic training. This continuing and immediate contribution by the grants program to the Nation's pool of highly trained scientific talent is of utmost importance to the Nation's future scientific strength. Thus, in addition to contributing to the Nation's store of scientific knowledge, the grants program also provides opportunities to an estimated three to four thousand graduate science students to participate as assistants to mature research investigators and to further their academic training.

"At the request of the Secretary of Defense, to support specific defense research activities":

9. During the current fiscal year, the Office of Naval Research has transferred funds to the Foundation for support of basic research in areas of science in which the two agencies are mutually concerned.

"To award scholarships and graduate fellowships in the sciences":

10. To encourage gifted science students to pursue their studies on a full-time basis, the Foundation during its first 5 years of operation awarded 2,456 predoctoral fellowships and 249 postdoctoral fellowships in the sciences at a cost of approximately $6.5 million. The Foundation awarded over 900 fellowships in fiscal year 1956. Every State in the Nation is represented among fellows of the Foundation, selected by rating panels of leading American scientists. Candidates are judged on the basis of (1) test scores on general ability, scientific aptitude, and competence in their science field, (2) previous scholastic record, and (3) confidential reports and evaluations from the applicant's faculty advisers. Fields of science represented among the fellows are the life sciences, chemistry, engineering, earth sciences, mathematics, and physics, and astronomy. Average annual costs to the Foundation for predoctoral fellows are about $2,500 per fellow, and for postdoctorals, $4,180. In addition to the stipend to the fellow, the award covers tuition costs and allowance for dependents. These fellowships permit the fellow to study for an academic year at the institution of his choice. In addition to these programs, the Foundation has instituted fellowship programs for senior postdoctoral scientists, and will institute fellowships for college science faculty members.

"To foster the exchange of scientific information":

11. Progress in science research is impeded to the extent that lines of communication among scientists are clogged. Investigators in a particular field of science must have access to the research of their associates. Meanwhile, published material in the sciences is reaching large proportions while publication costs are constantly climbing. As a remedial measure, the Foundation has for several years supported scientific publications needing emergency help over difficult periods as they attempted to increase reserves and become self-supporting. It also supports worthwhile research which promises improved methods for processing, storing, retrieving, and providing scientific information.

In addition, the Foundation has sought to open communication channels among scientists by giving support (1) to the improvement of bibliographic tools, (2) to the Library of Congress for preparation and publication of comprehensive lists of United States and Russian scientific serial publications, (3) to the American Institute of Physics for translating and publishing an English edition of the Russian Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics, and (4) to investigators working on the mechanization of information searching and machine translations.

12. In cooperation with the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, the Foundation published in 1955 Nicholas DeWitt's definitive study, Soviet Professional Manpower. The book pointed up the fact that the Soviet Union is graduating almost twice as many technical specialists in certain fields as the United States—682,000 professionals in the engineering field between 1928 and 1954 as against 480,000 in the United States during roughly the same period. While serving to focus nationwide attention on the capabilities of other nations in science and technology, the book drew attention as well to domestic problems concerned with identifying and training persons with special aptitudes for careers in science and technology.

"To maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel and to serve as a central clearinghouse for information covering such personnel":

13. Current information about the supply of scientists in the United States is quickly available through the National Register of Scientific and Professional Personnel maintained by the Foundation. The register, which now contains manpower data on all major fields of science, has been compiled with the cooperation of scientific societies in the several fields of science and engineering. Each society collects basic registration information on professionally trained individuals in its field of specialization, whether or not they are members of the society. Societies also maintain individual registers on a current basis. Duplicate copies are sent to the Foundation for the national register. Thus, the Foundation can quickly provide data concerning professional qualifications, training and employment of scientists by field, and can follow trends in the utilization of trained scientists and engineers.

As such manpower data become available and are analyzed, the Foundation from time to time issues reports and bulletins on the supply and characteristics of the manpower in a particular scientific field. These are released under such typical titles as "Manpower Resources in Chemistry," "Manpower Resources in Physics," and cover the several major disciplines in science. In particular demand has been the bulletin on shortages of scientists and engineers in industrial research, and such special reports as highlights of a survey of June 1951 college graduates and highlights of a survey of graduate student enrollments, fellowships and assistantships.

"To evaluate scientific research undertaken by Federal agencies and to correlate the Foundation's research programs with other such programs":

In support of this directive from Congress, underscored by the President's Executive order of March 1954, the Foundation has undertaken to study and evaluate the scientific research programs and activities of the Federal Government, with special reference to the role of the Federal Government in the support of basic research.

14. In conformance with a recommendation of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, a study was made by a Special Commission for Rubber Research appointed by the National Science Board concerning the support by the Government of basic research on synthetic rubber. This now completed study recommended that the Federal Government withdraw further support for research in synthetic rubber, thereby saving the Government an annual expenditure of more than a million dollars.

15. At the request of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a Special Committee on Medical Research, appointed by the National Science Board, undertook a review and evaluation of the medical research programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The report of this committee has just been released.

16. The worldwide program of special observations of various earth sciences phenomena planned between mid-1957 and the end of 1958—the International Geophysical Year (IGY) is of special interest. Scientists of at least 55 nations will cooperate in making simultaneous observations from a vast network of stations extending over the surface of the earth. The Foundation has responsibility on the part of the Government for obtaining appropriations from Congress and for administering these funds, including coordination of Federal agencies' interest in the undertaking. Federal appropriations to the Foundation to support the United States program may be made available by grant or transfer of funds to other Government agencies and private institutions engaged in the work. Planning and technical direction of the United States program are in the hands of the United States National Committee for the IGY, which exists under the aegis of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council. The world program is coordinated by an international committee, Comité Special Année Géophysique Internationale (CSAGI). Estimates of total world cost of the IGY vary from $200 million to $300 million. The Congress has appropriated $12 million for the United States program and the Foundation is requesting $28 million supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1956, the bulk of the latter to be used for the earth-satellite program undertaken by the United States.

Although lay interest may center on the drama that will surround launching of earth-bound satellites and expeditions to the Antarctica, scientific interest will focus on measured data which will come from worldwide cooperative efforts of scientists who will collect and coordinate geophysical data on meteorology, upper atmosphere physics including the ionosphere, aurora, geomagnetism, oceanography, glaciology, seismology and as a special additional program, redetermination of latitudes.

17. In accordance with recommendations of the President's Materials Policy Commission, the Foundation established an Advisory Committee on Minerals Research which is now making recommendations on a program of minerals research in the United States.

"To cooperate in international scientific research activities":

18. During the 5-year period of operation, the Foundation provided grants for partial payment of travel expenses to enable American scientists of outstanding ability to participate in selected international and scientific meetings. A total of 314 scientists received such grants permitting them to attend 68 different international scientific meetings. Grants average about $580, indicating that recipients must make substantial personal contributions to attend the meetings. Foundation policy stipulates that recipients shall participate if possible in the actual work of the conference. International meetings supported by travel grants are carefully selected, and scientists who receive Foundatoin grants are chosen with equal care by panels of consultants or by appropriate committees of national scientific organizations.

19. The Foundation concerns itself with other aspects of international science as follows: (a) preparation and publication of reports concerned with international scientific activities including a quarterly List of International and Foreign Scientific and Technical Meetings"; (b) certain conferences on important aspects of science which the Foundation helps support are international in character and are attended by scientists from abroad; (c) since successful candidates for Foundation fellowships are permitted to select institutions they desire to attend, a small percentage attend institutions in other countries; (d) a few grants in support of basic research have been awarded to principal investigators, part or all of whose work is conducted outside the United States—example, a grant of $5,000 for 1 year to Dr. A. C. Smith of the Smithsonian Institution, supported his work in descriptive flora of the Fiji Islands; (e) support of translations of foreign scientific papers. In all its relationships with international science, the Foundation works closely with the National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council and with the approval of the Department of State, supporting those programs and projects which relate significantly to the economy, welfare, and defense of the United States.

20. The Foundation is currently undertaking a study of the kinds of activities in which the several departments and agencies engage with reference to international science. The study takes cognizance of the contribution science can make toward lifting the domestic and external prestige of nations, facilitating economic development, easing international tensions, and contributing to a larger world reservoir of scientific knowledge and trained science manpower.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing review of several programs of the National Science Foundation indicates methods by which the Foundation attempts constantly to improve the environment of science and the quality of scientists through support of basic research in the sciences, providing opportunities to improve the training of scientists and engineers, gathering factual data necessary to recommend sound science policies for the Federal Government, maintaining a running account of United States scientific manpower resources, and encouraging a more complete and speedier exchange of information among scientists. However, these identifiable activities represent only part of the story—the very existence of the Foundation and the opportunity it provides for leadership in support of science in the Federal Government may well outweigh specific and tangible items. The position of trust which the Foundation has achieved in the university community is one which rests in part on the confidence built up during the comparatively short period of its existence.

In carrying out its assignment, the Foundation believes strongly that its responsibilities are leadership and guidance, not direction. Only in a free environment are scientists able to do their most creative work. In working out its program of activities, the Foundation has followed the wise admonition of Dr. Bush that "it should recognize that freedom of inquiry must be preserved and should leave internal control of policy, personnel, and the method and scope of research to the institutions in which it is carried on."

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues this splendid report. It is one of the most detailed compilations of the work of the National Science Foundation I have seen to date. It is a report of encouragement and of progress, and one that fully justifies the appropriations which have gone into this very worthwhile and all-important project of our Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 27, line 13, to strike the word "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty-two."

Mr. President, this relates to the number of people the Veterans' Administration can employ in public relations work. In 1947, Congress set a limit of 100 for this purpose, and year after year the number has been going down, until finally, in the full committee, on motion of one of the members of the committee, the number carried in the bill was reduced to 15. Obviously, this is too small a number to provide information to the country and to the veterans.

There are 21 million living veterans, and I understand from the so-called Bradley report that there are nearly 1½ million veterans of World War II who are service-connected disability cases who do not receive disability pay today.

There are only two ways in which information relative to the veterans' program can get to the public. One is through contact offices, and the other is through information offices.

In 1947, there were more than 900 offices to which a veteran could go and get the last word on veterans' benefits. Progressively, as a result of diminution in appropriations, the number of contact offices has been reduced from 900 to 300, and the number of officers has been reduced from a ceiling of 100 to a low of 15.

Obviously, Mr. President, if the veterans are going to get some advisory information as to what their rights are and what benefits they can properly enjoy under the law, we must have a few persons who can provide information, in a compact, understandable package, on what the law and the regulations are.

Certainly, Mr. President, as against a potential of 21 million living veterans, 15 public-relations officers are far below the ratio of any service agency in the Government. I think the number ought to be restored in accordance with the request which has been made.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator is completely correct. I wish to raise a question as to whether the Senator has made the figure sufficiently large. There is a difficulty of semantics in this problem. I think it is unfortunate that the phrase "public-relations officers" should be used, because there seems to be a rather negative connotation in connection with that phrase in the minds of many persons. They look upon it as some sort of propaganda or publicity or advertising service. As the Senator from Illinois has stated, it is not that at all.

For what do we primarily need these men? We need them as contact men to be of advisory service to the veterans who are going to lose many of their rights and who are not going to be able to take advantage of the services available to them if someone does not tell them about those services. It is very easy for us to find these things out for ourselves, but we should keep constantly in mind that there are not only the 21 million veterans to whom the Senator from Illinois has referred, but there are a great many fellow citizens who have performed patriotic service for all of us who are not educated men and do not have the advantages of persons who are well educated. They need this kind of a special service.

We should be calling it, I think, an advisory service instead of a public relations service. I do not believe that for want of a better name we should do the injustice which will be done to the veterans if we fail to provide them with an adequate number of advisers. I like to think of it as an advisory service.

I congratulate the Senator on the amendment he is presenting. I heartily endorse it, and I hope it will go to conference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I appreciate the remarks of my distinguished friend from Oregon.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will prevail, and I hope we shall be able to persuade the distinguished conferees of the House of Representatives of the rightness of our cause.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have one last amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 28, line 9, in lieu of "$16,453,000" to insert "$20,773,800, of which $10 million shall be available for medical research."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, because the amendment involves a considerable amount of money, I think I should briefly advise the Senate of its purpose.

We discussed in the committee at some length the question of medical research by the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration had submitted its request to the Budget Bureau many, many months ago. I do not know whether the amount requested was cut by the Budget Bureau, but the amount was cut a great deal. It was suggested that they should spend so much money of their vast appropriations—it is quite a large one—for medical research, on the ground that it would be economy, in the long run. We did not, however, add any specific amount to the bill.

Since that time I have discussed the matter with some of the representatives of the Veterans' Administration, who tell me that they might be somewhat handicapped in doing the research they wish to do unless we specify the amount. So I have submitted the amendment.

During the current fiscal year the VA is spending $662 million for the inpatient care of veterans. Over and above this it is spending an additional $82 million for outpatient treatment for veterans. As against this total expenditure of approximately $740 million for medical care—it is spending only $5,679,000 for research.

Mr. President, it is not good sense to spend less than 1 percent of a total medical budget to discover the research answers to the great killers of our day. Unless we find new treatments for these major diseases—America is faced with an annual tax bill of billions of dollars a year just for the care of its veterans.

Let me document this point. The total medical bill of the VA for fiscal 1956 has reached the staggering sum of $3,717,000,000. This sum includes hospital and clinic care, compensation and pensions, and new hospital construction.

Mr. President, this tax load is going up astronomically each year. Let me give you an example. In 1945 the Veterans' Administration spent approximately $38 million for the hospital care of mentally ill veterans. In 1955—only a decade later—the hospital bill for mentally ill veterans had soared more than 500 percent, to an excess of $220 million. And this is not all. Over and above this the Congress is now appropriating more than $400 million annually in compensation costs for service-connected psychiatric disabilities. A Hoover Commission medical task force report recently estimated that our bill for mentally ill veterans would soon reach a billion dollars a year. The three big diseases which afflict veterans are cancer, heart disease, and mental illness. With our veteran population growing older every year, these diseases are taking an increasing toll of our veterans. There is only one way out of the dilemma—to spend money for research to find cures for these diseases. The committee has proposed that the Veterans' Administration submit a plan to the Appropriations Committee for next year outlining their accelerated program against these major causes of death and disability among our veterans in order that hospital costs might be cut, and that the veterans might be returned to normal life—able to work and be self-supporting.

Mr. President, the Veterans' Administration should be spending at least 10 percent of its total budget upon research and upon the training of skilled medical personnel. I use the figure 10 percent because the National Governors Conference on Mental Health in 1954 adopted a statement that research and training should comprise 10 percent of the budget of any public medical facility. If we were to use this yardstick with relation to the Veterans' Administration program, we would find that the Veterans' Administration should currently be spending approximately $66 million this year on research and training.

I propose a gradual pointing up to the 10 percent figure. For next year, I believe the VA could wisely spend a total of $10 million in the major killers and cripplers—heart disease, cancer, and mental illness, which is what this will be for. There are an enormous number of research leads in these fields, and the VA has a magnificent hospital system in which to test new therapies and drugs. In other words some of the best hospitals we have are the VA hospitals. This was proven several years ago when the VA undertook an evaluation of the new drugs against tuberculosis. The magnificent work of the VA in that research project helped to extend the clinical application of these drugs throughout the world and to cut the death rate in the United States from tuberculosis by 75 percent. Several thousand beds in the VA hospital system were released with the advent of these new drugs. More important, several thousand veterans who suffered from tuberculosis are now back at work and are supporting their families. We cannot place any price on the happiness which the research effort against tuberculosis has brought to so many of our veterans and their families.

We must do the same type of research with the remaining big killers. There are thousands of compounds currently being studied against cancer. The VA should engage in a large scale evaluation of these important compounds. There are important leads in heart disease. There are new treatments for arteriosclerosis, including anticoagulance, special diets, and hormones. The VA

must pursue the existing research leads in this field. In mental illness there are new drugs which offer great promise. I am happy to note that the VA has started an evaluation of two of these drugs. However, this work should be expanded tremendously, because more than 50 percent of VA hospital beds are occupied by the mentally ill.

Mr. President, there are sound economic justifications for these expenditures. I have documentation to show that every dollar in Federal research expenditure has brought back $7 in economic productivity and tax returns. If we do not accelerate our expenditure we will, within the next decade, face a total Veterans' Administration bill in the neighborhood of $10 billion a year.

We must act, and we must act now. That is why I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I certainly concur in the objective sought by my friend, the Senator from Washington. I wish, of course, it could have been achieved within the money limitations which were in the bill as it came from the full committee. I think, however, we can take the amendment to conference. Certain it is that there are a good many fields of research which are not covered by tne National Institutes of Health. Only yesterday the Senate passed the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and in that bill a great many additional millions of dollars were provided over and above the budget estimates. But that money is to be used for research in the fields of cancer, heart disease, and all the other diseases which are commonly known to the people.

I think a special field is involved here. Military personnel serving abroad are subject to tropical diseases and diseases which are incident to other countries and other areas of the world. If the increase were not justified for any other reason, that would be a justification in itself.

So while the whole amount may not be retained in conference, I shall be glad, indeed, to go along with it. Then probably we shall be able to secure some additional assistance with respect to this item.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the statement made by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the Senator from Washington and agree wholeheartedly with what he has said regarding the ever-increasing need for research in the activities covered by his amendment. I agree also that in the past Congress has been very niggardly in providing necessary funds for this purpose.

Our colleagues may remember that only yesterday the Senate passed an appropriation bill providing funds for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I expressed great gratification over the appropriations which were recommended for the various activities carried on by the National Institutes of Health. They mark a very great step forward.

During the debate the distinguished Senator from Washington pointed out the gains which had been made during the past 2 or 3 years because of the increased appropriations which had been made, particularly for research. He cited figures showing that there had been an improvement of, I believe, 19 percent in the discharges of cured patients from mental hospitals because of the use of the new drugs which have been developed and are now in general use.

The Senator from Washington also gave extremely interesting figures with respect to the hopeful progress which had been made in cancer research and in research in the case of respiratory diseases, and circulatory diseases.

I think that if we do nothing else, we will have taken a long step forward if we continue in Congress to provide as generous appropriations for research work as are possible. We have shown a disposition to increase the appropriations for many activities dealing with the health of the people, but the funds for such work are still insufficient and still inadequate. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

While I am on my feet, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Washington upon his superb work in formulating this appropriation bill. Not only has he been active in this particular department, but he has also worked vigorously in the preparation of the budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which the Senate approved yesterday. I congratulate him and the members of his subcommittee upon their excellent work. It has been work well done.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I commend my delightful friend, the very able senior Senator from Washington, upon his thorough, statesmanlike work in presenting the two appropriation bills to the Senate today.

I have served on committees of Congress with the senior Senator from Washington for almost 20 years. I know of no person who is more expert in the fields in which he has chosen to operate than WARREN MAGNUSON. I know of no one who is more capable of carrying a bill through either the Senate or the House than the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He is a very valued colleague, and has done outstanding work not only on the Independent Offices appropriation bill, but also on the other appropriation bill for which he is responsible.

I commend him for offering the pending amendment, and assure him of my whole-hearted concurrence in the objective he seeks to achieve.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Washington for a moment, I wish to say I find myself so enthusiastically in support of his amendment that it would be a high honor if he would list me as a cosponsor of it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may be listed as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have listened with great amazement to the figures on the Veterans' Administration's medical program presented so ably by the subcommittee chairman, the distinguished Senator from Washington.

I think it is about time the people of this country were let in on what is going on in the Veterans' Administration. Many of us sitting here today voted appropriations 11 years ago to create a medical-care program for our veterans second to none in the world. It is my impression that under the first two medical directors of that program—Drs. Paul Hawley and Paul Magnuson—we were well on our way to achieving the goal set by the Congress.

I am therefore disturbed when I hear that the Veterans' Administration is spending only about $5 million a year in medical research, as against a total Veterans Administration medical bill in excess of $3 billion a year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an explanation of the listing of the Veterans' Administration total medical bill as $3,717,000,000.

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

EXPLANATION OF LISTING OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION TOTAL MEDICAL BILL AS $3,717,000,000

Direct hospital cost	$663,000,000
Outpatient care	82,000,000
Hospital construction	48,000,000
Compensation for service-connected disabilities	1,416,000,000
Compensation for nonservice disabilities	468,000,000

The remaining sum is composed of dependents receiving compensation on account of service-connected death of the veteran, pensions to living veterans physically unable to support themselves, and some miscellaneous items. I think all these costs can be attributed to the medical-care program of the VA.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday we voted greatly increased medical-research appropriations for the National Institutes of Mental Health because we were presented with incontrovertible evidence that for every dollar the Federal Government invests in research it receives a return of $7 in reduced costs for medical care and in increased economic productivity. I do not understand why in each of its annual reports over the past few years the Veterans' Administration has pointed up the vital necessity of greatly expanded medical research, but on the other hand, has not yet developed

a decently financed medical-research program.

Let me quote a section on medical research from the 1955 annual report of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs:

> The Department of Medicine and Surgery must conduct research activities in order to provide better patient care. The research program in a hospital serves both as a stimulus to the medical staff and provides an incentive for recruitment. The results of medical research improve the health and medical care of the veteran patient and secondarily supply new and important scientific information. The best patient care is usually provided in those hospitals wherein research and education activities are an integral part of the patient-care program.

I ask you to particularly note, Mr. President, the last sentence in that quotation, emphasizing the fact that the best patient care is provided only in those hospitals where research is an integral part of the program. By that yardstick, then, I seriously question whether the Veterans' Administration is today giving the best medical care to the 118,000 veterans now hospitalized in its institutions.

Further along in the 1955 report I came across the admission by the Veterans' Administration that it has a "serious responsibility" in medical research. Let me quote that section:

> It should be recognized that the Veterans' Administration has a serious responsibility in medical research due to the problems associated with:
>
> 1. The large numbers of hospitalized veterans with a variety of diseases that are not well understood and for which there is no effective treatment.
>
> 2. The large number of veterans receiving compensation or pension for medical disabilities.
>
> 3. Disabilities and diseases of an aging veteran population.

I wonder how many of us realize how serious a problem medical care for our veterans really is. Speaking as past chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am proud of the record I made during my term in that office in seeking passage and accomplishing the passage in the Senate of a considerable amount of veterans legislation which sought to protect the welfare of the veterans of the United States.

I point out that there are 21 million veterans in this country at the present time. Of these, 118,000 are hospitalized, and several million are receiving compensation for service-connected disabilities.

Furthermore, the problem is seriously aggravated by the increasing age of veterans, with a consequent increase in chronic and disabling illnesses. The average age of the hospitalized veteran is now 48. More than 13,000 hospitalized veterans are over 65 years of age.

My study of the Veterans Administration reports indicate that we are approaching the danger of having the Veterans' Administration hospital system turn into a series of homes for the chronic and disabled. The Veterans' Administration itself has admitted that more than one-half of all hospitalized patients have been in a veterans' hospital for more than 1 year, and that almost one-third of all patients have been hospitalized for more than 5 years.

Yesterday afternoon the Senator from Washington and I engaged in a colloquy in which we discussed the question of domiciliary care for our veterans. I am all for that. I have voted, and shall continue to vote, for any domiciliary hospital the Veterans' Administration requests of the Congress of the United States. But that is not the major obligation of the Veterans' Administration when it comes to medical care. Its major obligation, I may say most respectfully, is to provide such care as will help veterans to recover from a curable disease. In order to insure that, we need to enlarge our appropriations for medical research, because, as the Veterans' Administration's own report shows, it can do a good job of medical care of its patients only to the extent that, through research, there are discovered new ways to treat some of the death-dealing illnesses from which so many veterans suffer.

The Senator from Washington pointed out what we are doing in the field of medical research in connection with cardiac disease, cancer, and the other great death-dealing diseases; but I submit that it is important to build up the medical research services for the veterans' hospitals.

Now the Veterans Administration has some fine words to say about the aging population of veterans, and I quote again from the 1955 report:

> The Veterans' Administration has a responsibility to investigate these chronic and other diseases in order to be able to develop and provide for effective methods of diagnosis and treatment. These methods in turn should and do effect significant economics. A better understanding of patients with long-term illnesses will undoubtedly result only if this opportunity is capitalized.

Mr. President, the Veterans' Administration hospital system is the largest in the world. Medical scientists have testified before congressional committees that it is a superb closed system in which to study disease. Dr. George M. Lyon, Assistant Chief Medical Director for Research of the Veterans' Administration, corroborated the statements of these scientists when he reported in January 1955 that—

> Because of the large number of patients hospitalized, because of the wide variety of diseases and disabilities encountered in Veterans' Administration hospitals, and because of the fact that these are observed within a single hospital system—the largest in the world—there exists the greatest opportunity imaginable for the clinical study of disease in man. The close association of 91 Veterans' Administration hospitals having research facilities with 72 medical schools in which active research programs are also underway makes it possible to pursue the study of disease in the hospitalized patient in a way, and to an extent, never before envisaged.

What is the Veterans' Administration doing with this magnificent opportunity? I cannot find that it is doing very much at all. Each year the Congress appropriates large sums for new Veterans' Administration hospitals; each year the cost to the taxpayers rises astronomically. As my distinguished colleague from Washington has pointed out, the cost of hospitalizing mentally ill veterans alone has gone up more than 500 percent in less than a decade—from approximately $38 million in 1945 to $223 million in 1955.

Look at the figures on heart disease, Mr. President. We are spending more than $200 million annually in compensation payments to veterans afflicted with heart disease. By contrast, the Veterans' Administration is spending only a few hundred thousand dollars for research on heart disease, the Nation's No. 1 killer.

Mr. President, my record shows that I would never economize at the expense of the veteran. However, I want to see that our veterans get the best medical care, which the Congress is duty bound to provide them. It is not good economy, nor is it humanitarian, to spend pennies on medical research and millions and millions of dollars on mere custody. I join my colleague from Washington in supporting a $10 million amendment as a minimum appropriation for the medical-research activities of the Veterans' Administration during the coming fiscal year. Furthermore, I join him in insisting that the Veterans' Administration present to the Congress next year a long-range medical-research program leading to a major attack on the diseases which now disable thousands upon thousands of our veterans.

Last of all, Mr. President, I wish to answer one of the fear arguments which I find has crept into the thinking of some veterans' organizations, in regard to the appropriation of funds for research purposes. Apparently there is a fear that the funds for research will be used to turn the veterans who are hospitalized into guinea pigs; that experimentation will be practiced upon them for no good end except for experimentation.

Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that that is not a part of the medical-research program. There is no ground for a fear among the veterans that a medical-research program in a veterans' hospital will be any different from such a program in any other hospital. Such a program does not constitute a guinea-pig approach, but only puts into practice the findings of medical researchers that will aid in the patient-care of the veteran himself. Therefore, if we vote today for this $10 million amendment, we shall do much to improve the patient-care of a veteran who goes to a hospital in an endeavor to recover from the disease which put him in the hospital in the first place.

I wish to congratulate the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the other members of the subcommittee for what I consider to be the excellent job they have done for the Senate in submitting the bill in such fine form to it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Washington whether he will allow me to be listed with him as a cosponsor of this amendment, which has such an enlightened and worthy a purpose, namely, by increasing the appropriation to do away with the inadequacy of the present medical-research expenditures on the part of the Veterans' Administration. I understand that the senior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] also wishes to have his name listed

as a cosponsor, if that is agreeable to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I join my distinguished colleague from Washington in his grave concern about the inadequacy of the medical research expenditures of the Veterans' Administration.

I have been interested for a considerable length of time in the problem of cancer and its cruel effects. Figures recently released by the American Cancer Society in its April 1956 campaign indicate that if we do not achieve any major research breakthroughs against cancer in the next few years, approximately 40 million people now alive in the United States will have some form of cancer during their lifetime, and an estimated 24 million of these will die from cancer.

During World War II, cancer took a greater toll than enemy bullets. Almost 2½ times as many people died of cancer during World War II as were killed in action in all of our far-flung battles over the face of the world. Furthermore, in 1 year cancer killed nearly 10 times the number of Americans who were killed in action during 3 years of war in Korea.

We learned a little of the ravages of cancer as we drafted our young men, the healthiest group in the Nation, into service in World War II. Of this group of men between the ages of 18 and 37, the so-called prime of life, 32,000 were rejected for cancer, a number sufficient to man at least 2 Army Infantry divisions.

On the basis of reliable current statistics, 1 out of every 4 veterans now living will have cancer unless medical research discovers some new cures and preventive measures. Since there are now 21 million veterans in the United States, about 5 million veterans will be hospitalized, or will be entitled to hospitalization, for cancer.

If 80 percent of the veterans developing cancer receive full hospitalization from the Veterans' Administration, they will cost the taxpayers a total of $5 billion. If only 50 percent receive full hospitalization, they will cost the taxpayers $3 billion.

Even now the cost of cancer to the Veterans' Administration is mounting astronomically. Hospital care for veterans suffering from cancer now costs about $25 million. In addition, more than $10 million was spent last year in compensation payments to 11,000 veterans disabled by cancer.

In the face of these rising costs, what is the Veterans' Administration doing in research upon cancer? Currently, it is spending less than $1 million a year against a disease whose cost runs into the hundreds of millions of dollars. Even that small expenditure of funds has produced several vital research discoveries. A talented research scientist of the Veterans' Administration has discovered that cancer and leukemia are caused by a virus, and that the virus may be transmitted from parent to children, in whom cancer later develops. This discovery is of fundamental importance because it opens up a whole new avenue of approach. Yet I am convinced that the Veterans' Administration is doing far too little in exploiting that magnificent discovery.

On June 5 we heard the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], in discussing this Nation's medical research program, point out that "recent advances in virus research have opened up the possibility of exploring with unprecedented thoroughness earlier suggestions that some forms of cancer may be caused by, and others may be susceptible to, cure by viruses."

On the basis of this evidence, the Senate Appropriations Committee allocated several million dollars to a pursuit of this exciting lead. But the Veterans' Administration, with the finest hospital system in the world, drags along on a cancer-research budget far less than that of a single cancer institute in this country—the Sloan-Kettering Institute, in New York City.

Mr. President, we heard our colleagues from Washington and Oregon and other Senators refer to the aging of our veteran population. The average age of the hospitalized veteran is now 48. In another 10 years it will be 58. With increasing age, there is increasing susceptibility to cancer.

Mr. President, are we to face a sorry and tragic future in which, for want of research knowledge, we allow 5 million of our veterans to die from cancer? I say this need not be. I join my colleagues from Washington and Oregon in proposing an increase of $5 million for the coming fiscal year for the medical research programs of the Veterans' Administration, and also in insisting that the Veterans' Administration submit to this Congress a long-range medical research program leading to the conquest of the major killers of millions of Americans.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] be added as cosponsors of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], on behalf of himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 9739) was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. POTTER the conferees on the part of the Senate.

FREE OR REDUCED AIR TRANSPORTATION RATES FOR MINISTERS OF RELIGION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2030, Senate bill 3149.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3149) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit certain air carriers to grant free or reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert "the last sentence of", and after line 4, to strike out before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "and, in the case of foreign air carriers, and air carriers not receiving payments made by the Board under the provisions of section 406 of this act and Reorganization Plan No. 10 of 1953, to ministers or religion" and insert after "such persons" a semicolon and the following: "ministers of religion on a space available basis", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of subsection (b) of section 403 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 is amended by inserting after "such persons" a semicolon and the following: "ministers of religion on a space available basis."

USE OF BOXCARS FOR SHIPMENT OF LUMBER AND OTHER PRODUCTS IN TRANSIT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have several documents dealing with a common subject which I should like to introduce into the RECORD.

We have a problem in the Pacific Northwest over a service order of the Interstate Commerce Commission known as Service Order 910. It deals with the question of the use of boxcars for the shipment in transit of lumber, particularly, although it may apply to other commodities as well. A small lumber mill may load a boxcar and start it in transit for Chicago, and the lumber may be sold en route. One of the controversies is over the question whether or not this practice results in so delaying shipments that it has the effect of creating, to some extent, an additional factor in the boxcar shortage problem.

The lumbermen themselves are in dispute over the question. For the most part, the big lumber operators seem to be in favor of Service Order 910. The small mills are against Service Order 910.

Some of the small mill operators, testifying before the committee of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], claimed that the cancellation of Service Order 910 would result in more time being taken in shipment, because what would be done would be to take the longest route around rather than the shortest route.

Be that as it may, the position I have taken is that the question should be the subject of a public hearing. The shippers should be given an opportunity to present to the Interstate Commerce Commission their points of view on both sides in a public hearing.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am chairman, will make, or is in the process today of making, such a suggestion to the Interstate Commerce Commission. This is too important a subject to be dealt with arbitrarily.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate very much the statement of the Senator from Washington. It will be very helpful.

My position is that there should be a public hearing on the question. The service order is not a sudden decision on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The record is replete with proof that the Interstate Commerce Commission has been planning Service Order 910 for a long time past. Even the court, in a decision which I shall insert in the RECORD, had that thought clearly in mind, as will be seen from the language of the court.

I have been very frank on this subject. I have stated in my correspondence with both big and small lumber operators that such an order issued by an administrative tribunal should be based on a full record. One group wants the order. The other wants it canceled. I have said, "This is an administrative tribunal, which, under the law, has the legal duty and right to issue such an order, but it ought to issue it on the basis of a full record made by the parties in interest."

This question became such a hot issue among the lumber industry in my State that it got into court. A few days ago the court handed down a decision. This decision is by a three-man Federal court.

I ask unanimous consent that the decision be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON, CIVIL NO. 8541

DAUGHERTY LUMBER CO., ET AL., PLAINTIFFS, *v.* UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, DEFENDANTS; ATLAS LUMBER COMPANY, ET AL., INTERVENORS PROPLAINTIFF; STAR LUMBER COMPANY, A COPARTNERSHIP, ET AL., INTERVENORS PROPLAINTIFF; THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL TRAFFIC LEAGUE, INTERVENOR PRODEFENDANT; WEST COAST LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION, WESTERN PINE ASSOCIATION AND CALIFORNIA REDWOOD ASSOCIATION, INTERVENORS PRODEFENDANT

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before: Stephens, circuit judge, and Solomon and East, district judges.

East, district judge.

Acting Chief Judge Albert Lee Stephens, circuit judge, Ninth Judicial Circuit, established this court by order entered on April 16, 1956.

Parties

The plaintiffs, Daugherty Lumber Co., et al., consist of some five business organizations engaged in the business of buying and selling lumber on a wholesale basis and as such utilize railway transportation for the movement of such lumber products from the Pacific Northwest to other portions of the United States. One of the plaintiffs is a manufacturer of lumber products and disposes of its products to the mentioned wholesale lumber brokers.

The intervenors, Atlas Lumber Co., et al., proplaintiff, consist of some 63 business organizations engaged in the sale and transport of lumber products through interstate commerce throughout the United States.

The intervenors, Star Lumber Co., et al., proplaintiff, consist of some six business organizations engaged in the manufacture and distribution of lumber products through interstate commerce originating from the State of Oregon.

The intervenor, the National Industrial Traffic League, prodefendant, is a voluntary national association composed of and representing business organizations engaged in the shipment and receipt of commodities transported by railroads in every State of the United States.

The intervenors, West Coast Lumbermen's Association, et al., prodefendant, are associations representing business organizations engaged in the manufacture, sale, and distribution of lumber products throughout the Pacific Northwest.

The defendants are the United States of American and its administrative agency, the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Commission's order

On March 19, 1956, the Commission issued service order No. 910, to be effective 12:01 a. m., April 9, 1956.

The plaintiffs complained and by order, per East, D. J., dated April 7, 1956, the Commission was temporarily restrained in the execution of said order.

On April 13, 1956, the Commission made a corrected service order No. 910, to be dated as of March 19, 1956. The order, as corrected, to our concern, reads:

"It appearing that an acute shortage of freight cars exists in all sections of the country; that the movement of loaded freight cars is being delayed solely for the purpose of gaining additional time; that present rules, regulations, and practices with respect to the use, supply, control, movement, distribution, exchange, interchange, and return of freight cars are insufficient to promote the most efficient utilization of cars; it is the opinion of the Commission that an emergency exists requiring immediate action to promote car service in the interest of the public and the commerce of the people. Accordingly, the Commission finds that notice and public procedure are impracticable and contrary to the public interest, and that good cause exists for making this order effective upon less than 30 days' notice."

Whereupon the following regulations of concern were prescribed:

"(1) No common carrier by railroad subject to the Interstate Commerce Act shall willfully delay the movement of loaded freight cars by holding such cars in yards, terminals, or sidings for the purpose of increasing the time in transit of such loaded cars.

"(2) Loaded cars shall not be set out between terminals except in cases of emergencies or sound operating requirements.

"(3) Backhauling loaded cars for the purpose of increasing the time in transit shall constitute willful delay and is prohibited.

"(4) Through loaded cars shall not be handled on local or way freight trains for the purpose of increasing the time in transit of such loaded cars.

"(5) The use by any common carrier by railroad, for the movement of loaded freight cars over its line, of any route other than its usual and customary fast freight route from point of receipt of the car from consignee or connecting line, except in emergencies, or for the purpose of according a lawfully established transit privilege (not including a diversion or reconsignment privilege), is hereby prohibited."

Furthermore, the Commission, in deference to the mentioned restraining order, stated in its official report that "No action will be taken to enforce Service Order No. 910 until further order of the Commission."

Authority of the Commission

Section 1 (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U. S. C. A. 1 (15)) reads as follows:

"Whenever the Commission is of opinion that shortage of equipment, congestion of traffic, or other emergency requiring immediate action exists in any section of the country, the Commission shall have, and it is hereby given, authority, either upon complaint or upon its own initiative, without complaint, at once, if it so orders, without answer or other formal pleading by the interested carrier or carriers, and with or without notice, hearing, or the making or filing of a report, according as the Commission may determine: (a) to suspend the operation of any or all rules, regulations, or practices then established with respect to car service for such time as may be determined by the Commission; (b) to make such just and reasonable directions with respect to car service without regard to the ownership as between carriers of locomotives, cars, and other vehicles, during such emergency as in its opinion will best promote the service in the interest of the public and the commerce of the people, upon such terms of compensation as between the carriers as they may agree upon, or, in the event of their disagreement, as the Commission may after subsequent hearing find to be just and reasonable; * * *"

It is conceded by all of the parties that the Commission acted upon its own initiative without complaint and without notice, hearing, or the making or filing of any report except to publicize order No. 910 after issuance in the Federal Register.

Contentions of plaintiffs and intervenors, proplaintiffs

These parties, through plaintiffs' petition, assert that for many years last past plaintiffs and other lumber manufacturers and wholesalers of lumber products situated in the States of Oregon, Washington, and California, have traditionally operated their respective businesses in the following manner:

Upon completion of loading a car of lumber, the bill of lading and ownership of said car has been transferred to a lumber wholesaler or lumber broker who thereupon pays the invoice price of said car even though said wholesaler or broker has no present customer for said car; said wholesaler then normally commences the movement of said car toward the eastern seaboard without instructions to the railroad to expedite the movement of said car, but with instructions to the railroad to keep the wholesaler advised of the progress of said car toward a particular transfer or diversion point; during the eastward progress of said car, the wholesaler finds a purchaser for same, and upon finding such purchaser the railroad is notified to move said car to destination forthwith.

They claim that said Service Order No. 910 of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the subject of this bill, would overnight change this traditional method of buying, selling, and transporting lumber between points on the Pacific coast and points in the eastern parts of the United States without affording to lumber manufacturers or wholesalers an

opportunity, if such were possible, to revise their methods of operation.

Further, "that if said Service Order No. 910 were allowed to become effective, it would seriously and adversely affect plaintiffs in the conduct of their respective businesses in the following manner:

"1. That wholesalers would refuse to purchase cars of lumber from sawmills until such time as they had a specific order for said cars and therefore plaintiffs would have to accumulate large inventories of lumber far beyond their capacity to finance same, or in the alternative, plaintiffs would have to stop production until such time as plaintiffs should receive an order for a specific type of lumber and then proceed to cut same and load the car and invoice the wholesaler.

"2. That said order would prevent plaintiffs and others similarly situated from maintaining an efficient and economic production schedule in that they would no longer be able to set up their respective mills to cut a substantial amount of the same type of lumber but rather would be forced to set up and reset over short periods of time to cut specific orders.

"3. That said Service Order No. 910 would require such large investments of plaintiffs in their respective businesses as to make it impossible for plaintiffs to continue their businesses.

"4. That said Service Order No. 910 will have the effect of eliminating and destroying many small lumber manufacturers and diverting their business to large manufacturers who do not sell their lumber on a diversion basis.

"5. That said Service Order No. 910 would result in requiring small lumber manufacturers to maintain inventories of lumber at their respective yards far beyond their financial capacity to do so and thus discriminate against them in favor of larger and better financed lumber companies.

"6. That purchasers of lumber in the East would also be adversely affected in that they would be unable to control the arrival time of cars upon their spur tracks and thereby prevent economical and efficient unloading of the same and would require large expenditures of such purchasers of additional spur tracks and additional facilities.

"7. That the enforcement of said Service Order No. 910 would tend to bunch loaded cars at switching points thereby delaying the movement of cars requiring expedited service.

"8. That instead of alleviating any actual or contemplated car shortage, the effect of said Service Order No. 910 would be to aggravate the situation.

"9. That there is no actual car shortage at the present time, nor was there at the time the Commission entered said Service Order No. 910.

"10. That if there be any car shortage, this situation is caused primarily by the failure of the eastern railroads to return cars to the West.

"11. That 'slow routine' is not just a convenience for a few isolated shippers, but is in fact a standard integral part of the distribution system employed by a large percentage of the lumber industry; that said practice has been accepted and encouraged by all concerned as the normal and standard method of lumber distribution; that the many small producers and wholesalers in the West, and the small users and retailers in the East, have founded their entire businesses upon the existence of such practice and are inextricably bound to it so that said Service Order No. 910 will result in chaos among the small-business men so engaged."

The defendants and intervenors, prodefendant, through their appearances, admit the alleged factual situation, but, in effect, deny the legal effect thereof.

It has been agreed among counsel, with the consent of the majority of the court, that the issue of law presented by these respective contentions should be submitted to the court upon the record and the briefs of the parties.

Accordingly we accept as true all that the plaintiffs and intervenors proplaintiff allege and contend in their respective appearances.

Legislative emergency

The plaintiffs urge that Service Order No. 910 is invalid for the reason that no emergency existed at the time of its entry. This suggestion causes us to reflect and remind ourselves that the first step of governmental tyranny is through policing and restrictive acts without notice or hearing to the persons thereby affected. In this view one might think that before declaring the existence of an emergency and ordering a disruption of the 20-year existent practice of shipping via railroads by a large segment of the lumber industry of the Pacific Northwest, the Commission would afford prior notice and an opportunity to be heard by those affected by its order. However, this observation of policy is of no import for the reason that Congress has delegated the inquiry of the existence of an emergency in the province and in the opinion of the Commission. See *Avent* v. *United States of America* (266 U. S. 127; 69 L. Ed. 202).

The congressional authority thus granted to the Commission is an implement or enforcement of legislative action. It follows, therefore, that the definition or meaning of "emergency" must be viewed in a legislative sense as distinguished from the commonplace meaning of an "unforeseen combination of circumstances which calls for immediate action."

Legislative emergencies are those situations where the common good or public interest is legislatively declared to be paramount to individual interests. Common knowledge tells us that legislative action effective immediately, has on legion occasions been adopted to correct an adverse public interest situation of long standing. Furthermore, common knowledge tells us that a shortage of railroad cars available to the lumber industry in the Pacific Northwest has occurred during the summer and fall months annually for many years last past. We further know, from common knowledge, that the reason or cause of this car shortage is a contentious question among the railroads and the several classes of shippers. We accept the contention of the plaintiffs that the enforcement of Service Order No. 910 will not alleviate the car shortage; however, this court has no province in the matter as a legislative emergency declared by Congress or one of its administrative agencies is not subject to judicial review upon its merits.

"The commission having based their order on their opinion that an emergency such as was contemplated by the statute existed, it is not within the power of the court to annul their order on the ground that the administrative power conferred on the commission was unwisely or improvidently exercised." (*Baltimore, etc. R. Co.* v. *Lambert Run Coal Co.* (258 U. S. 377, 66 L. Ed. 671).)

The "opinion" of the Commission had to be based upon some information before it and in the absence of a contention that the "opinion" of the Commission was motivated by fraud, wrongdoing or capriciousness, this court has no office to review the "opinion" of the Commission.

"The Commission is the expert in the field of transportation. And its judgment is entitled to great deference because of its familiarity with the conditions in the industry which it regulates."

"Even though, upon a consideration of all the evidence, a court might reach a different conclusion, it is not authorized to substitute its own for the administrative judgment." (*Swayne & Hoyt, Ltd.* v. *United States* (300 U. S. 297, 304). See also *Federal Communications Commission* v. *WOKO, Inc.* (329 U. S. 223, 229); *United States* v. *Pierce Auto Freight Lines, Inc.* (327 U. S. 515, 535–536); *Barrett Line, Inc.* v. *United States* (326 U. S. 179, 199).)

East Texas Motor Freight Line, Inc., et al. v. *Frozen Foods Express, the Secretary of Agriculture, et al.* Nos. 162–164 in the Supreme Court of the United States entered April 23, 1956.

Shipper's right of selecting route of shipment

The Congress has recognized that (49 U. S. C. A. 15 (8)) "the person * * * making such shipment subject to such reasonable exceptions and regulations as the Interstate Commerce Commission shall from time to time prescribe, shall have the right to designate in writing by which of such through routes such property shall be transported to destination, and it shall thereupon be the duty of the initial carrier to route said property and issue a through bill of lading therefor as so directed, and to transport said property over its own line or lines and deliver the same to a connecting line or lines according to such through route, and it shall be the duty of each of said connecting carriers to receive said property and transport it over the said line or lines and deliver the same to the next suceeding carrier or consignee according to the routing instructions in said bill of lading."

Should it be the purpose of the Commission, through the provisions of paragraph (5) of its order, to interfere with this right, ample judicial relief is open to any aggrieved party. The mentioned paragraph (5) is not, in our opinion, so vague or indefinite as to impute such an intent on the part of the Commission that would authorize judicial restraint.

Standing of plaintiffs

The effect and restriction of the order applies to all shippers and is not discriminatory. Therefore, any adverse effect upon one mode of marketing as against another mode not so affected, even though engaged in business competition, is not an infringement upon a legal right. (*Sprunt & Son* v. *United States* (281 U. S. 249, 254–255, 256–257 (1930); *Pittsburgh & W. Va. Ry.* v. *United States* (281 U. S. 479, 486–488 (1930); *Edward Hines Trustees* v. *United States* (263 U. S. 143, 148 (1923); *Merchant Truckmen's Bureau* v. *United States* (16 F. Supp. 998) (S. D. N. Y., 1938).)

It follows that neither plaintiffs nor intervenors proplaintiff have a legal right or interest that is unjustly affected by Service Order No. 910.

Conclusion

Therefore, we conclude that plaintiffs' petition and bill in equity and the petition of intervenors proplaintiff should each be dismissed and the temporary restraining order of this court, dated April 7, 1956, aforesaid, should be vacated as of the date of entry of a judgment of dismissal herein, all without costs to any party.

Counsel for the defendants are requested to submit appropriate judgment order.

Dated this 31st day of May 1956.

ALBERT LEE STEPHENS,
United States Circuit Judge.
GUS J. SOLOMON,
WILLIAM G. EAST,
United States District Judges.

Mr. MORSE. On page 8 of the decision the court said:

The plaintiffs urge that Service Order No. 910 is invalid for the reason that no emergency existed at the time of its entry. This suggestion causes us to reflect and remind ourselves that the first step of governmental tyranny is through policing and restrictive acts without notice or hearing to the persons thereby affected. In this view one might think that before declaring the existence of an emergency and ordering a dis-

ruption of the 20-year existent practice of shipping via railroads by a large segment of the lumber industry of the Pacific Northwest, the Commission would afford prior notice and an opportunity to be heard by those affected by its order. However, this observation of policy is of no import for the reason that Congress has delegated the inquiry of the existence of an emergency in the province and in the opinion of the Commission. See *Avent* v. *United States of America* (266 U. S. 127; 69 L. Ed. 202).

I have no doubt that the court, in the decision which it handed down sustaining the Interstate Commerce Commission and its authority to issue the order, is technically correct. I am not questioning the legal soundness of the decision of the court. What I am seeking to point out is that the Interstate Commerce Commission ought to heed the language of the court in its decison, in which the court, in effect, raises its legal eyebrows at the practice of the Interstate Commerce Commission in not scheduling such questions for a hearing, so that all sides may be heard.

That is all I have ever asked for in this controversy. I appeared before the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate and asked that public hearings be granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission. To date it has refused to do so. Again on the floor of the Senate today I renew my request for a hearing. I do not know what the final decision ought to be with reference to Service Order 910, because I think that will depend upon what the parties themselves offer by way of proof in the record at a hearing. I have heard, for the most part, spokesmen for small mills. They are very much disturbed, and have made strong representations, which I presented before the committee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a joint letter which the two Senators from Oregon wrote under date of June 1, 1956, to Commissioner Owen Clarke, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, dealing with the decision which was handed down, and with our request that the question be made the subject of a hearing.

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

JUNE 1, 1956.

Hon. OWEN CLARKE,
Commissioner, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER CLARKE: We understand that the Federal court at Portland, Oreg., has dissolved the temporary restraining order issued by the court against Interstate Commerce Commission Service Order 910 and has dismissed the suit for an injunction against that order.

While technically this upholds the authority of the ICC to issue an order of this kind, we have received numerous telegrams and letters from small lumber shippers in Oregon that point out the extreme hardship that would be caused these shippers if the provisions of Service Order 910 were enforced. From a smaller number have come wires and letters supporting 910, indicating the highly controversial nature of the order and underscoring the need for a hearing on the question in the area concerned.

We respectfully request that you arrange hearings in Oregon and any other appropriate places on the Pacific coast to allow shippers to express the varied opinions on transit shipping of lumber.

Once the various points of view have been presented to the Commission, regardless of the final decision, there will be a more gracious acceptance of the Commission's action.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator.
RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks certain excerpts from an article on this subject published in the Traffic World for June 2, 1956. The article appears on pages 37 and 38.

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

The Southwestern Industrial Traffic League, in its annual membership meeting on May 22, at the Buccaneer Hotel, Galveston, Tex., decided to oppose proposed legislation to facilitate establishment of "incentive rates" (low rates on trainloads, multiple carloads or multiple truckloads), gave support to a Senate joint resolution providing for an ICC investigation of car shortages.

* * * * *

ACTION ON CAR SUPPLY PROBLEM

The league discussed, but took no action on, a railroad proposal to increase demurrage charges and bills in Congress to empower the Commission to impose penalty charges on railroads, in addition to daily car rental charges (per diem) in times of actual or threatened car shortages. However, after expressions of concern over the present car supply, the league voted to instruct its secretary to bring to the attention of the United States Senators from the Southwestern States "the inadequate supply and deplorable condition" of freight cars in the Southwest and to urge support by those Senators for Senate Joint Resolution 171. That joint resolution, it was stated, would direct the Commission to investigate in conferences with shippers and carriers the car supply situation, and to make recommendations with respect to, among other things, a proposal for establishment of a separate corporation to supervise distribution and use of the freight-car supply.

The statement was made that the freight-car shortage was now averaging 7,000 to 8,000 a day. Several members of the league agreed in the view that the car service order No. 94, of the Association of American Railroads, requiring expeditious return of empty cars to the owner lines in the West, was unfair to the roads, including those of the Southwest, from which those cars were taken while no provision was made to bring back to those roads the cars they themselves owned which were on "foreign" lines. As a result of operation of order 94 it was said, one industry which normally loaded 100 cars a day had been forced to shut down.

It was agreed, ultimately, that the only way in which the railroads could "help" was to order more cars and step up maintenance of the existing car supply.

Mr. MORSE. The resolution to which reference is made in the article is the joint resolution which my colleague from Oregon and I introduced sometime ago.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an excerpt from a letter which I received from a representative of small lumber operators in the State of Oregon, in which he discussed certain objections which he thinks can be raised to Service Order 910. I think it is only fair that his point of view be in the RECORD. These objections involve arguments which I think need to be developed at a hearing before the Interstate Commerce Commission. How can the Interstate Commerce Commission fully appreciate and understand the effect of Service Order 910 if a small mill operator such as this man represents is not given his day in court, so to speak? When I talk about a "day in court" I am not talking about an informal conference with the Interstate Commerce Commission. I am talking about a hearing of record, where there can be made the judicial record which may be needed in order to follow other legal steps if one decides that he has grounds upon which to take a case to court, on the basis of the arbitrary and capricious exercise of discretion on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

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

Perhaps the decision is right on technical terms, but the effect of the decision is to (a) work a severe hardship on small mills and wholesalers; (b) disrupt a 20-year practice without a hearing; (c) is the first step of governmental tyranny by taking unilateral action without notice or hearing to the persons affected thereby; (d) favors big business—i. e., the railroads; (e) will not alleviate the car shortage, which is simply the lack of adequate cars, and not faster movement thereof; (f) will discriminate in favor of eastern wholesalers, who route cars to the East and then sell them en route, thus causing hardship to western wholesalers; (g) will pinch small western mills, many of whom will go out of business, because of the prices they will receive will be substantially less than formerly; (h) force small mills to sell to large businesses, thus doing away with advantageous prices, and eliminating western wholesalers; and (i) taking of property without due process of law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks certain excerpts from a letter which I received from another representative of small mills in my State. The exerpts are marked in the letter.

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

With the office on summer schedule, I am left to do the typing if this is to reach you on Monday morning with a copy of the opinion of the court in *Daugherty Lumber Co.* v. *United States.*

The opinion of the court is enclosed. It concludes that the ICC is vested with statutory power to issue Service Order 910 without prior notice or hearing having been accorded to the affected persons and interests. As I stated at the hearing before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on May 8, WFIA was not challenging the naked legal power of the ICC to issue the order.

In discussing the procedure followed by the ICC, the court finds itself reminded of "governmental tyranny." With this concept, WFIA has also been in accord. We have suggested that the procedure adopted by the ICC in the issuance of its order was a willful evasion of congressional intent, arbitrary, and imperious. We have intimated that perhaps the reluctance of the ICC to hold a hearing in the matter may be reasonably attributed to the embarrassment it might suffer should it appear that the ICC was not acting with adequate knowledge of the situation it was seeking to regulate.

Our prime concern is the fact that the Commission elected to proceed with Order 910 under the provisions of section 1 (15), 49 USC 1 (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act rather than under section 1 (14) of the act. Under section 1 (14), the Commission could not have issued the order without first having held a hearing. Under section 1 (15), no hearing is necessary. But section 1 (15) authorizes the Commission to issue orders without a hearing only when there exists an emergency which requires immediate action.

Here the Commission knew a year in advance that it would issue Order 910. It might then have held a hearing. Certainly it could not then have issued the order without the hearing. But to evade this statutory requirement, to ignore fundamental concepts of fair dealing by a government with its own citizens, to provide a cloak for its own possible ignorance—the Commission waited for the beginning of the annual car shortage. Then, with its anticipated emergency finally at hand, the Commission was able to issue its Order 910 without a hearing. This may be, as the court concludes, legal. But it is sharp dealing. It is imperious and arrogant. It has lead a thoughtful court to reminisce of "governmental tyranny."

To outline the current situation:

Many months ago, the ICC knew that it intended to issue order 910. (See Traffic World, May 12, 1956, p. 30.)

The Commission deliberately awaited the onset of the anticipated car shortage before issuing its order in order to evade the necessity for a hearing.

The Commission, while pointing to gross loss in car-days resulting from transit type lumber shipments, has never considered whether, as many experts contend, there are gross savings resulting from quicker loading of transit cars, more nearly full loading of transit cars, absence of lost days that result from the partial unloadings experienced by firm order cars, etc.

The Commission has not adduced data to show whether there is a net gain or a net loss in car-days resulting from the transit sale technique for lumber.

If there is a net loss, the Commission should have considered the economic impact of its order on many lumber producers and the payrolls and communities they maintain in order to arrive at a thoughtful conclusion as to whether the net loss, if any, in car-days is more harmful to the public interest than is the dislocation and disruption likely to stem from ICC Order 910. It is difficult for us to believe that such information and understanding of the complex economics of this industry could have been achieved without a full hearing conducted locally and a careful, intelligent study of the record. Absent a hearing, we have government by ignorance.

To issue the order without notice and hearing was an arrogant, imperious procedure.

A hearing might have been held at any time before the issuance of the order. A hearing might have been held while enforcement of the order was temporarily restrained by the district court. A hearing might still be held. It is seldom too late to cure the ignorance of those who wish to learn.

Failure to hold the hearing flaunts accepted standards of governmental conduct. Even in the gravest of emergencies, ex parte orders of courts must be followed promptly by hearings. Congress acts only after public hearings conducted by its committees, excepting only instances where national security compels secrecy. In short, the ICC deliberately adopted a procedure which the Court may not, and Congress would not employ.

A hearing held for the lumber industry apparently would accommodate all of the protests received against order 910. (See Traffic World, supra, p. 30.)

* * * * *

Perhaps it is also pertinent to remark that if the ICC had buckled down to the job it is supposed to be doing, it is unlikely that Service Order 910 would even have been considered. Instead of tackling the fundamentals of the car shortage and presenting to Congress a comprehensive plan for assuring that the Nation's industry and agriculture will not be cut off from raw materials and markets, the ICC has stumbled along with makeshifts and piecemeal notions bottomed on the risky foundation of ignorance and speculation. In this connection, the need for Senate Joint Resolution 171 becomes apparent. It is disheartening to think, however, that a joint resolution of the Congress is needed to induce the ICC to do its basic job. Why won't the ICC rush in to do its job without waiting for this additional congressional directive?

Possibly the ICC would hold a hearing on Order 910 if the Magnuson subcommittee or the full committee would issue an appropriate report and recommendation. This would not invade the quasi-judicial functions of the ICC. It would aline the committee clearly with the courts in suggesting that a hearing is in order.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from Mr. J. E. Bauer, a lumberman of my State, who takes strong exception to Service Order 910. I think his point of view should be in the RECORD, and I think he should be given an opportunity to appear as a witness at a public hearing on this subject, called by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Reference ICC Order No. 910. May we suggest that you point out on the floor of the Senate that this order is discriminatory against the small-business men in this United States, not only the small wholesaler and mill man in Oregon but retailers and others throughout the United States all of which are small-business men. Also, point out that the three-judge court has declared that they have no province in the matter of suspending ICC Order 910.

At the same time point out that Mr. Eisenhower has time and time again said that the backbone of our economy is the small-business man, and now we would like to see if the administration is going to take the side of the small-business man and do something about ICC and Service Order 910 or will take the side of big business which many contend, as ICC Order 910 is without a question in favor of big business. It will be interesting to see which side the administration will take.

Yours very truly,

J. E. BAUER.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say to the small lumber mill operators of Oregon, here and now from the floor of the Senate, that, given that hearing, if they cannot make a case which on the basis of the preponderance of the evidence supports their view that this order ought to be canceled, then I will say to the Interstate Commerce Commission it should insist that its order go into effect. My criticism of the Interstate Commerce Commission is limited on this point solely to the fact that up to this hour the Commission has not given the lumbermen of my State the hearing which I believe under our system of fair trial in this country they are entitled to have, as is clearly intimated in the language contained in the court's decision.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a telegram I received from the Timberlane Lumber Co., of Eugene, Oreg., sent to me by Mr. R. B. Taylor, dealing with the same subject matter. Mr. Taylor is another lumberman who thinks that at least he ought to have a right to be heard and to make a record on this subject.

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

EUGENE, OREG., *June 2, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Federal court's dismissal restraining order on ICC Service Order 910 apparently means Commission has dictatorial powers allowing no recourse by hearing or through courts; therefore, you are our only hope to prevent the continuation of this tyrannical deprivation of a way of doing business so essential to small-business men in this area. The court in its opinion confirmed our contention that the order was unwise and would not alleviate the car shortage, but said they lacked jurisdiction to stop the order. Obviously, this is another attempt of big business to gain competitive advantage. Can any remedy be found to curb this situation?

TIMBERLANE LUMBER CO.,
R. B. TAYLOR.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, lastly I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement prepared by Aaron Jones, W. C. Kelsay, Russ Fryburg, and Dana McBarron, supplementing their oral testimony of March 29, 1956, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

With respect to Service Order No. 910, however, we can not concur in the Commission's judgment. This is not because of lack of respect for the Commission's expert knowledge of carriers. Indeed, we are confident that if the Commission had as much knowledge of the economics of the production and distribution of lumber as it does of the economics of rail transportation, Service Order No. 910 would not have been issued.

Certainly a knowledgeable Commission would not have adopted the imperious procedure used in the promulgation of Order 910. On March 30, 1956, the Commission informally advised us that in October 1955 it began collecting statistics to support the order. Until the Commission releases its statistics, careful analysis of them is premature and impossible. Suffice it to say at the moment that the Commission in gathering its statistics was acting in obvious ignorance of the subject matter because its statistics fail even to allude to the car savings created by lumber transit sales. In effect, the Commission looked only at the liability side of the balance sheet and through ignorance or otherwise ignored the asset side.

But the salient and terribly distressing fact is that in October 1955 the Commission began to gather its inadequate statistics. On March 19, 1956, the Commission issued Service Order 910. For over 5 months the Commission was apparently preparing for the issuance of its order. It is an order which strikes at an industry of which the Commission has no expert knowledge. Indeed,

the order exerts almost its total force against only the small- and medium-sized independent units of that industry. Yet in this entire 5 months' period there was no consultation with these small- and medium-sized business units. Indeed, there was not even a word of warning.

Without prior notice, on March 19, 1956, the order was issued, to become effective April 9. Nor was this gap of a few days intended to afford these stricken people an opportunity to make any adjustments. The Commission's view, as related to us, is that the gap was intended to accommodate only transit cars then en route. The Commission intended that from the moment of notice of its order, transit sales would stop. What the small mills were to do, what the lumber purchasers were to do, what was to become of Oregon's economy, seems not to have been considered. There was no consultation with us—no warning. It is difficult to conceive of discretionary power exercised more arbitrarily, more imperiously.

In the circumstances, we ask the committee to use whatever persuasion or power it possesses to induce a suspension of this Service Order No. 910 until the Commission holds a hearing, formal or informal, in western Oregon, for the purpose of acquainting itself with the economics of the lumber industry it seeks to regulate, and particularly of acquainting itself with all aspects of the transit-sale technique.

AARON JONES.
W. O. KELSAY.
RUSS FRYBURG.
DANA MCBARRON.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to say again to the Interstate Commerce Commission: "Give us a hearing, so that you will relieve the Commission of the just criticism which I believe is implied in the court's decision that failure to accord a hearing in such a matter really lays the foundation for the danger of establishing a trend toward tyranny in administrative law processes in our country."

NEW FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have recently had occasion to mention on the Senate floor the imaginative and provocative study of foreign aid which has been prepared by Max Millikan and Walter Rostow of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies. An excellent and detailed analysis based on this study appeared in the Washington Sunday Star for May 20, 1956. The article discussed first "some misconceptions" about foreign aid as judged by Professors Millikan and Rostow, and then summarizes their proposed program. I ask unanimous consent that this article appear at this point in my remarks.

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

NEW FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY STUDIED

(This article's background: A bold and comprehensive plan for revamping the United States' foreign economic policy was being circulated on Capitol Hill and in the highest echelons of the executive department last week. Its passionately nonpartisan approach apparently has impressed most of the men who are studying it. Authors of the 104-page, 24,000-word proposal are Max Millikan and W. W. Rostow, professors at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies. They make their proposals as private citizens, although the research on which their conclusions are based was conducted by MIT. Their summary of the proposal is given under the heading Some Misconceptions. A provocative tabulation of popular misconceptions about foreign aid, as judged by Mr. Millikan and Mr. Rostow, is given under the heading The Proposed Program.)

SOME MISCONCEPTIONS

Since many of the challenging criticisms of foreign assistance proposals have been directed against what we believe to be misconceptions of the kinds of political and psychological effects that such programs can be expected to have, it is well to take a look at some of these misconceptions.

The simplest misconception is that gratitude for help and assistance extended by us will lead the recipients to act in ways we desire simply because we want them to. Crudely put, the notion is that we can buy friendship and affection and that these in turn will insure behavior in our interest. Anyone who has had experience in the psychology of the grantor-grantee relationship in private charity or in international relations will not consciously fall into this error.

The grantee's sense of dependence commonly produces aggressive feelings of resentment toward the grantor which may easily worsen rather than improve relations between the two. If on other grounds we determine that large-scale assistance is in our interest, we must expect that an incidental result will frequently be less rather than more spirit of cooperation and mutual respect, even and perhaps especially if the aid programs are successful in achieving their objectives.

Many measures can be taken to reduce the severity of these hostile reactions to economic assistance, but they are often the precise opposite of the measures likely to be taken by an official smarting from the hurt of these reactions or spurred by a Congress so hurt. Our public role as donor must be minimized, not maximized; exaggerated credit must be given the recipient for his own contributions; demands for demonstrations of alliance and agreement must be reduced rather than increased.

Aid adds military strength?

A second misconception is that the central purpose of economic aid programs is always to strengthen the economies of the recipient countries to enable them in short order to carry a much larger share of the burden of military buildup against Communist armed forces.

There is, as we have already recognized, a good case for military assistance to allies who, as in Western Europe, have real industrial potential. This idea has been extended much too uncritically, however, to the less developed areas. The first trouble with it is that the resources of most of the underdeveloped areas are so limited that even with massive aid the contribution they can make to defense against open military aggression by the Communist nations is inevitably going to be very small.

We must face squarely up to the fact that resistance to determined military aggression by the Soviet bloc powers is a job for the United States with help from NATO powers of Western Europe. The hope that we can create and maintain such a defense cheaply by organizing the manpower masses of Asia, that we can prevent aggression by getting Asians to fight Asians, is largely illusory because Free Asia (perhaps excluding Japan) does not now have and cannot in the near future create, even with our assistance, the economic potential to suport a major military effort.

In the second place, while these countries can help to resist minor aggression and should be able to maintain order internally, weapons and military potential are ineffective without the will to use them. Some of the underdeveloped areas appear to have this will, others clearly do not.

Aid bolsters private enterprise?

There is an expectation frequently associated with American aid programs that they can and should be used to halt or reverse the trend toward socialism present in many underdeveloped areas.

We agree with those who hold that a private market system with maximum opportunity and incentive for individual enterprise will in the long run promote self-sustaining growth better than a highly bureaucratized system dominated by central government. But we believe paradoxically that we shall promote ultimate reliance on private incentives more effectively by not insisting on any particular economic philosophy as a condition of aid than by attaching private enterprise strings. A favorable environment for private investment can, in some cases, be established only after a period of rather heavy capital formation under Government auspices.

This is what happened in Japan in the decade after 1868, and, more recently, the whole set of measures instituted by the Indian Government in the period starting in 1951 have, by 1956, created an environment in which the Indian private sector is undergoing rapid growth.

Thus we believe on the one hand that crude attempts to force a free private enterprise philosophy on recipient countries as an explicit or implicit condition for aid are almost certain to be self-defeating; on the other hand we believe there are good reasons for expecting countries now avowedly Socialist but determinedly democratic to move toward greater reliance on private incentives as their development proceeds.

Communism springs from hunger?

A final and serious misconception which exposes proposals for economic programs to effective attack is what may be called the Marxist fallacy underlying the thinking of many conservative people on the role of economic change in political development.

Crudely stated, it is held that revolt and protest are the result of hunger and poverty and that relieving hunger and reducing poverty will therefore reduce revolutionary pressures. In other words, if we can supply the wherewithal to feed people better, they are much less likely to support Communist or other extremist movements.

The implied picture of the forces affecting social and political change is so naive as to be vulnerable to attack from a number of directions.

In the first place, the spirit of revolt does not breed easily among people who are chronically destitute. In the rigid feudal societies which still characterize some parts of the world those at the bottom of the scale have for generations accepted a fatalistic view that it is in the nature of things that they should be poor. People do not organize and conspire to promote change when they believe change to be inherently impossible.

These facts are well understood by the Communists, who concentrate their efforts not among those who are hopeless but among those in whom expectations have already been aroused.

The first and most powerful effect of economic development efforts is likely to be to dislodge convictions and habit patterns which have in the past insured stability. A further factor contributing to unrest is the education which accompanies economic change. With a growing understanding of the huge discrepancies in rewards customary in backward societies comes a growing awareness that these discrepancies are not the inevitable result of God's will.

The proposed program

As we see it there are two priority tasks for United States foreign policy. The first of

these is to meet effectively the threat to our security posed by the danger of overt military aggression. This danger arises, at the moment, from the capabilities and possible future intentions of the Communist bloc countries.

It is to be met primarily by maintaining or increasing United States military strength and second by solidifying alliances with other countries in a position to contribute significantly to American strength. One of the instruments to be used in this effort is military and economic assistance to countries with important industrial potential, mainly the NATO powers, designed to make that potential militarily more effective. This is part of our current policy and need not be discussed further.

The second priority task of our foreign policy is to use our influence to promote the evolution of a world in which threats to our security and more broadly to our way of life are less likely to arise. Success in this task would mean the freeing of a large volume of resources from military to more constructive uses. More important, it would mean freeing our society from the oppressive pressures inevitably associated with a garrison state, pressures which threaten our most cherished values.

The components

We may summarize the component parts of our proposals thus:

The United States should launch at the earliest possible moment a long-term program for sustained economic growth in the free world. This program would make available to the underdeveloped areas sufficient additional capital and technical assistance to satisfy all likely demands for such assistance which meet fairly high standards of eligibility based on the prospective productivity of investment. The levels of investment assumed would be sufficient to make possible an overall one percent annual increase in real income per capita for all the underdeveloped countries of the free world. In practice, some would grow faster, some slower, than this rate.

As part of this program the United States Government should offer to provide a new long-term capital fund of from $10 to $12 billion to be available for loans and grants over a 5-year period to accelerate economic growth in underdeveloped areas. Although an initial 5-year allocation is recommended, the plan would look ahead for a longer period, at least a decade.

This sum would be accompanied by commitments from the advanced countries to make additional loans and grants of from $2 to $3 billion over the same time period as part of a unified free world program.

Concerted measures should be taken to enlarge the international flows of private capital. Such measures might yield an addition over present level of $3 to $4 billion during the first 5-year period.

These sums must be made available to free world countries without any military or political strings, but under strict business-like criteria.

Recipient countries must show evidence of widespread popular support of the broad goals of the programs.

It is most unlikely, if such criteria are enforced, that the whole of the sums offered would be taken up. It is essential to the plan, however, that availability of the full amount be guaranteed in order to remove capital as a bottleneck to economic growth and to provide maximum stimulus for the governments and peoples of the underdeveloped countries to expand their capacities to use capital effectively.

A systematic plan should be worked out for establishing international stocks of agricultural surpluses to be made available for development purposes. Such a plan must contain certain provisions designed to insure that distribution of such stocks would not interfere with the normal markets of exporting countries.

Loans and grants should be administered by existing national and international agencies, including the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank, the Colombo plan organization, etc. New machinery is required, however, to set the ground rules and lay down the criteria for the investment program.

The program would include the following features:

1. To restore and maintain an efficient international division of labor, insuring for industrial countries sources of agricultural products and raw materials and markets for their products.

2. To stabilize in the interest of the supplying countries raw material and foodstuff markets and prices.

3. To liberalize United States trade policies by progressive stages.

4. To achieve free world currency convertibility.

5. To achieve a common free world policy on East-West trade.

Sharp edge of policy

This program will not achieve its basically political and psychological purposes unless its fundamental features are preserved. The sharp edges of policy which must be preserved appear to be these:

The additional sums envisaged must be large enough to remove capital as a bottleneck to growth, under the tough criteria of productivity envisaged.

There must be no tie between economic aid and military pacts, and no explicit political conditions within the free world beyond the requirement that development goals be democratically established. An aid program with strings yields satellites, not partners.

The plan must look to a long future and envisage a sustained United States effort.

There must be a real measure of international contribution and international administration.

Without these elements, the proposal would probably be rejected by some nations we would wish to see join in the effort, e. g., India. With these elements maintained, we believe this plan will go far toward restoring and maintaining the unity of the free world.

THE RUSSIAN DEEMPHASIS OF STALIN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of our gifted and outstanding former colleagues of this body recently delivered an important speech to the Overseas Writers' Club here in Washington. Speeches and articles by former Senator William Benton are always stimulating and this one is no exception. Senator Benton criticizes the administration for its failure to take full advantage of the historical opportunity offered the free world by the new Russian deemphasis of Stalin. This important and significant speech has not yet attracted the attention it deserves.

As Senators will recall, former Senator Benton recently visited the Soviet Union for an extended period of time, and some of the observations he made on his visit have been very informative and educational to the American people.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

REMARKS BY WILLIAM BENTON, PUBLISHER, ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA, OVERSEAS WRITERS' CLUB, HOTEL STATLER, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 30, 1956

These past few months the American people have suddenly awakened to the fact that our influence and prestige abroad are skidding. At the same time Soviet influence and prestige are, on net, going up. The Middle East turmoil; Iceland's request that we withdraw our troops; the defeat of its strongly pro-Western government by Ceylon; French Premier Molle's sharp criticism of our foreign policy; all of these have come as a surprise to most Americans and as a shock to some.

Not all the voices asking whether we are losing the cold war are those of Democratic Party presidential hopefuls. Even the Eisenhower administration seems alarmed. A new note has appeared in recent speeches by President Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles. Obviously some very serious reappraisal, maybe even agonized soul searching, is taking place in this city. The hunt for ideas seems to be on. I'd therefore—on my first visit to Washington in some months, occasioned by testimony tomorrow before a subcommittee of the Atomic Energy Committee—I'd therefore like to throw out a few ideas as a good will offering from a defeated Democrat to a victorious Republican administration.

The focus of the world struggle has shifted to the field of propaganda. Its focus is likely to remain fixed on propaganda and economic policy and appropriations, for a long time to come. When he has put his mind to it President Eisenhower has been, and can be, a great propagandist. His atoms for peace speech before the United Nations in December 1953 was a top propaganda move—in the best sense of the word. So, judged strictly as propaganda, was his aerial inspection plan for armament control. I personally favored his proposal for an atom peace ship—though many opposed it. Such a ship could be worth a dozen in the Navy. President Eisenhower can compete with Bulganin and Khrushchev as propagandists—if he wants to—and I'm not suggesting he undertake the strain of world tours. Secretary Dulles seems to enjoy the latter chore, and good for him, because such tours are greatly needed.

But first the President must appreciate the importance of competing. He has discovered, and I'm sometimes perplexed as to whether gladly or sadly, that he must be the chief propagandist of the Republican Party. He must now discover that he is the essential man as the chief propagandist of the free world, and this involves a more aggressive propaganda world role than any since Wilson, including Franklin Roosevelt with his four freedoms. The world-wide propaganda of the West is no longer a job for a second- or third-ranking Assistant Secretary. It is for the President himself who must speak out. He must speak often and well, continuously carrying the refrain of the fight for freedom. Only he can speak for America in a voice that all the world will listen to. Even the Soviet press has now conceded that it must let its readers know what Eisenhower is saying. And that means that when he speaks, he can speak to the Soviet people and to the satellite people directly.

Jack Raymond of the New York Times was in the Ukraine last week. He talked to the mayor of Odessa. This is how Raymond describes what the mayor had to say:

"He declared he had obtained his first inkling of Stalin's role in a statement made by President Eisenhower that was published in the Soviet press. He said the President had asserted that upon Stalin's death the

'Stalin era' had ended. This expression set him to thinking, he declared."

How revealing this is. The Times could have livened its editorial page by comment on Raymond's dispatch. The President of the United States makes a speech. It gets printed in the Soviet press. It starts the mayor of one of Russia's biggest cities to thinking along new lines. And are we to suppose that the mayor was the only one who started thinking? There's quite a lot of new thinking going on today in Russia and in Eastern Europe. And our job is to help that thinking along, to provide it with fresh facts and new ideas.

An enormous—a historic—opportunity has opened up to us. Will we take advantage of it? The anti-Stalin campaign is shaking Russia psychologically in a way it has not been shaken in the 38 years of the Soviet regime. For decades, the people of the U. S. S. R. were told that Stalin was the wisest, the kindest, the sweetest, the greatest man who ever lived. In a word, that he was infallible. Ever since World War II that theme has been hammered into the captive peoples of East Europe. Now the word is that he was a maniac; he was also a murderer and a monster. His victims are being released from jail, or posthumously "rehabilitated." Books, movies, plays, poems, and pictures produced during his lifetime must now be scrapped. What was yesterday's white is today's black.

Only last week Khrushchev's attacks on Stalin were reported to be growing still tougher. Stalin is alleged to have been more anti-Semitic than Hitler, with all Jews having been scheduled for deportation to Siberia. Can and should we now assume that the Soviet people are so stupid that they will not draw conclusions from the evidence given them by their own leaders, now laid each week before them, of how a madman deceived them, of how he lied to them and of how he even killed their brothers and sisters, their fathers and mothers?

For an American parallel we have to imagine how Americans would have felt in 1789, the year of our Constitution, if they had suddenly found out that George Washington was a British spy, and Benedict Arnold a patriotic American whom Washington had framed.

The men in the Kremlin are concerned about this shock. Look how slowly and carefully they are releasing the news to their people. Look at the happenings in Tiflis last month, when Soviet troops had to machinegun Stalin's countrymen in the streets. Even in the Soviet Communist Party there has been a reaction which caused Pravda to denounce what it calls "rotten elements" in the party. These elements, we can hope, may be those who have been stimulated to doing some thinking for themselves.

In Poland, the news has been given to the people straight, not slowly and carefully as in Russia. Here's what the Polish radio had to say a few days ago:

"The cult of Joseph Stalin. How strong was the reaction of every one of us when the figure of this man emerged before us in the full glare of historical truth. Many of us experienced this with as much pain as if it were a blow delivered to ourselves. For thousands, for millions of people Stalin was the personification and symbol of justice, infallibility, genius, and goodness. The reaction was strong and painful. It sometimes started with rebellion. People said in factories the following: "We shall not allow Stalin to be taken from us."

Then the broadcast continued:

"Recently we read in the weekly paper Poprostru the statement by one of the young leaders: 'As a result of bitter reflection on the subject of the cult of personality, I came to the conclusion that no authorities exist, beginning with the secretary of the basic party organization and ending with the Secretary of the Central Committee.'"

Mind you, this is a Communist radio commentator speaking, a Communist commentator in Poland where Stalin has been glorified only for 10 years. How much sharper, how much more explosive must be the present psychological reaction among Soviet youth where most of the population can't remember a time when they were not told that Stalin was the personification of all that is noble.

Can it be that because of the tremendous successes of the Communist propaganda since 1917 and even before—can it be that the Soviet leaders have now at last overestimated the power of their propaganda? When they now tell the youth of Russia about Stalin, when they tell the youth of Russia that Stalin was not infallible—may they not be sowing the seeds of unbelief in the Soviet propaganda? I like a phrase of Allen Dulles'. He writes me of his "cautious optimism." I agree. From such seeds as the present cynical reversal on Stalin, from these may we not hope that future disbelief and discord may develop. The question before the Eisenhower administration is how to cultivate this hope, how to seize it and develop it, and in this area we should now be seeking the ideas for the President and his administration.

Khrushchev is worried. It is now 2 months since he delivered his secret speech to the Communist Party Congress. The speech has not yet been published anywhere. Moreover, it must be clear to many Russians that the full story of Stalin's crimes has not been told, even by Khrushchev. Khrushchev and his associates are trying to preserve part of Stalin's past reputation in order to hang on to Soviet material gains which Stalin's crimes made possible. Moreover, they have a personal interest in preserving part of Stalin's reputation: They were his proteges who might be nothing today if it were not for Stalin. So far as we know, Khrushchev and company still have not publicly answered the key question: Why didn't they stop Stalin while his crimes were being performed? For them this is a question of the stop-beating-your-wife variety. They don't propose to answer it because the answer is obvious. Theodore Kaghan printed an amusing anecdote on this point, which he reported is circulating in Europe. While Khrushchev was at the height of his denunciation of Stalin, while the congress was in executive session so to speak, a note came up to the rostrum. Khrushchev opened it and read aloud: "Where were you while all this was going on?" Khrushchev raised his eyes and said, "Will the comrade who sent this note please stand up." No response in the congress. Khrushchev said "I demand that the comrade who sent this note stand before I give a count of 3." Still no response. Khrushchev then said, "Comrade, you have my answer. I was just where you are today."

This anecdote, if true, as it may well be, helps show Khrushchev's talent with a phrase; his own skill as a propagandist.

The attack on Stalin helps bring into the open, it helps define the opportunity now before the American people through their President. I suggest that President Eisenhower now authorize a series of statements directed to the Soviet people, and to the people in the satellites. The theme should be Stalin himself, and only Stalin. This is the theme forced upon us by the Soviet leaders themselves. The top issues in the world today, as defined by these leaders, are Stalin's crimes, Stalin's lies, Stalin's aggression, and Stalin's personal responsibility for the cold war, the arms race, and most of the world's troubles.

Ideally, the President himself should make these statements, perhaps in the form of personal broadcasts carried by the Voice of America. As I think we here today can agree, his is the one voice that speaks most effectively for the United States, and his words, as President, are the only words the Communist press might not now dare to ignore. However, I have been around Washington enough to know that one does not demand that the President "must" do anything, and today I have no wish of any kind to add to the strains upon a busy man who quite understandably has much else on his mind in this election year. Perhaps a series of statements under his signature or made for him by the Secretary of State, will break through to the Soviet and satellite peoples.

Here are some of the things the President could say with productive results to the free world:

First, he ought to call on Khrushchev to make public the secret speech he made before the party congress. He might even suggest that it would not run counter to the "spirit of Geneva," the great new propaganda slogan of the U. S. S. R., if the Communist leaders quit treating the Soviet people like political infants who can only be fed one drop of the truth at a time.

Second, he ought to tell the Soviet and satellite peoples that the true history of the past several decades was far, far different from what they have been taught. Did you see the news reports on the textbooks I brought back from the U. S. S. R., given me by Mr. Kairov, then Minister of Education? They don't mention the United States in the victory over Japan in World War II—and they state flatly that General Eisenhower only launched the Normandy landing after the heroic Soviet armies had defeated the Nazi armies.

The President ought to discuss in detail such Stalinist crimes as these:

The Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939.

The German-Soviet partition of Poland.

The destruction of the Baltic States independence by the Red army.

The deliberate way Stalin let the population of Warsaw be murdered by the Germans during the Warsaw uprising while the Red army stood nearby and did nothing to help the heroic Polish underground in 1944.

The Katyn Forest massacre in which Stalin murdered the flower of the Polish Army officer corps.

The enslavement of the captive states after 1945; and the destruction of the freedom of Czechoslovakia in 1948.

The attempted takeover of northern Iran in 1945 and 1946.

Soviet atomic espionage against the United States.

The Communist aggression against South Korea.

The germ warfare lie campaign.

Third, the President should explain to the Soviet people how it is difficult for us to trust the present Soviet leaders who were Stalin's henchmen throughout the period of his worst crimes. The members of the Presidium were picked and trained by Stalin. We have no guaranty that they will not repeat his treachery if given a chance.

Fourth, the President should make clear that we of America and the free world have no intention of interfering in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union. At the same time he should make clear our belief that Soviet collective leadership, as it is practiced today, is only collective dictatorship. He should stress that we fear the power of a dictatorship to deceive its people, and to misuse the nation's resources for political, economic, and military aggression. He should set forth and underscore our belief that only a democratic regime in Russia, or in any other country, can make certain that the people's yearning for bread and peace will be met.

Fifth, the President should openly challenge the Soviet leaders to present his words to the Soviet people, in full and not in part,

To the best of my knowledge, Secretary Byrnes was the first to do this, when I was serving under him a decade ago. He got away with it, too, in one critical speech.

The President can again remind Khrushchev and company that their speeches are printed here in the United States in full, that they are available to every person who wants to read them. He should stress that, if they suppress his messages, world public opinion will know there is no sincerity in their present talk of peace and coexistence. The President should speak bluntly, and over more so, as bluntly as did Khrushchev in London last week when he boasted of Soviet hydrogen bombs and intercontinental missiles.

The President's theme to the Soviet people must be direct and simple: That Stalin committed not only the crimes Khrushchev admits, but also many that Khrushchev has not admitted, and that it is this great bundle of crimes which forced us to arm in self-defense, and to create overseas bases and defensive alliances. As never before, the President's messages to the enslaved peoples of the world can carry conviction because even the Soviet people have at long last been set to thinking, to questioning and doubting. Because they already have been told that Stalin bamboozled them, and have had a partial documentation, they are prepared to hear more.

The possibility of such an approach by us must have occurred to the Soviet leaders. On the record, they've been much smarter propagandists than we have. They must be unhappy and even uneasy about the possibility. Take a look at some of Premier Bulganin's remarks in Great Britain last week. He suggested we Westerners should let bygones be bygones, and not discuss past responsibility for international tension too much. It's easy to understand why he feels that way, but it would be stupid and foolish for us to acquiesce and submit. The Soviet crimes of the past are the basis for much of the world's present unhappy situation and for our present fears. That is what the Soviet people must be told.

In the past week or two both President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles seem to have made a start along the lines I am recommending. The President called for rectification of Stalin's crime in enslaving the captive nations. Mr. Dulles mentioned Stalin's lies about the Korean war and germ warfare. But these were individual paragraphs in long speeches devoted primarily to other topics. In that context the paragraphs could have little or no impact upon the Soviet people.

What I feel is urgently needed is a series of top-level speeches, dealing with Stalin and Stalin alone, backed up by and promoted by every available media and every publicity and promotion technique. Such speeches should be directed specifically to the Soviet and satellite peoples and not to American public opinion. In them, I hope our Secretary of State will look abroad, instead of toward Madison Avenue and November 1956. As a graduate of the Avenue, 21 years ago, I urge upon him the viewpoint that by this rearrangement of viewpoint, he may astonish his advertising agencies and do a better job of public relations and even win a better chance of victory. I agree, however, that we must use one advertising technique: We must repeat our story time and time again, using every medium we can, to get it into the Communist empire and to keep it there. The Soviet propagandists, like American advertisers, know the value of repetition. Our Government must learn it and apply it as well.

Some may argue that what I am proposing is undiplomatic, that it is tactless, that it will offend the Soviet leaders and lessen the chance for peace. My reply is "Nonsense." I do not deny that there is often the need for tact and diplomacy in dealing with the Russians. But the Soviet leaders do their best every day to speak to the peoples of the free world over the heads of the free world's leaders. Their own conduct can serve as a precedent and a justification for what I propose, although I don't like to advance their conduct as either a precedent or justification for anything.

The Soviet people are thinking. They are asking questions. They are breaking out of old patterns of passive belief and acceptance. This gives to us of the free world a historic opportunity and one we may not soon get again. If we grasp this opportunity boldly and exploit it imaginatively we can, I am confident, achieve gains of the first magnitude toward our objective of peace and international understanding. If we let the opportunity slip by, a new equilibrium may be created in the Communist world, a new set of myths can develop, and rather quickly, to dominate the thinking of the Kremlin's subjects so that our future messages will again go unheeded, even if not unheard. The opportunity is now here. The time to exploit it is now. I do not understand the delay. Can it be attributed to the upside-down world described by an official so high ranking that he shall be nameless? His topsy-turvy substitution occurred before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He gave us a new version of victory, a version which made him sound more like a Madison Avenue public-relations man than a statesman. He flatly denied that the Soviet leaders are leading from strength and suggests that their hand is a Yarborough.

The decision to take the needed action is up to the President of the United States. I pray to God he will grasp that opportunity for the good of all humanity. He has the kind of understanding for the problem if he will but apply it. I well remember his understanding and his eloquence in this area. When I was Assistant Secretary of State, in the toughest job I ever tackled, and when he was Chief of Staff, he was my favorite witness before congressional committees. He understood the kind of issues I'm discussing today—as also did Generals Marshall and Bedell Smith—far better than did the top officers of the State Department. I hope he will unleash his understanding and leadership in this field of communication of ideas—I hope he will unleash it again through his leadership at this time.

THE BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] addressed the Senate on the subject of the recurring boxcar shortage. On May 9, 1956, I invited the Senate's attention once more to that crisis which seems to hit us on a seasonal basis every year. Hearings have been conducted on Senate 2770 by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I am certain that a great many Senators are waiting for action on this matter as impatiently as I am. I earnestly hope that the committee will report this measure favorably in the very near future so that this critical situation will be alleviated after these months and years of postponement.

I join with other Senators today in asking the Interstate Commerce Commission to do whatever it can to stimulate, first of all, the proper movement of boxcars into markets, so that the available supply can be properly used; and, secondly, to do whatever it can to encourage the railroads to fulfill their responsibilities in providing boxcars, which are urgently and desperately needed.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I sincerely join the distinguished Senator from Minnesota in asking for prompt action on the bill to which he has referred.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say that I have concluded hearings on the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We know the Senator has concluded hearings.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is on the agenda of next Wednesday's regular meeting of the committee. I hope we can report the bill then, because I am afraid the ICC will not do anything unless we pass the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to commend the Senator from Washington for what he has done to expedite the processing of the bill. I testified before his subcommittee. The Senator has had many other duties to perform, as was exemplified by the appropriation bills today. My point was merely to join with my colleagues in urging favorable action by the committee and, once the bill is reported and placed on the calendar, prompt action by the Senate.

Two articles which describe the boxcar shortage from a Minnesota viewpoint appeared in the Minneapolis Star on May 28 and 29. They are written by the Minneapolis Star staff writer, Herb Paul. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Minneapolis Star of May 28, 1956]

BOXCAR SPEEDUP SOUGHT IN CONGRESS

(By Herb Paul)

Congress has been asked for immediate legislation to help speed movement of present supplies of railroad boxcars to prevent upper midwest market-bound grain from becoming "mired by the most drastic boxcar shortage it has faced."

E. L. Peterson, director of the Minneapolis Traffic Association, called on grain dealer and farmer country elevator associations to make their members' voices heard in Washington in a concerted effort to obtain such legislation before Congress adjourns.

"We are again confronted with another boxcar shortage," he said. "Every indication tells us it will be more severe than last year."

A survey conducted by L. L. Crosby, chairman of the Minneapolis Grain Exchange Car Supply Committee, of nearly 2,400 country elevators showed these results:

Out of the first 300 replies received by the end of last week, 78 country elevators reported they were plugged with old grain because of inability to obtain boxcars.

Of this number, 35 were in North Dakota, 7 in South Dakota, 16 in Minnesota, and 20 in Montana.

Nationally, Peterson said, the car shortage is rapidly getting worse. As of May 7, 1955, the average daily boxcar shortage was 3,578 cars, while on May 5 of this year it was 4,603 cars, an increase of 1,025 cars.

Peterson, to hasten congressional action, urged Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat of Washington, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to seek immediate passage of the bill he introduced

permitting penalty per diem charges during boxcar shortages.

Per diem charges are rental charges on cars used by non-owning roads and today are fixed at $2.40 per day by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The ICC, Peterson said, is powerless to further increase the per diem charges and the responsibility rests with Congress to which the ICC answers.

Hearings started on the bill in March, at which time Peterson urged its approval. But a group of railroads opposed the bill as it was written, although reported in sympathy with its objectives, and a substitute bill was offered.

Peterson said the grain trade and country shippers feel passage of either bill would speed up and stimulate the return by eastern railroads of cars owned by western roads.

Pointing out both bills involve the matter of per diem on car rental charges, Peterson called Magnuson's attention to the fact railroads now are in the process of formulating substantial increases in their demurrage rules and charges.

This is the charge a railroad imposes upon a shipper who takes more than a "reasonable" number of hours to load or unload a car. Peterson believes that because of the demurrage increases, grain shippers are justified in asking increased rentals be imposed on railroads using another line's equipment.

Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, already has cited the seriousness of the boxcar shortage and he urged MAGNUSON'S committee to expedite action "so that we may at last be saved from the seasonal recurrence of a boxcar shortage this year."

HUMPHREY inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a story in the Minneapolis Star on the action of the executive committee of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners (NARUC) demanding congressional action on the car shortage. The NARUC has backed the bill.

It also appealed to the Office of Defense Mobilization to extend the amortization program for rapid tax write-off on new equipment which was terminated last year so more boxcars could be included in its provisions.

[From the Minneapolis Star of May 29, 1956]

BOXCAR SHORTAGE BLAMED ON EAST

(By Herb Paul)

An insight as to how the boxcar shortage situation applies to the upper Midwest was presented by two Minnesota railroad experts at the convention of the Midwest Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners at Omaha, Nebr.

They were M. J. Galvin, public relations counsel for Minnesota railroads, St. Paul, and E. S. Ulyatt, general superintendent of transportation of the Northern Pacific Railway.

Speaking at the invitation of Paul A. Rasmussen, chairman of the Minnesota Railroad and Warehouse Commission, president of the association, Galvin and Ulyatt discussed what they termed is a most troublesome subject as far as our industry and a great segment of shipping public are concerned.

"Particularly," Galvin said, "because we raise and market grain and other agricultural products which come at certain peak or load seasons and have to be moved to concentration or processing points over comparatively short periods of time."

One main cause of the perennial boxcar shortages, he said, is the fact the upper Midwest, as a producing country, ships a great amount of products to the concentrated population in the East—and has difficulty getting its boxcars back.

As a result when western lines request return of their cars each spring, they find by July they have only about 80 percent of ownership available. And by October this drops to about 75 percent.

Today, with mechanized harvesting, much of the grain goes to market immediately so the impact on country elevators, rail shipping, and storage facilities in the rural areas has been terrific.

Grain that goes to the terminal market must be sampled, graded, and offered for sale, either stored or diverted to other destinations, all of which takes time.

Galvin believes this situation only can be remedied effectively by additional storage facilities in rural or other points close to the harvest and not readily remedied by boxcar supply.

It would be simply transferring the congestion from rural areas to terminal points where the headache might be greater.

"If the railroads had on hand all boxcars needed to move the grain at harvest time stored on the rail sidings," he said, "it would only be a matter of days when the terminals would become so plugged with cars awaiting inspection, sales, and switching for diversions or unloading that the headache would be much greater than it is today."

Another thing that contributes to the boxcar shortage, Galvin said, is the fact that all Commodity Credit Corporation grain loans come due the last of April.

When the time comes for the Government to take over the grain when the loan is above the market price, the CCC must start to process its paper, he said.

"A couple of years ago they moved the loan paper to central points where, we have been told, it sometimes takes as long as a month to process the paper and take over the grain.

"Then we often find the movement of that grain to terminals is delayed into June and July, tying up boxcars that otherwise would be available for movement of the current crop."

Galvin believes southern and northern crop loans might be made for the same period of time and not all come due on one date.

Ulyatt said car rental per diem charges are an important factor in the car supply and distribution.

"We favor legislation (by Congress) which would authorize and require higher per diem charges during car shortages, as well as high per diem generally, upon the ground such higher charges will provide an incentive for increased ownership."

He said increased per diem charges during a car shortage partially will offset the revenue loss sustained by a railroad when its cars are appropriated by other roads, and will promote quicker movement of freight cars at all times.

He said that "as long as it is cheaper to rent a car than it is to own one (and that is the situation today) underbuilding will be the policy of the strategically situated (eastern) railroads. And construction of new cars will be held to minimum requirements."

Ulyatt said Northern Pacific generally operates with below 80 percent ownership of its cars, which places a severe handicap on the shippers it serves.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, 8 years ago Senate Resolution 175 was considered in committee at a hearing over which the late Senator Reed of Kansas presided. More than 500 witnesses testified in favor of the very thing that is now in the bill to which the Senator has referred. At that time the ICC promised to see to it that cars would be provided to haul grain in early spring. And I believe the Senator from Washington will recall that there were 50,000 bushels of flax on the Montana prairies, and a great number of bushels of wheat. At that time we secured from the Interstate Commerce Commission every promise that it could make to regulate the use of railroad boxcars. Nevertheless, today the situation is as bad as it was at that time. That is why I am so eager to join the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Minnesota in asking prompt action. I have had telegrams and letters from all over the Northwest urging action on the bill.

INTERNATIONAL FARM YOUTH EXCHANGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most constructive and imaginative efforts now being conducted in the whole field of international exchange of persons is the program sponsored by the National 4–H Club Foundation called the International Farm Youth Exchange. In the interest of removing the causes of world tension and promoting peace, this International Farm Youth Exchange program arranges for the exchange of rural youth between the United States and nearly 50 countries throughout the world.

Wearing blue jeans and work clothes, the boys and girls who participate in this program live and work as regular members of the family in such diverse places as the farming villages of Western Europe and the rice paddies of Japan. Demonstrating by their deeds that the American people have not lost touch with our heritage of manual labor, these young Americans are correcting a common misconception about us widely held abroad—the assumption that everything in the United States is machine driven or machine run.

At the same time, youths from Europe, Latin America, Asia, and the Near East have come to this country to live as members of farm families in nearly every State of the Union. They are sharing the day-to-day pleasures and hardships of American farm life, and in this process they are having an opportunity to feel the pulse of rural life in our own democracy. Minnesota farmers alone have been hosts to 41 exchanges from countries throughout the world.

Mr. President, I think it is important to note that the cost of operating the International Farm Youth Exchange is not paid by the United States Government. The National 4–H Club Foundation, which sponsors the exchange, obtains contributions from 4–H clubs, civic groups, farm organizations, foundations, American industry, interested individuals, and others who feel that through this program they can contribute in some measure to the establishment of better understanding at the family level, which must be the basis for a lasting peace.

The International Farm Youth Exchange will soon be conducted out of the National 4–H Club Center, which is being developed in Chevy Chase, Md., by the National 4–H Club Foundation. 4–H Club members themselves are giving a dime each to help establish this "working" 4–H shrine. When the

4–H Center is in operation, we, as Members of Congress, will have the opportunity to meet there with 4–H Club members from our States. At this national 4–H shrine, symbolic of the dignity of agriculture, we can discuss the operation of our national Government and help 4–H'ers from our States to prepare to serve their country as good citizens in a democracy.

Those who take part in the International Farm Youth Exchange have broadened their perspectives through the down-to-earth experiences they have shared in the homes and on the farms of this country. Without a doubt they form the nucleus of a well-informed democratic leadership in the rural society of their native lands. We can see, too, in the Americans who left rural communities for this overseas experience, a corps of enlightened citizens well aware of the problems and perplexities of this ever-shrinking world. Moreover, we should not overlook the thousands of farm families who, as host families, have acquired a better understanding of their world neighbors.

Mr. President, this is the 9th year of the International Farm Youth Exchange, under which 630 of our rural youth have gone abroad to live and work with our rural neighbors in other lands. This year 300 exchanges will be conducted with nearly 50 countries.

I feel that the National 4–H Club Foundation, the Cooperative Extension Service, and the farm people themselves are to be commended for the success of this unique and worthwhile program.

As one Senator, I hope it will continue to grow and to serve the cause of peace in the years ahead, and I join with others in commending it for an outstanding program of service to our country.

FREE OR REDUCED AIR TRANSPORTATION RATES FOR MINISTERS OF RELIGION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3149) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act in order to permit certain air carriers to grant free or reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 232, extending greetings to the American National Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary. I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 232) extending greetings to the American National Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, although this is a House concurrent resolution, it was unanimously approved by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. There are certain reasons why the American National Red Cross wishes to have the resolution agreed to this week. I therefore ask for its immediate consideration. Nothing is involved in it except congratulatory recognition of the American National Red Cross.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 232) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress extend its greetings and felicitations to all the members of the American National Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary, express to them its appreciation for their services to humanity, and urge the continued voluntary participation by the American people in the work entrusted to the organization by the Congress and the Government.

The preamble was agreed to.

PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE IN RURAL AREAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2089, H. R. 2840. I call the attention of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] to the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2840) to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. A similar bill has been reported by the committee in previous sessions, and it has been passed by the Senate previously.

The bill has now been passed by the House. What we seek to do is simply what the Senate has already done before.

The bill provides for public library services in rural areas. There are presently approximately 27 million Americans without access to any local public library services and 90 percent of these people live in rural areas. Additionally, about 53 million people have local library services which are deemed by competent persons to be inadequate.

The bill has for its purpose the development of public library services in rural areas, providing modest funds in grants for a period of 5 years which will stimulate the States to develop methods of providing library services to residents of small towns, villages, and farming communities which now totally lack them or where they are inadequately supplied.

The committee wishes to emphasize the 5-year nature of this program. It is anticipated that 5 years of Federal assistance should be sufficient to energize a program for expansion of library services so that at the end of the period the States and localities will be able to provide adequate services. John S. Richards, president of the American Library Association, in testifying in favor of this bill, assured the committee that his organization believed that the program should be limited to 5 years and that in that period of time the States would be stimulated to solve most of their rural library problems.

The cost for this program of stimulating State extension of library services to rural areas—incorporated or unincorporated communities of 10,000 population or less—will be $7,500,000 for each of 5 years.

It should be stressed that because of greatly developed professional cooperation among librarians and the institutions they serve, the mere provision of library services in rural areas almost immediately opens up enormous library resources to these areas. Librarians have worked out cooperative methods of lending their books and files and other materials to such a degree that there can be a constant flow of valuable library materials to these rural areas once the outlets are established for their utilization.

Another expected result for this legislation lies in the chain reaction which comes about from demonstrating to communities the values of library services. Where no library services exist, communities cannot be expected to fully understand their value and importance. Once acquainted with what an adequate library does for them, people will be able to evaluate and hence work for continuation of the services with local resources.

The money appropriated under this bill will be allotted to the States in the following manner: Each State will receive a basic allotment of $40,000, except the Virgin Islands, which will receive a basic allotment of $10,000. The balance of the appropriation will be divided among the States on the basis of their rural population as compared with the rural population of the United States. The allotment for each State must be matched by the State on the basis of the per capita income of the State as compared with the national per capita income.

In order to receive funds each State must prepare a State plan for the further extension of public library services to be submitted to the Commissioner of Education, who is required to approve the State plan if submitted to him by the authorized State agency and if the plan complies with the specifications set forth in the act. The State plan may

use any method for extending public-library services that it determines will use the funds to maximum advantage. The State plan may make use of public libraries in local rural areas so long as the funds granted under the bill go for the extension of public library services to adjacent areas. In order to be eligible a State plan must certify that the State appropriation to the State library agency has not been reduced below that of the year previous to the one in which Federal funds are to be received. The State has complete authority in the selection of books, materials, and personnel. The determination as to whether or not library services are inadequate will be made by the State library agency.

One of the Senators most interested in the bill is the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. I am happy to yield to him at this time.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama, the chairman of the committee, which gave such gracious consideration to the bill which came from the House.

If the bill is to be effective, the States must cooperate, and they must do their share in order to participate in its benefits. The need for the bill was, I think, shown quite adequately before the committee. More than that, one of the most interesting comments about the bill, to my mind, was that in my correspondence concerning the bill I found I received letters from not only professional teachers or professional educators, but also from ranchers, farmers, and even mechanics, from my own State and other States adjacent to it. All these persons were interested in the bill.

I feel certain this is a step in the right direction, a step which I think should have been taken, perhaps, a long time ago.

I pay my tribute to the distinguished Senator from Alabama for his consideration and active support of the bill.

Mr. HILL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for his kind words; and I again express appreciation for the deep interest which he has taken in the bill.

I wish also to express appreciation to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] who also demonstrated great interest in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I express appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, for the cooperation the committee has had in trying to develop some of the health bills and also the library bill during the past month or two, and publicly, on the floor, I wish to acknowledge our indebtedness to the Senator from Alabama for the fine teamwork he has elicited in the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FREE OR REDUCED AIR TRANSPORTATION RATES FOR MINISTERS OF RELIGION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2030, S. 3149.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3149) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, in order to permit certain air carriers to grant free reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no other Senators who desire to address the Senate at this time, I am prepared to move that the Senate stand in recess.

Before doing so, I again call attention to the announcement made previously today that the Senate will consider tomorrow the various bills to which I alluded when the Senate convened today.

It may be that if the Senate can complete the consideration of these bills in time tomorrow, we can proceed to the consideration of the social security bill. If not, the Senate will probably go over until Monday and resume the consideration of the unfinished bills on Monday, and then begin the consideration of the social-security bill.

Mr. President, I should also like to announce the possibility that on Monday next there will be a call of the calendar.

Pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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 Thursday, June 7, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 6 (legislative day of June 4), 1956:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Lewis Blaine Hershey, O6530, United States Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, and sections 303 and 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

Major to lieutenant colonel

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Butterfield, Charlotte Gage, 21244W.
Ray, Elizabeth, 21324W.
Blalock, John Wilmer, 6043A.
Rodzankas, John Frank, 6044A.
Turner, Egbert Snyder, Jr., 6122A.
Lambert, Floyd Aubrey, 5721A.
Imig, Paul Jacob, 6211A.
Krogh, Laurence Bertram, 6254A.
Swenson, Shirl H., 6371A.
Little, John Preston, 6373A.
Callaway, Roy Lavert, 6374A.
Peterson, Lee Lieske, 6376A.
Deppen, William Christian, Jr., 6379A.
Haas, John A., 6381A.
Allen, Stanley Ernest, 6382A.
Ray, Wilbur Richard, 6383A.
Lemons, Joseph Pascal, 6384A.
Ceely, William David, 6387A.
Feile, Clarance William, 6388A.
Carstensen, Dale Lafayette, 6389A.
Bruner, Frederick William, 6391A.
Collins, Harold Colbert, 6392A.
Lathan, Noel Olin Elder, 6394A.
Morgan, Fred Arthur, 6395A.
Ellis, Bythel Laurence, 6399A.
Dickens, Thomas Nolan, 6400A.
Mattie, John Duane, 6401A.
Johnston, Charles Harvey, 6402A.
LaRowe, John Simon, 6403A.
McCullough, William Edward, 6404A.
Sheehan, Roy Hampton, 6405A.
French, Russell Leroy, 6406A.
Benson, Frank Tipton, 6408A.
Royce, Clare Howard, 6409A.
Spencer, Harold Melville, 6412A.
Guider, Herbert Neal, 6415A.
Morat, Charles David, Jr., 6417A.
Lanning, George Richard, 6418A.
Wooster, Vernon Oliver, 6419A.
Sharpless, Thomas Frank, 6421A.
Kernan, Robert Mills, 6422A.
Smith, Sidney George, 6423A.
Burnett, Robert Leon, 6425A.
Bear, George Harold, 6427A.
Swanson, Richard Walter, 6429A.
Walter, Clarence Douglas, 6430A.
Norton, William Nicolson, 6431A.
Lawton, Kenneth, 6432A.
Pash, Robert Norman, 6434A.
Neff, Charles Laban, 6435A.
Woinowsk, Russell Kenneth, 6437A.
Abercrombie, John Woodrow, 6438A.
Risher, John Randall, 6439A.
Short, Howard Earl, 6440A.
Smith, Everett Hensel, 6441A.
Reeder, Vendor Harvard, 6442A.
Simonetti, Lino David, 6444A.
Merrill, Woodrow Taylor, 6446A.
Whitehead, Chauncey Brownloe, 6451A.
Jones, John, Jr., 6452A.
Lasly, Walter D., 6453A.
Thabault, George Bernard, 6457A.
Hoke, Peter Joseph, 6458A.
Crosson, Norman Robert, 6461A.
McDowell, Glenwood, 6462A.
Stewart, Carl W., 6464A.
Higginbotham, Harold Kenneth, 6466A.
Dell Angelo, John Andrew, 6467A.
Reeder, D. M., Jr., 6468A.
Forsblade, Kenneth Dave, 6469A.
Adleman, Julius J., 6470A.
McDonnell, Heston, 6471A.
Hay, Frank Olmested, 6472A.
Reed, Henry George, 6473A.
Reese, James West, 6475A.
Riddle, Charles Lewis, 6477A.
O'Bert, John James, 6478A.
Creo, Andrew Bartholomew, 6479A.
Swanson, Theodore Benedict, 6481A.
Drew, Troy, 6482A.
Long, Alan Guy, 6486A.
Lumpkin, William Hiram, 6487A.
Bray, Jack William, 6491A.
Hefling, Robert James, 6494A.
MacGregor, Wallace Fletcher, 6496A.
McFarlan, Frank August, 6497A.
Habeck, Carl William, 6500A.

Wright, Julian Carleton, 6501A.
Prevatte, James Osborne, 6502A.
Moore, William Weatherly, 6503A.
Deppe, Ralph William, 6505A.
Ferrell, Frank Ellington, 6507A.
Hart, Malcolm Detraz, 6508A.
Sprawls, Philip Claudius, 6509A.
Akins, Dudley Stephenson, 6510A.
Sweigart, Bert LeRoy, 6511A.
Stallings, Guy Harrison, 6512A.
Chiarella, James Santo, 6516A.
Mills, Thomas Harris, 6517A.
Sanders, Roy Clifton, 6518A.
Sensenbrenner, Ralph Debald, 6519A.
Moore, George Eugene, 6520A.
Driver, John James, 6522A.
Dacko, William, 6525A.
Strauss, William, 6526A.
Jones, Hubert Ledyard, 6527A.
Rudolph, Ray Harding, 6532A.
Kerr, Jean Louth, Jr., 6533A.
Weisbrodt, Charles Richard, 6534A.
Snaider, Himey Jones, 6536A.
Warthman, Jack Dussell, 6537A.
Milholland, George William, 6538A.
Salisbury, Stanley Gordon, 6540A.
Rhode, Storm Charles, Jr., 6542A.
Hight, James Lester, 6543A.
Ondo, Michael, 6544A.
Calof, Donald Robert, 6546A.
Christenson, Richard Andrew, 6548A.
Johnson, William Melbourne, 6549A.
Funk, Carl Franklin, 6550A.
Sullivan, Arthur Joseph, 6553A.
Johnson, Lycurgus Waldemar, 6557A.
Douthett, Elwood Moser, 6559A.
Taylor, Henry Weston, Jr., 6560A.
Hunt, Seaborn McDonald, 6526A.
Cole, Edward Lee, 6563A.
Elliott, Charles Robert, 6564A.
Barrett, Alfred William, Jr., 6565A.
Jacobson, James Louis, 6566A.
Bean, James Otto, 6571A.
Tansel, Dave Collins, 6572A.
Schold, George Bertie, Jr., 6573A.
Harper, Harmon Hicks, 6574A.
Edelen, Henry Hill, Jr., 6576A.
Slough, James Carl, 6577A.
Ireland, Melvin J., 6578A.
Ofner, David Bernhard, 6579A.
Elston, Ernest Woodrow, 6580A.
Poole, George Irvin, Jr., 6581A.
Turbak, Chester, 6582A.
Bass, Feris Achile, Jr., 6584A.
Clark, DeLair Aubrey, 6585A.
Creyts, Harold George, 19548A.
Campbell, William Joseph, 6587A.
Gray, Leon Walton, 6589A.
Nye, Richard Sadler, 6590A.
Topper, Morse, 6591A.
Gibson, Robert Duane, 6592A.
Price, Andrew Henry, 6594A.
Tilghman, Marvin Hugh, 6596A.
Wagner, Wilfred William, 6597A.
McLaren, William Aiden, 6599A.
Bryan, William Tagg, 6601A.
Fincher, William Walter, 6603A.
Edwards, Kenneth Rhea, 6604A.
Kremer, Harry Darwin, Jr., 6608A.
Zorka, Jack Carl, 6609A.
Ellis, Ollie McLaurin, 6610A.
Schobel, Sumner, 6611A.
Blackman, Richard Orchard, 6612A.
Brown, Frank Lobdell, 18085A.
Sirney, John Ashton, 6613A.
Browning, John Robert, 6616A.
Riggs, Carl Nelson, 6617A.
Krause, Harris F., 6619A.
Bradford, Carl Walker, 6620A.
Dascombe, Charles Burr, 6621A.
Boddie, James Warner, 6622A.
Stringer, Robert Dillon, 6623A.
Lindsay, Andrew Gowen, 6624A.
O'Hern, Luther, 66251A.
Burt, Joseph Autry, 6627A.
Bright, David Morgan, 6628A.
Stallings, McLendon Montgomery, 6629A.
Hartwig, Robert Louis, 6630A.
Thompson, Arthur John, Jr., 6631A.
Patterson, Warren Shaw, Jr., 6632A.
Swindler, Harold, 6633A.
Dehner, Joseph Harvey, 6635A.
Saville, Wesley Thomas, 6636A.
Deane, William Boyd, 6637A.
Dennis, Larry Denton, 6638A.
Buechner, William Austen, 6639A.
Jarrell, Robert Edward, 6640A.
Barber, James Luther, Jr., 6641A.
Schulherr, Richard Modglin, 6643A.
McCormack, Bailor Daniel, 6644A.
Linko, George Andrew, 6645A.
Parks, Bernard Grant, 6646A.
Hunt, Earl Gilbert, 6647A.
O'Donnell, John Thomas, 6648A.
Carpenter, John Woolsey, 6649A.
Shipley, Edward Vail, 6651A.
Boselli, Theodore John, 6653A.
Riddick, James Walter, 6654A.
Gaylor, Don Gordon, 6656A.
Yoder, Harry David, 6658A.
Chauvet, Jack Sydney, 6659A.
Robinson, John Henry, 6660A.
Andrews, John Albert Cornelius, 6662A.
Nevling, Gilbert, 6665A.
Murphy, Robert Marshall, Jr., 6666A.
Tattini, Leno, 6667A.
Quattlander, Frank Paul, 6668A.
Wilson, Irl Donaker, Jr., 6669A.
Fontana, Robert Edward, 6670A.
Porter, Lester Williams, 6672A.
Crutchfield, James Oscar, 6673A.
Turk, Laurel Agee, 6674A.
Castle, Vernon Henry, 6675A.
Murden, Charles Holt, Jr., 6676A.
Zurek, Walter John, 6677A.
Andersen, Homer Paul, 6678A.
Poe, John Everett, 6680A.
Miller, Lynus Parker, Jr., 6681A.
Grending, Carl Nelson, 6682A.
McCleary, Robert Joseph, 6684A.
Bohman, Thomas Spare, 6685A.
Kellerman, Jack Hickman, 6686A.
Reinhardt, Herbert Wilton, 6687A.
Fox, Robert Winston, 6690A.
Ritter, Herbert Waldemar, 6691A.
Herrington, John Athol, 6693A.
Deterding, Floyd Milton, 6695A.
Edwards, James Thomas, 6696A.
McGlasson, Robert Bruce, 6697A.
Ivey, Maury Herbert, 6698A.
Kafer, Ernest Emanuel, 6699A.
Austin, John Florea, 6700A.
Parker, Van Robison, 6701A.
Francis, Tim Benton, 6702A.
Morgan, Russell Dodson, 6703A.
Fussell, James Glen, 6705A.
Hill, John Theodore, 6707A.
Moe, John Gillette, Jr., 6708A.
Ragon, Dale Ambrose, 6710A.
Johnston, Robert Edward, 6711A.
Pryor, Daniel Franklin, 6712A.
Jennings, Elton Jordan, 6714A.
Hall, Thomas William, 6715A.
Allen, Ed Crow, 6716A.
Chandler, George William, 6717A.
Mona, Reuben Edward, 6718A.
Stewart, John Leger, 6719A.
Cartwright, Everett Jackson, 6720A.
Slater, Ralph Phipps, 6721A.
Wilson, Woodrow, 6722A.
Hamilton, Samuel Davis, Jr., 6723A.
Konin, David Harry, 6724A.
Rogers, Dale Edward, 6726A.
Spohn, Clifford Adams, 6727A.
Kruge, William Arthur, 6728A.

MEDICAL CORPS

Bilotta, Laurence Alexander, 19227A.
Kloess, Edward John, 19806A.
Kennett, Donald Michael, 19228A.
Wright, Paul Eugene, 19229A.
Perri, Frank Adrian, 19230A.
Twichell, Gilbert Alfred, 19231A.
Johnston, Maurice Blair, 19232A.
McFall, Voris Francis, 19234A.

DENTAL CORPS

Hutchinson, William Rex, Jr., 18899A.
Dilley, Harold Edward, 18900A.
Ekstrom, Maurice Fred, 18901A.
Connell, Thomas Benton, 18902A.

VETERINARY CORPS

Sasmore, Daniel Paul, 18995A.
Bills, William Edward, 18996A.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Lee, William Henry, 18082A.
Lunnie, Francis Melrose, 19435A.
Kretschmer, Ernest Theodore, 19461A.
Farrell, Thomas Augustus, 19436A.

NURSE CORPS

Peschon, Ida Elaine, 20904W.
Zeller, Dorothy Nellie, 20915W.
Conroy, Elizabeth Julia, 21925W.

CHAPLAIN

Powers, William Edward, 18760A.
Cameron, George James, 18763A.
Fulkerson, Maurice Dale, 18764A.
McWilliams, Alfred Edward, 18765A.
Cutress, Albert Leo, 18766A.
Holt, Maurice Robert, 18767A.
McArthur, Luther Wheeler, 18768A.
Pennington, Henry Clay, 18769A.

First lieutenant to captain

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Smith, George Washington, Jr., 28026A.
Hogue, Norman Kirkland, 28027A.

CHAPLAIN

Ansted, Harry Burton, 27662A.

Second lieutenant to first lieutenant

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Wells, James Paschal, 28619A.
Troutman, Clarence Walter, 28618A.
Moody, Stanley A., 28620A.
Reed, Robert Harvey, 28631A.
Samples, Wheeler Dewey, Jr., 28622A.
Thulin, John Harold, 28626A.
Bohn, Lowell Fred, 28623A.
Stone, Denver, 28624A.
Foster, Dudley John, 28621A.
Christman, William Charles, 28628A.
Black, Harley Samuel, 28627A.
Stone, Lewis Walter, 28629A.
McNeill, Royce Houston, 28630A.
Phelps, Harold Lawrence, 28625A.
Evans, Richard Earl, 28641A.
Frazier, John F., 28632A.
Townsley, William Harter, 28647A.
Clark, Robert Scott, 28636A.
Hope, Joseph Jessee, 28643A.
Enzian, Richard Bryan, 28640A.
Greenleaf, George Henry, 28642A.
Blake, Thomas Aubin, 28634A.
Enney, James Crowe, 28639A.
Morgan, Frederick John, 28644A.
Chadwick, Elbridge Gerry, 28635A.
Dauenhauer, Ervin Francis, 28638A.
Abney, Kenneth Lee, 28633A.
Thomas, James Carroll, 28646A.
Cole, Charles Owen, Jr., 28637A.
Owens, Eugene, 28645A.
Watson, Everett B., 28648A.
Thomas, Cornelius Alexander, 28649A.
Roberts, Ben Allen, 28650A.
Hickenbottom, Richard, 28651A.
Moore, Arthur M., 28652A.
White, John, 28655A.
Ulrich, Donald Eugene, 28654A.
Vehling, David Read, 28653A.
Thomas, Lloyd Edward, 25450A.
Rosburg, Charles Reed, 27907A.
Fanning, Robert Wayne, 28657A.
Jordan, Walter Fritz, Jr., 28658A.
Burgdorf, William, 28659A.
Liethen, Frank Elmer, Jr., 25155A.
Haggard, Thomas Gene, 28660A.
Hennessey, Charles B., 28662A.
Holloway, William Victor, 28663A.
Hook, Cecil M., Jr., 28661A.
Patterson, Kenneth Morris, 27909A.
Collins, James Quincy, Jr., 27908A.
Bateman, Thomas Scott, 28664A.
Hildebrant, Verne B., 27910A.
Caleb, Phillip I., Jr., 28665A.
Alexander, Fernando, 28666A.
Kimsey, Melbourne, 27148A.
Simpson, John Edwin, 25642A.
Andrada, Thiophilos, 27911A.
Doherty, Robert Edward, 27912A.

McGouldrick, Francis Jay, Jr., 28667A.
Brown, Gordon Richard, 27914A.
Fincher, Donald Blake, 27151A.
Webber, James Hugh, 27149A.
Bennett, James Robert, 27150A.
Harwood, James Thomas, 27152A.
Rigney, James Hinds, Jr., 27153A.
Carter, Donald Eric, 27917A.
Craft, Roby Robert, 27915A.
Welch, Henry Owen, Jr., 27918A.
Matthews, Frank Alvin, 27916A.
Wilkes, John August, Jr., 28668A.
Pluenneke, Harold Curtis, 28673A.
Zoerlein, Ralph Walter, 28671A.
Bennett, Robert Bernard, 28674A.
Delvecchio, Vincent E., 28670A.
Pytel, Stanley J., 28672A.
Davis, Frederick E., 28669A.
Kakacek, John Gerard, 27919A.
Kroen, Edward J., 28675A.
Gindoff, Alan Solomon, 27920A.
Martin, Billy, Jr., 28676A.
Batten, John Marshall, 28677A.
Davis, Paul Edwin, 28678A.
Stone, Gordon E., 28680A.
McGovern, Charles E., 28679A.
Elmore, Willie E., Jr., 28681A.
Baisden, James K., 28682A.
Walters, Neil Ince, 28684A.
Thoburn, Russell Eugene, 28685A.
Lyons, Albert Eugene, 28686A.
Turek, Edward H., 28683A.
Ingalsbe, Orville, Don, 28687A.
Weidner, Charles Herman, 28690A.
Pinson, Charles R., 28689A.
Tice, Fred R., 28688A.
Kerr, Thomas Bailey, 28691A.
McClellan, Robert Joseph, 28693A.
Lewis, George F., 28692A.
Kott, Richard Francis, 27922A.
Butler, Gunning, Jr., 28694A.
Lockwood, Frederick St. John, 3d, 28695A.
Martino, Joseph P., 28696A.
Ralph, William Delbert, Jr., 28697A.
Walborn, Chester Alden, 27154A.
Timm, Robert Herman, 27923A.
Norman, Russell, 27926A.
Needham, Paul Eugene, 27925A.
Pinchuk, Lanis, 27928A.
Pedjoe, John Paul, 27927A.
Miller, Carl William, 28701A.
Tucker, Lester W., 28703A.
Duncan, Clyde Eugene, 28698A.
Kennedy, Charles Roy, 28700A.
Mills, Billie B., 28702A.
Wiegand, Karl Leo, 28704A.
Falkner, Donald Clark, 28699A.
Millson, Chris, Jr., 28705A.
Hudson, John A., 28707A.
Byrkit, Robert Allen, 28706A.
Shugart, James Elmer, 27938A.
McClain, Larry David, 27937A.
Rutscher, John Jerome, 27934A.
Carnahan, Jerald Dean, 27935A.
Hancock, Gordon Kjolvik, 27931A.
Boughton, Alain George, 27933A.
Gill, Linden Lee, 27929A.
Kimbriel, John Ruell, 27930A.
Crowder, Calie Gene, 27936A.
Tudino, Frank Anthony, 28070A.
Matthes, James R., 28712A.
Lee, Vernon R., 28715A.
Thomas, James Herman, 28709A.
Culp, Kenneth C., 28714A.
Wold, James W., 28717A.
Jenson, Henry J., 28716A.
Schaffhauser, Carl N., 28711A.
Watson, John F., Jr., 28719A.
Gentry, Roy L., Jr., 28713A.
Baker, James D., 28708A.
Knoke, Frederick L., 28718A.
LaPorte, Donald C., 28710A.
Drennon, Philip Rodney, 27940A.
Josephson, Kent Alan, 27941A.
Noe, Philip Sanford, 27939A.
Gerber, Richard A., 28721A.
Wood, Milton Boyd, 28720A.
Irwin, Donald L., 28722A.
Fitzpatrick, Richard L., 28724A.
Kuska, Robert J., 28723A.
Hayek, Allan Donald, Jr., 27942A.
Witt, Raymond Julian, 27943A.
Weber, Kenneth Lewis, 28725A.
Landry, Edward B., 28726A.
Humke, John W., 28728A.
Scarlett, Bobby Reldue, 28727A.
Morris, Jack Allison, 28729A.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

IN THE NAVY

Paul A. Weber, Jr. (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps), to be an ensign in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefore as provided by law:

Lieutenant commander

Herbert D. Steinbeck

Lieutenant

William C. Dempsey
Francis Gilbert
Wilford D. Hoofer

The following-named Reserve officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Commander

Orville F. Nielsen

Lieutenant commander

Thomas S. Marks

Lieutenant

Robert D. Cordier
Samuel O. Cornell
Vernon N. Houk
Walter M. Johnson
Harold R. Schumacher
Robert W. Steagall, Jr.
Joseph E. Stitcher

The following-named Reserve officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Commander

Edward J. Copping, Jr.
Gordon H. Rovelstad
Winthrop F. Smith

Lieutenant commander

Theodore E. Carlson
Sun R. Cloud

Lieutenant

Robert E. Forner
Joseph C. Gleeson, Jr.
Louis R. Pistocco
Austin Robbins
Carl J. Swanson
Joseph F. Williams

Manuel A. Benero, United States Navy, retired, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, pursuant to title 37, United States Code, sections 275, 276, 277, 403 (a), 406 (a), 407 (a), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve aviators) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Edwin C. Adamson, Jr.
Kenneth L. Ahlgren
George W. Allen
Stephen O. Armstrong, Jr.
Robert B. Arnold
Carl G. Austin
Harold Barnes
Frederick R. Bartlett
Richard D. Bishop
Walter H. Blaseck
Charles G. Bostwick, Jr.
Darrell H. Brooks
Gerald G. Buc
William McK. Burnett
Raymond M. Burris
John K. Cammall
Karl L. Carlson
James F. Carroll
Richard J. Cavicke
Robert T. Chase, Jr.
Norman B. Chezem
Eugene M. Clemens
Robert O. Conroy
Lawrence W. Coor
Gordon L. Cox
Donald G. Crabtree
Elmer M. Cranton
Merrill E. Critz
Hubert D. Daily, Jr.
Russell E. Davis
Modestino R. Defeo
Gerald M. Dempsey
James R. Derda
Morris C. Drees
Richard C. Drummet
Robert G. Duff
John F. Dunn
Thomas W. Durant
Kenneth C. Eckerd
James W. Ehl
William K. Erickson
Thomas D. Eyres
Fred J. Ferrazzano
James M. Foley, Jr.
Arvid E. Forsman
Thomas J. Foster
Henry J. Fox IV
Richard W. Fox
John L. Frederick
George Gedney, Jr.
Ernest H. Gleim
Erwin A. Goschke
Malcolm N. Guess
Arthur J. Hack, Jr.
Roger H. Hageman
Wilbur G. Hager
Winfred F. Hampton, Jr.
David L. Harlow
Francis A. Hiser, Jr.
Robert L. Hollingsworth
Bill "J" Hoskins
Edward J. Jacobs, Jr.
Alfred C. Johnson, Jr.
Robert E. Johnson
Robert H. Jones
Larry L. Jongewaard
Donald E. King
Hollis H. Kirkpatrick
Donald O. Knerr
Frank A. Krisman
Joe V. Lacefield.
David S. Langner
Willis I. Lewis, Jr.
Cleland V. McBurney
Walter H. McCall
Rodney F. McCartney
Thomas W. McElrath
Robert D. McLin
Patrick P. Marsha, Jr.
Robert M. Matta
Bernard L. Minetti
Thomas G. Moore
Kendall E. Moranville
Samuel W. Morey
George M. Mulvany
Jack H. Nichols
William V. Patterson
Robert M. Pedersen
Ralph E. Poore
Raymond W. Porter
Lorenzo J. Rathke
John J. Richard
Kenneth J. Rieder
John K. Ritchie
Ray Roff, Jr.
Theodore A. Santuae
Douglas D. Schaadt
Estill E. Schnetzler, Jr.
Paul F. Selby
Eugene L. Soldwedel
James R. Spohnholtz
Russell E. Stearns
Duncan P. Stevens.
John D. Stich
Thaddeus J. Szpara
Don W. Taylor
Eli L. Tucker, Jr.
Thomas A. Tucker
William C. Uelman
Raymond A. Vohden
Billy V. Wheat
Irving M. Wiltse
Robert O. Wirt
Robert J. Wuebler

The following-named enlisted personnel to be ensigns in the line (aviation ground) of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Gillard W. Apgar, Jr.
William H. Appley
Samuel B. Aston
John H. Bailey, Jr.
Albert Barre
Dale F. Bear
William T. Bocim
James F. Bowlin
Donald C. Breuer
James S. Broos
John R. Burgoon, Jr.
Lloyd B. Camp
Louis J. Cason
Fred L. Clark
Samuel W. Cobean
Judson K. Cokefair
Richard "L" Conn
Walter G. Cronise, Jr.
Thomas V. DeMarino
Henry J. Demers, Jr.
Norman L. DeNoon
William G. Dugan
Jewell H. Eastham
Abe P. Fennell, Jr.
William T. Fenton, Jr.
Raymond F. Fitzpatrick
Harold E. Ford
Richmond D. Garrett
John D. Gilbert
Gordon E. Gilmore
Gail E. Gundersen
William F. Hale
Thomas S. Herring
Harvey Herzog
Carl M. Hill
Chester H. Holleman
Frederick Hoole
Robert S. Hughes
Irvine D. Irby, Jr.
Edward H. Johnson
James L. Jordan, Jr.
William R. Kane
James P. Kavin, Jr.
Lewis D. Keller
Clyde T. Kirkman
Robert A. Laabs
Paul J. LaClair
Donald R. Larkin
Richard R. Leaverton
Darrell A. Lightner
Morton Lockwood
Charles B. Lufburrow
Hans W. Lunder
Dale W. Lynch
John J. McAloon
Joseph F. McMullin
Eugene P. Moccia
Clarence T. Morris, Jr.
Joseph M. Morris
John G. Muller
Richard E. Nevins
Neil F. O'Connor
John A. O'Shaughnessy
Gerald D. Parham
Bennie Rangeo
Raymond E. Reames
Paul G. Richter
Ray Rigmaiden
Charles C. Roberts
Daniel P. Roper
Samuel V. Roper
Joseph Ropiak
James F. Southerland
Ernest B. Snook, Jr.
Arthur J. St. Martin
Henry W. Stoke
George R. Stradley
Vincent Sylvester
Warren N. Tache
DeWayne A. Thomas
Donald M. Tucker
James A. Vyskocil
Calvin W. Wade
Sidney K. Weaver
Marshall E. Windham
Bernard "J" Womack
Robert L. Wright
Walton E. Yates
Charles T. Young

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns in the line (aviation ground) of

the Navy, for temporary service, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

George C. Adams
Ellis E. Austin
Charles S. Carter
Francis L. Gilmore
Fred "B" Glover
William C. Guthrie
William B. James
James R. Kay
William J. Mitchell
James A. Moore
Jacob W. Pangle
Joseph F. Riley

The following-named chief warrant officers to be ensigns in the line (aviation ground) of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert F. Ace
Gordon K. Ayres
William H. Brown
James Carpenter
Richard W. Carter
Billy M. Harkins
Norman O. Keesling
William R. Lander
Francis C. Norris, Jr.
James C. Petersen
Charles M. Quinlan
Charles E. Savo
Anthony J. Schiavone
Robert F. Tucker

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the Supply Corps of the Navy in the grade of lieutenant:

Charles L. Gillis
Lowell T. Hughes
Norlin A. Jankovsky

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (jg.) and the temporary grade of lieutenant:

Charles W. Barrett
Robert R. Harvey, Jr.
Frank T. Maynard
George L. Stansbury III

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the Supply Corps of the Navy in the grade of ensign:

James G. Farrell
Joe Mook
James L. Stidham

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the grade of ensign:

George M. Gans, Jr.
Carleton C. Hoffner, Jr.
Horace B. Jones, Jr.
John P. Jones, Jr.
Raymond E. Paulsen
Paul A. Petzrick

The following-named officers in the Supply Corps of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (jg.), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Walter T. Meyers
John N. Postak
William J. Ryan

William H. Alexander, Supply Corps, United States Navy, for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the line of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (jg.) and in the temporary grade of lieutenant.

Norman E. Beck, Supply Corps, United States Navy, for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the line of the Navy in the permanent grade of ensign.

(PERMANENT PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY)

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant:

Lieutenant, line

Smith, Jack D.
Averitt, Gordon F.
King, Cecil
North, Sylvester F.
Pegues, John K., Jr.
Stenke, George
Peugh, Everett R.
Criner, James E.
Halleck, William L.
Leibold, William R.
Bramblett, John J., Jr.
Bish, Arthur A.
Thomson, William O.
Pescott, Robert
Leach, Everett N.
Ramsey, Walter A.
Christensen, Earl D.
St. Marie, Joseph
Gale, Robert D.
Hobbs, James B.
Waterfield, Willard F.
Mosley, Aulcey D.
Tillotson, Ted K.
Garrett, Bernard H.
Hounihan, John C.
Childs, John T.
Thomas, Preston G.
Padgett, James P.
Cobern, Ernest L.
Wilkinson, Raymond O.
Sandberg, William G.
Tomsky, Jackson M.
Pinning, Joseph E.
Reid, Albert R.
Antar, Albert
Goebel, Herman E., Jr.
Fuchs, Julius E.
Mikkelsen, Richard E.
Lewallen, John D.
Peterson, Loyd G., Jr.
Evans, George J.
Birdsong, Harold S.
Jacks, Robert G.
Powers, Wilbur P.
Whitman, George W.
Dievendorff, Frank
Lilienfeld, Joe J.
Church, John H.
Read, Garlin R.
Macauley, George W.
Villines, William M., Jr
McGuire, Eugene J.
Murdock, Lloyd E.
Jackson, Robert G.
Christensen, Donald A.
Turner, James D.
Callaghan, Jerry E.
Stradtman, John F.
Johnson, Robert M.
Woods, Searle W.
Faver, Walter M.
Askin, Thomas B. H., Jr.
Ingersoll, Richard W.
Roush, Randall C.
Perl, Burton K.
Jarrett, Alonzo C.
Turpin, Lander H.
Dersin, Clement
Gire, Howard A.
Rowland, Mervin
Clark, Andrew
Willis, Chesley E., Jr.
Murphy, Gerald E.
Selby, Howard K.
Forrester, James H.
Brackney, Louis S.
Raymer, Edward C.
Roberts, Douglas H.
Law, Thomas L.
Winant, Barent P. III
Davis, Ralph E.
Babine, Arthur L., Jr.
Rozell, Curtis J.
Sneed, Beckom U.
Saxton, Frank
Ravan, Landrum E.
Thomas, George C.
Russell, William D.
Burnham, Rowland E.
Waterloo, Francis C.
Hirz, Joseph D.
Riba, Robert
Kaiser, Karl D.
Arp, Phillip S.
Weaver, Edward H.
Koch, Joseph
Wheeler, James W., Jr.
Gerlach, Richard E.
Madeo, Joseph F., Jr.
Hunter, Glenn A.

Lieutenant, Supply Corps

Davis, Harold R.
Reade, Lowell A.
Reed, Clarence E.
McKenzie, Charles H.
Nelson, George W.
Abraham, Donavon E.
Rains, William D.
Needham, Thomas P.

Lieutenant, Civil Engineer Corps

Bodtke, David H.
Martin, Robert A.
Fail, Raymond P., Jr.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abele, Henry F.
Abercrombie, Jerry T.
Abrahams, Thomas P.
Abrahamson, Dean A.
Adkins, Kenneth G.
Adler, Ronald E.
Adorney, Frank
Ahlquist, Stanley W.
Aiau, Harvey C. K.
Albers, William P.
Albright, Richard K.
Alexander, Robert C.
Alldredge, Donald L.
Allen, William D.
Allyn, Richard H.
Altee, Thomas M.
Amendt, John H.
Ammerman, Don J.
Anderson, Andrew G., Jr.
Anderson, Curtis O.
Anderson, Forrest P.
Anderson, Robert C.
Anderson, Robert N.
Andrews, Frederick C.
Appich, William H., Jr.
Apted, George L.
Armel, Lyle O., II
Armstrong, Philip M., Jr.
Arnold, John E.
Arrington, Robert A.
Ash, Leonard C.
Ashley, Bruce H.
Aucoin, Leonard L.
Aumuller, Richard W.
Avary, James C., Jr.
Avrit, Richard C.
Babcock, Donald E.
Baciocco, Albert J., Jr.
Bagby, Hallam O.
Balderston, Buele G.
Baldwin, Charles C.
Ball, Courtland D., III
Barke, Arthur R.
Barnes, Harry G., Jr.
Barnes, Robert G.
Baron, Charles R.
Barry, Thomas M.
Barthelenghi, George H., Jr.
Bassett, Melvin S.
Bates, David H., Jr.
Bauchspies, Rollin L., Jr.
Bean, Edward W., Jr.
Beard, Donald W.
Beat, Robert O.
Bedworth, Wilfrid J.
Beers, Robert C.
Beeton, Harvey J.
Bein, George E.
Bell, Bill J.
Bell, Clyde R.
Bell, Gershom R.
Bell, William R.
Belton, Jack G.
Benner, Leslie W., Jr.
Bennett, Richard L.
Bennett, Richard W.
Bennie, Donald B.
Benning, Carl J., Jr.
Bentley, William C.
Bergbauer, Harry W., Jr.
Berge, Norman K.
Berger, James K.
Best, Eddie F.
Betsworth, Brian C.
Bierer, Bion B., Jr.
Bird, Joseph W., Jr.
Bivens, Arthur C.
Bizon, Joseph E.
Blackmore, Thomas A.
Blanchard, Robert C.
Blandine, Robert E.
Blasczak, Walter J.
Blum, Frederick J. III
Blundell, Peveril
Bocock, Kenneth S.
Bodling, Paul F., Jr.
Boggs, Steve V.
Bohannan, William L.
Boncer, Lawrence
Booth, Roger G.
Booth, Theodore W.
Boris, Andrew Paul
Borthwick, Robert B.
Botten, James R.
Bottenberg, Foster L.
Botula, Bernard C.
Bourdeau, Paul T.
Bowers, Donald L.
Bowling, Roy H.
Boyd, John H., Jr.
Boyer, Walton T., Jr.
Boyett, Stephen G.
Boyle, Darrell D.
Bradbury, John I.
Braden, Melvin E., Jr.
Bradshaw, Robert D.
Brady, Francis T.
Bredehoft, Charles M.
Breland, Ernest W., Jr.
Britton, William L.
Brooks, Edwin H., Jr.
Brown, Larry J.
Brown, Walter H., Jr.
Browning, Siras D.
Broz, George A.
Brubaker, Russell E., Jr.
Brummage, Richard L.
Brunskill, Robert J.
Brunson, Wright A., Jr.
Buck, Charles W.
Bucy, John T., Jr.
Bull, Joseph L. III
Bullard, John R.
Bullock, William A.
Burgess, James A.
Burt, Thomas E.
Bush, Lawrence A.
Bushong, Brent
Bussell, Robert B.
Butcher, Nathan T.
Butcher, Paul D.
Butler, Charles T.
Butler, James K.
Butrym, Stanley B., Jr.
Buys, Jay R.
Bynum, Frank B., Jr.
Byrd, Sam R.
Byrnes, Robert E.
Byron, Robert S.
Callaghan, Joseph M.
Callicott, Jack D.
Calnan, Eugene T.
Campbell, Bruce H., Jr.
Campbell, George R.
Campbell, Jack
Campbell, Robert E.
Campbell, Robert J.
Campbell, William N.
Camplin, Paul E.
Cannell, Donald T.
Cannon, David E.
Cannon, Leo J.
Cannon, George A. III
Cardwell, John J.
Carlson, Olef M., Jr.
Carlstrom, Richard H.
Carothers, Phillip F., Jr.
Carpenter, Arthur J.
Carr, John H.
Carr, Nevin P.
Carrier, Willis H. II
Carrington, James H., Jr.
Carson, George L.
Carter, Charles C.
Carter, James D.
Carter, Robert D.
Carterette, Robert T.
Cassell, Dean G.
Catlett, Jack C.
Cauble, Donald K.
Chadbourne, Harland A.
Chadwick, John K.
Champlin, Gerald B.
Charest, Alexis N.
Charest, Philip G.
Chase, Edgar M.
Chase, Warren A.
Check, Robert T.
Chesley, James F.
Chewning, Robert W.
Chisum, Albert, Jr.
Christensen, Eugene J.
Christensen, Raymond J.
Cirbus, Dominic E.
Clark, Charles R.
Clark, David P.
Clark, Edwin B.
Clark, Lynn R.
Clark, Richard G.
Clarkin, James J.
Clements, Billy R.
Clinton, Thomas G.
Coe, David C., Jr.
Cole, Edgar E.
Cole, William S., Jr.
Coleman, James O.
Colgan, John G.
Collier, Larry D.
Collins, Philip K.
Conolly, Robert D.
Conrad, Charles, Jr.
Conrad, Peter C.
Converse, Douglas
Coogan, John M.
Coogan, Richard D.
Cook, Vernon H., Jr.
Cooke, Donald L.
Cooley, Arthur W.
Corbett, Eugene A.
Corbin, Malcolm R., Jr.
Corboy, Michael R.
Cornell, Arthur F.
Coskey, Kenneth L.
Coughlin, Paul G.
Cour, Edward E.
Crader, Clifford L.
Craig, Earl C.
Cramton, Philip B.
Crane, Leonard B., Jr.
Crater, Ray F.
Crepeau, George A.
Cricchi, John V.
Crinklaw, Douglas L.
Crook, Richard W.
Cross, Charles H.
Cross, Lorin R.
Crouch, Michael B.
Cruden, David S.
Crum, Paul M.
Cuccias, Leo P.
Culver, Eugene A.
Cunningham, Edward F.
Curl, Kent W.
Curtis, Fayne E.
Dally, David F.
Dalton, Richard V.
Daly, Harry P., Jr.
Daly, Richard G.
Daniels, James M.
Davidson, Robert P.
Davis, Bill N.
Davis, John B.
Davis, Michael C.
Davis, Robert C., Jr.
Davis, Walter J.
Davison, John W., Jr.
Deal, Walter C., Jr.

Dearborn, Richard E.
Dearman, Kermit E.
Debit, Dion G. B.
DeHart, William
DeLamar, Dean O.
Delaney, William E.
DeMartini, Edward J.
Denman, Charles C., Jr.
Derby, Arthur E., Jr.
deSaulles, George A.
Devereaux, John R., Jr.
Dickman, Jerry A.
Dickson, William T.
Dierdorff, Loren M.
Diesel, Charles N.
DiGiacomo, Joseph G.
Dillard, Marvin B.
DiNola, Michael J.
Dixon, Edward R.
Dixon, Norval W., Jr.
Dixon, Osmund W., Jr.
Dodds, Robert M.
Doelling, Robert D.
Dolan, John G.
Dolan, William R.
Donahue, Paul F.
Donaldson, Robert J.
Donaldson, Robert S.
Donnelly, Robert G.
Donovan, Daniel D., Jr.
Dooley, Bobby J.
Douglas, Lee W.
Douglass, James G., Jr.
Dowds, Donald H.
Dowe, William J., Jr.
Doyle, Ingell H.
Dozier, Charles D.
Drago, Anthony J., Jr.
Drain, John F.
Draper, Frazier
Drew, Russell C.
Dubino, Andrew D.
Dudley, Paul L., Jr.
Duffy, Bernard A.
Duffy, Paul G.
Duhrkopf, Don J.
Duke, Bobby G.
Duke, Marshal D., Jr.
Dunaway, John A., Jr.
Dunbar, Vance O.
Dunkin, Ray L.
Dunn, Charles B.
Durbin, Peter
Dwyer, George M.
Eckhart, Franklin F.
Ecklund, Glenn L.
Eddy, Denver D.
Eddy, John A.
Edwards, Jerry J.
Eibert, Don C.
Elliott, Orville G.
Ellis, David E.
Ellis, Donald F.
Ellis, John H., Jr.
Elmore, John F., Jr.
Elster, James M.
Emmerling, Henry C., Jr.
Endlich, John
English, Edward V.
Evans, Boyce D.
Evans, Ralph M.
Evans, Robert C.
Everts, Ronald J.
Ezzell, Leon J.
Fagan, Donald F.
Fahlstedt, Barry R.
Falconer, Alastair S.
Farber, Karl H.
Fawcett, Craig R.
Fead, Louis M.
Feeney, Richard L.
Fehl, Frederick C., Jr.
Feller, Allan C.
Fellowes, Frederick G., Jr.
Fellows, Charles D.
Felt, Donald L.
Feltham, John C., Jr.
Ferguson, Albert E.
Ferguson, William W.
Fergusson, Ernest W.
Fette, Estal J.
Field, Harford, Jr.
Fischbein, Ernest
Fischer, David H.
Fisher, John C.
Fitzgerald, Thomas W.
Fitzgerald, David
Fitzpatrick, Edward C.
Fleming, Raymond T., Jr.
Flood, Francis A., Jr.
Florance, John E., Jr.
Flynn, Francis P.
Flynn, Michael D.
Foley, Edmund F.
Foley, John E.
Font, Carlos G.
Fossum, Paul G.
Fox, Charles W., Jr.
Frank, Benjamin L.
Fraser, George K., Jr.
Fraser, Robert E.
Frederick, Donald R. A
French, Fred H.
Frick, Joseph F.
Friedel, Gordon W.
Frier, John M., Jr.
Friesen, Floyd A.
Frost, John F. III
Fudge, David A.
Furey, Laurence T.
Furgerson, John A.
Furmanski, John A.
Gallagher, Hugh L.
Gallagher, Robert
Gallup, Shelley P.
Galvin, Bernard J.
Gandy, John D.
Gantt, Richard G.
Gardner, Harvey E.
Gardner, Louis J.
Garnett, Walter W.
Gehman, Robert S.
Gibbs, Charles E. J.
Gildea, Joseph A.
Gillette, Halbert G.
Gilmore, Arthur H.
Glazier, Alvin S.
Godek, John
Godfrey, Forrest J.
Goldner, Robert R.
Goldsmith, Watson W.
Goodreau, Robert W.
Goodrich, John R.
Goodwin, William D.
Gordon, Bruce J.
Gordon, Ralph L.
Gordon, Richard F., Jr.
Gowing, Richard M.
Gradel, Robert
Graf, Frederic A., Jr.
Grahlert, Walter H.
Graveson, George L., Jr.
Greeley, Michael T.
Green, Harry J.
Green, Thomas B.
Greer, Marvin S., Jr.
Greer, Wayne C.
Gregory, George B.
Griggs, Norman E.
Grinstead, William C., Jr.
Groenert, Frederick E.
Groff, Peter F.
Gross, Arthur J.
Gruber, Robert A.
Gunning, Patrick J.
Gurnsey, Ronald A.
Hackney, Benjamin F. III
Hackney, Thomas M.
Haggquist, Grant F., Jr.
Hahn, Frederick, Jr.
Haig, Robert B.
Haley, Robert J.
Hall, Donald F.
Hall, James N.
Hall, John P.
Hall, Philip L.
Hall, William C.
Halsey, Charles H., Jr.
Halverson, Richard K.
Hamilton, Glenn D.
Hamm, Clement D., Jr.
Handford, Richard C.
Hanegan, Ralph E.
Hangartner, Lyle G.
Hansen, Rodney V.
Hanson, Albertlea
Harney, Russell F.
Harris, Frank B.
Harris, James W.
Harris, Richard A.
Harris, Robert K.
Harrison, Donald K.
Harvey, Charles O.
Harwood, John B.
Harwood, Lewis D.
Haskin, Robert E.
Hatch, Harold G.
Hatcher, Robert E., Jr.
Hatfield, William R.
Hawk, Arthur L.
Hayes, Albert M., Jr.
Hayes, Jerome B.
Hays, Estel W.
Head, William N.
Headland, Carl B.
Hebbard, LeRoy B., Jr.
Heise, Paul R.
Helgeson, Harry E., Jr.
Helmandollar, Allen W.
Helvey, Julius L. II
Hempel, Robert E. III
Henderson, Nathan S. J.
Hendrick, David R.
Henley, John R.
Henson, John M.
Herkner, Richard T.
Herring, "E" Belmont
Herriott, Donald M.
Higginbotham, Allen B.
Higgins, Hugh W.
Higgins, Thomas G.
Hill, Earl E., Jr.
Hill, James J.
Hill, John H.
Hill, Marshall E.
Hiller, Melvin L.
Hincks, Herbert A.
Hines, John C.
Hinman, Albert H.
Hobgood, Ray A.
Hoch, John E., Jr.
Hocking, James R.
Hodges, George P., Jr.
Hodges, James W., Jr.
Hodson, Theodore L., Jr.
Hoffman, Harley E.
Hoffman, Robert B.
Hogan, Walter V.
Holcomb, Gordon B.
Holcomb, "M" Staser
Holian, James J.
Holland, Elbert R.
Holland, William A.
Hollen, Frederick M.
Hollenbeck, Gerald R.
Holley, Melvin M., Jr.
Holt, Ivey B., Jr.
Holt, John J.
Holt, Kenneth N.
Hoover, John S.
Hope, Edgar G., Jr.
Hopkins, David F.
Hopkins, Daniel J.
Horton, Robert L.
Hostettler, Stephen J.
House, Edward C.
Houston, Albert W.
Howard, Albert W., Jr.
Howell, Harry E.
Hoyt, Richard L.
Hozey, Ira D., Jr.
Hubal, Augustine E., Jr.
Hubbell, Walter, B.
Huber, John J., Jr.
Hudson, Roland W.
Huffman, Malcolm L.
Huffman, Sam H., Jr.
Hughes, Kenneth P.
Hukill, Henry D., Jr.
Hullryde, Donald
Humphreys, Felton M., Jr.
Hunzeker, Myron E.
Hurd, John B.
Hurley, Robert J.
Hurt, Thomas W.
Hussey, Clifton M.
Hutchinson, Kenneth F.
Inskeep, William F.
Irving, Leo H.
Jacobs, Edward J.
James, Joe M.
James, Joel L., Jr.
Jamison, Billy D.
Jaynes, Jack K.
Jefferis, Allen S.
Jenkins, Folsom
Jenkins, James R., Jr.
Johnson, Allen L.
Johnson, Arne C.
Johnson, Clarence A. E., Jr.
Johnson, Eldon D.
Johnson, Henry C., Jr.
Johnson, William R.
Johnston, John M.
Johnston, James I.
Jones, Alfred L., Jr.
Jones, Arthur L., Jr.
Jones, Donald S.
Jones, "T" Embury, Jr.
Jones, Thomas W., Jr.
Jordan, James S.
Joyce, Bernard K.
Judd, Roy L.
Kaai, Samuel W.
Kaiser, Dean E.
Kane, Paul E.
Karcher, Robert K.
Kassel, Robert H.
Kattmann, Roger H.
Kauderer, Bernard M.
Kaye, Michael C.
Keefe, Jerome M.
Keester, Louis J.
Kehoe, Thomas J., Jr.
Keimig, Allen D., Jr.
Kelley, Alfred G., Jr.
Kelley, Roy A.
Kendrick, William O.
Kennedy, William E.
Kern, Robert A.
Ketzner, Harry T.
Kiddle, Bradley D.
Killian, Donald J.
King, John E., Jr.
Klee, Robert E.
Kloepping, Herbert E.
Knapp, William R.
Knight, Robert H.
Knipp, Walter J.
Kniss, Donovan E.
Knoerr, Don H.
Knotts, Philip L.
Koch, Donald F.
Koch, James R.
Koci, Vaclav H.
Koenig, Edgar F.
Kotick, Robert E.
Kowalski, Robert J.
Kratz, Marshall L.
Kretzschmann, Curt H.
Krochmal, Alfred F.
Kruse, Charles H., Jr.
Krusi, Peter H.
Kucyk, Peter M.
Kuffel, Robert W.
Kunstmann, Clarence M.
Kurth, Donald A.
Kutzleb, Robert E.
LaBarre, Richard E.
Lafferty, Jerry D.
Lage, Robert L.
Laib, Ernest E., Jr.
Lake, Walter W.
LaLonde, William F.
Lammers, Francis E., Jr.
Langer, Donald A.
Lanier, Robert J.
Lanphear, Roy E.
Lardis, Christopher S.
Larrew, Marvin F.
Larsen, John H.
Larson, Howard J.
Lashbrook, Durwood E.
Latham, William B.
Laughlin, Gerald F., Jr.
Lawler, Frederick W.
Lawler, William A.
Lawrence, Donald S.
Leavitt, Horace M., Jr.
Ledbetter, Reid
Leenerts, Rolland E.
Leicht, Joseph, III
Lemmon, Virgil J.
Lenihan, Edward L., Jr.
Lent, Willis A., Jr.
Lepper, James R.
Levey, Sanford N.
Libby, Charles D.
Lichlyter, Stanford E.
Lina, Robert A.
Lindsay, Robert B.
Lipford, Charles E.
Litwin, William S.
Lloyd, Theodore L., Jr.
Locke, Barrie B.
Logan, Joseph B.
Lohr, Chester H.
Low, Frederick M.
Lowry, George C.
Lucas, Milton A.
Luthin, Richard B.
Lyman, John S., Jr.
Lynch, William A.
Lyon, Peter W.
MacGregor, John
MacIntyre, Donald
Mahony, Wilbur J.
Malone, Thomas L., Jr.
Manion, James H.
Margeson, Alan J.
Markham, Lewis M. III
Markley, Edward K.
Marsh, William C.
Marshall, Lawrence J.
Marshall, Richard M. III
Martin, Charles W., Jr.
Martin, Charles W., Jr.
Martin, Frank L., Jr.
Martin, Robert C.
Maser, Walther G.
Mason, Sidney F.
Mason, Wesley R.
Matais, George R.
Matheson, Eugene C.
Mathews, Bobby D.
Mathews, Donald W.
Matteson, Max R.
Matthews, William B., Jr.
Mattison, Ralph M.
Mauldin, Richard A.
Mauthe, Benjamin C.
Maxim, Rodney E.
Maxwell, Philip H.
May, Charles T., Jr.
Mayberry, Thomas A., Jr.
Mays, Clayton P.
McAllaster, Archie F.
McCanna, Marvin G., Jr.
McCarty, Charles M.
McComb, Robert B.
McCormick, Daniel G.
McCoy, John F.
McCrane, Brian P.
McCullen, John G., Jr.
McCurdy, William E., Jr.
McDaniel, Johnny B.
McDonald, Clovis K.
McGovern, Joseph J.
McGreevy, Walter J., Jr.
McKee, Jack V.
McKenna, Patrick
McLaughlin, Bernard R.
McNaughton, James M.
McQuesten, John T., Jr.
McVay, Donald H., Jr.
Meacham, Arthur J.
Mead, George R.
Meador, William A.
Melton, Edward C., Jr.
Mercer, Donald M.
Meredith, Stuart T.
Merget, Andrew G.
Meyer, William C., Jr.
Mhoon, John E.
Middleton, Charles O. III
Milani, Louis F.
Milano, Vito R.
Millard, Grant A.
Miller, Curtis W., Jr.
Miller, Donald M.
Miller, Evan K.
Miller, Floyd H., Jr.
Miller, Grant W.
Miller, Joseph J., Jr.
Miller, William V., Jr.
Mills, James R.
Mills, Merle E.
Mirman, Joseph E.
Mitchell, Carroll K.
Mitchell, Howard C.
Mitchell, Jerry L.
Mittell, David P.
Mock, Roy L.
Monroe, William D. III
Moonan, Raymond L.
Mooney, John B., Jr.
Moore, Carlton H., Jr.
Moore, Clarence E.
Moore, Milton W., Jr.
Moore, Rufus J.
Moran, Thomas M.
Moreau, Arthur S., Jr.
Morelli, Frank P.
Morgan, James D.
Morgan, Joseph R.
Moriarty, Edwin S.
Morris, Robert D.
Morrison, John H., Jr.
Morse, Edward A.
Moss, Irvin R.
Moulton, Daniel B.
Mowery, Dale H.
Muench, Gerald W.
Muka, Joseph A., Jr.
Mullender, Thomas J., Jr.
Mumford, Charles E.
Murdoch, Alan G.
Murphy, Elbridge F., Jr.
Murphy, Gordon F.
Murtagh, Thomas J.
Musorrafiti, Francesco A.
Naylor, Frankie L.
Nelson, George E., Jr.
Nelson, Keith
Nelson, Teddy N.
Nesbitt, Harry J.
Nevarez, Antonio
Neville, Paul E.

Nielsen, Donald E.
Nolan, Richard W.
Nomady, Verne G.
Norby, Merlin R.
Nord, James R.
Nordhill, Claude
North, Robert R.
Northrop, Robert E.
Nuss, Charles R.
Nutter, Andrew T. J.
Nystrom, Frederic L.
O'Connell, John D.
O'Keefe, James L., Jr.
O'Leary, John B., Jr.
Oliver, Perry S., Jr.
Olsen, Harold L.
Olson, Conrad B.
Olson, John R.
Olson, John S.
O'Rourke, Daniel, Jr.
Osborne, Charles N.
O'Shea, John A., Jr.
Ostronic, Francis J.
Owens, Robert M.
Pacia, Erwin
Padgett, Harry E.
Palmieri, John J.
Paolucci, Donald C.
Pape, William J. II
Park, Carroll W.
Park, John B.
Parker, Thomas C., Jr.
Parkes, Joe
Parr, Donald R.
Paulk, John E.
Pearlman, Samuel S.
Peckworth, Dana
Pederson, Alton A.
Perot, Henry R.
Perrey, Philip L.
Perry, David L.
Perry, James W., Jr.
Perry, Lowell E.
Personnette, Alan J.
Pertel, Joseph A.
Pestcoe, Joseph
Peters, Edward R.
Peters, William J.
Petersen, Edwin J., Jr.
Petersen, Leroy E.
Peterson, George E., Jr.
Peterson, John W.
Petrie, Roland A.
Petry, William A.
Pettit, Thomas E.
Phelps, Robert L.
Phillips, Charles A.
Phillips, John T.
Phillips, Walter M., Jr.
Piazza, John R.
Pickett, Gordon D.
Pickett, Thomas R.
Place, Allan J.
Platt, Alvin W.
Platt, Ralph E.
Ploss, John H.
Poland, James B.
Pollum, Edgar W.
Poor, Robert A.
Pope, Daniel K. IV
Pope, James F.
Porter, David N.
Porter, Jerome K.
Porter, William H.
Porterfield, Robert E.
Potter, Arthur M., Jr.
Powell, Julian B.
Prell, Raymond B.
Prentice, Paul N.
Prentiss, Dickinson
Preston, John L.
Prewett, William T.
Price, Walter P.
Prickett, Bruce L.
Priddy, Clarence L., Jr.
Prieb, Charles R.
Profilet, Clarence J.
Pugh, Richard
Purdum, William H.
Purser, Fred O., Jr.
Purvis, Ronald S.
Quirk, John T.
Quirk, William J.
Raffaele, Robert J.
Ramsey, Gayle
Ramsey, William E.
Randall, Howard F., Jr.
Randall, Howard W.
Ratcliff, Stephen D.
Rawlings, Lawrence J.
Reddick, Robert E., Jr.
Reed, Charles A.
Reeg, Frederick J.
Refiitt, Raymond E.
Reid, Jack M.
Reilly, William F.
Reith, George, Jr.
Reynolds, James H.
Rhodes, Randolph L.
Rice, Daniel W.
Rice, Harry E. III
Rich, Robert T.
Richards, Lloyd W.
Richardson, Harold M.
Rieken, Richard G.
Rigdon, Roland H.
Riley, Raymond T.
Rinne, Keith D.
Ritz, Merlin C.
Roach, Francis L.
Robbins, Noel
Roberson, George D.
Roberts, Lytle C. III
Robinson, William A.
Robson, Harry E.
Rodgers, James B.
Rodgers, James R.
Roe, Charles W.
Roepke, John R.
Rogers, Charles E., Jr
Rogers, Ralph E.
Rogers, Warren F.
Roland, Gerald K.
Ross, William T., Jr.
Rubb, Milton R.
Ruch, Martin, Jr.
Ruddick, George R., Jr.
Rudolph, Francis A., Jr.
Rusch, John M.
Russell, Charles T.
Rutzler, Joseph A.
Ryan, James A., Jr.
Ryan, William A.
Sanders, Ben T.
Sanks, David R. III
Sargent, Richard E.
Sassano, John P.
Sawyer, Charlie H.
Schaaf, Thomas W.
Schafer, Edward D., Jr.
Schaller, Robert A.
Schasteen, James C.
Schermerhorn, James R.
Schmid, Herbert H.
Schmidt, Walter P.
Schmitz, Richard J.
Schulte, Jean H.
Schultz, Eugene D.
Schuster, Dale G.
Schweitzer, Robert J.
Scott, Edward T.
Scott, Kenneth M.
Scott, Norman H.
Sebring, Leland H.
Seeba, Herman A.
Seeger, Charles R.
Seitz, Richard L.
Selz, George O.
Seward, John K.
Seymour, Conrad L.
Seymour, Ernest R.
Shakespeare, Franklin B.
Shappell, John R.
Sharrah, Ronald L.
Shaw, John H.
Shay, Fred L.
Sheeley, Elmer E., Jr.
Sheets, Jean P.
Shilling, John D.
Shirley, William B.
Shoopman, Bertram H., Jr.
Showalter, Louis R., Jr.
Shrewsbury, Lawrence H., II
Shropshire, Edwin D., Jr.
Shuck, Thomas L.
Shughrou, John J., Jr.
Sima, Frederick F., Jr.
Simmons, Arlis J.
Simmons, Clayton M.
Simmons, Reginald C.
Simpkins, George C.
Skelton, Stuart A.
Skerrett, Robert J.
Skillman, Charles F.
Skolnick, Alfred
Skomsky, Louis J.
Sladky, James A.
Slater, Donald L.
Slyfield, Frederick J.
Smiley, Charles B.
Smiley, Douglas I.
Smith, Alfred A.
Smith, Delvin W., Jr.
Smith, Donald B.
Smith, Frederick D., Jr.
Smith, George L.
Smith, James T.
Smith, Joseph C.
Smith, Morgan H.
Smith, Norman A.
Smith, Thomas J.
Smith, William L.
Smith, William L.
Smithberger, Thomas J.
Smitter, Clarence H.
Snee, John J.
Snelgrove, Edward R.
Snively, Abram B., III
Snouse, William H.
Snuffin, Jerry A.
Snyder, Aaron W. S.
Snyder, Herman L., Jr.
Snyder, Ned C.
Sokol, John
Solan, Thomas V.
Sonnenburg, Paul N.
Sonniksen, Ronald G.
Southerland, Thomas C., Jr.
Spar, Edwin F.
Speelman, Thomas W.
Spencer, Roy S., Jr.
Spicer, Oscar F.
Spiegler, Felix R.
Spiller, Fraser W.
Spohr, Carl J., Jr.
Stafford, Frank R.
Stafford, Kenneth B.
Stallings, Clyde, Jr.
Starcher Charles W., Jr.
Starnes, Billy G.
Stead, Kenneth A., Jr.
Steinke, Harris E.
Stevens, James P.
Stewart, David H.
Stillwell, Robert L., Jr.
Stoner, John W., Jr.
Storm, Richard E.
Strange, William M.
Strasheim, Don N.
Strawn, James H.
Stride, William F. A., Jr.
Strohecker, Franklin M.
Strong, Dean L.
Struven, Robert L.
Studebaker, Clayton A.
Stuntz, John R.
Sturgeon, William J. III
Sullivan, William W.
Sutherland, Doyle L.
Sykes, Lewis B.
Talbot, Frank R., Jr.
Talbot, James R., Jr.
Tall, Charles H. III
Tally, Billy F.
Tarlton, Joe E.
Tarpley, William A.
Tavis, Lee A.
Taylor, Edmund B., Jr.
Taylor, Reeves R.
Taylor, Thomas H.
Templeman, William E.
Terry, Daniel G. W.
Thies, Walter L.
Thole, Charles P.
Thomas, Clifford C., Jr.
Thomas, Don W.
Thomas, Earl G.
Thomas, Frederic J.
Thomas, George R.
Thomas, John C.
Thomas, John D.
Thompson, William M.
Throop, James R.
Thweatt, Freddie J.
Toadvine, Stephen P. III
Toland, Hugh J. C., Jr.
Tolman, Milton H.
Tomlinson, Alva C.
Tortora, Anthony M.
Trammell, Webb D.
Traweek, Billy B.
Trawick, Charles V.
Treat, Richard A.
Trost, Carlisle A. H.
Truax, Evan C.
Trueblood, William E.
Tuttle, George S.
Tuttle, John R.
Umberger, Robert C.
Upshaw, Donald E.
Vahlkamp, Eugene W.
Vail, Joseph L.
Van Allsburg, Donald E.
Van derGoore, Jacob L.
Vanhoof, Eugene R.
VanWestendorp, Steven
Varner, Duane L.
Vaughan, Edgar III
Velazquez - Suarez, Francisco A.
Vining, Albert D., Jr.
Visnich, Sam
Voelker, Donald C.
Vosseller, John H.
Voyer, Irving L., Jr.
Wachtel, Joseph J.
Wagner, David F.
Waldorf, Daniel M.
Walker, Charles S.
Walker, Harold E., Jr.
Walker, James B., Jr.
Walker, Peter R.
Walker, Wilmer E.
Wall, Joseph E.
Wall, Richard H.
Wallace, Thomas M.
Walling, Eugene K.
Wallner, Michael P.
Walshe, Edward C., Jr.
Walters, Harold L., Jr.
Walters, Isaac J. III
Ward, Gene P.
Ward, Hugh W., Jr.
Ward, Robert B.
Warren, James W., Jr.
Warren, Thomas C.
Waters, George H.
Watson, Lawrence H., Jr.
Weaver, Jerold Q.
Weaver, John H.
Webb, James I.
Webster, James M.
Weddington, George L., Jr.
Wehrman, Philip W.
Wellings, John F.
Wells, Don V.
Wells, Walter H., Jr.
Westmoreland, Ralph M.
Wetrich, Charles R.
Wheeler, James B.
Whitcomb, Richard A.
White, Charles E.
White, Donald C.
White, Frank L.
Whittier, James F.
Will, Otto W.
Willenbrink, James F.
Willever, Edward L.
Willhauck, Marion
Williams, David W.
Williams, James B.
Williams, Louis A., Jr.
Williams, Ralph T.
Williamson, James, Jr.
Williamson, Harry H., Jr.
Willis, Jack R.
Wilner, Jack D.
Wilson, Glenn A.
Wilson, Harry A.
Wilson, Jack L.
Wilson, James A., Jr.
Wilson, James G.
Wilson, Richard V., Jr.
Wilson, Vaughn E., Jr.
Wilson, William F.
Winfield, Gordon T., Jr.
Winfree, Herman D., Jr.
Wisdom, Robert W.
Wise, Peyton R. II
Wise, Richard S.
Witcher, John R.
Withrow, John E., Jr.
Wittrock, Henry L.
Wolff, William F.
Wolke, Victor B. C.
Wong, Raymond W. C.
Wood, Edgar K., Jr.
Wood, John P.
Woodall, Franklin T., Jr.
Woodberry, Earle B.
Woodburn, Craig E.
Woods, Robert C.
Workman, Harry E.
Worth, Edward R.
Wray, Walter D., Jr.
Wright, Charles H., Jr.
Wright, James D.
Wright, Kenneth L., Jr.
Wright, Richard T.
Wright, William F., Jr.
Wright, William W.
Yanaros, John O.
Yeager, Donald R.
Young, Alfred A. III
Young, David B., Jr.
Young, Joseph A.
Youngjohns, Richard P.
Youse, James A.
Zahn, Raymond C.
Zebrowski, Joseph P.
Zirps, Christos
Barrett, Patricia F.
Bradley, Nancy M.
Campbell, Jean L.
Carter, Joanne G.
Coleman, Rose E.
Dickey, Barbara J.
Dunham, Dixie L.
Matthes, Maureen D.
Erhart, Dorothy L.
Gilbert, Amarette H.
Hartington, Pauline M.
Higgins, Sarah P.
Hilyard, Effie J.
Kearney, Carolyn E.
Kunce, Genevieve D.
Lewis, Nancy A.
Lotspeich, Mary J.
Masback, Margery E.
Mogge, Marjorie H.
Radyx, Sylvia G.
Shapland, Georgia L.
Smith, Cecily J.
Swing, Eleanor S.
Vradenburg, Joanne P.
Watkins, Joann E.
Wilson, Lois J.
Young, Sue E.

SUPPLY CORPS

Almen, Richard E.
Badger, George R.
Bailey, Donald P.
Boyer, Charles L.
Brain, George W.
Brainard, John W.
Bruyneel, Louis K.
Bryant, Robert K.
Canon, Roscoe H., Jr.
Christopher, Robert N.
Coleman, Ernest B.
Corn, James R.
Curtis, Richard E.
Dempster, Darrell D.
Donzell, Richard J.
Ebert, Scott W.
Fishback, Burney L., Jr.
Freese, Ralph F.
Frost, Shirley D.
Gilmore, Roger W.
Gilpen, Franklin M.
Girod, Roy O.
Govan, David M.
Greenwood, Joseph L., Jr.
Gunther, Roy W.
Hemmert, George V.
Hodges, William J.
Hoffner, Carleton C., Jr.
Hohenstein, Charles R.
Jernigan, Joseph W.
Johnson, Richard L.
Jones, Glenn
Jones, Horace B., Jr.
Jordan, Alva F., Jr.
King, Braxton R.
Kispert, Lane A.
Kollios, Achilleas E.
Kuhlmann, Dietrich H.
Larson, Nelson S.
Lathrop, Charles F.
Lemly, William D.
Lenderman, James L.
Lenz, Allen J.
Livermore, Robert E.
Lovell, Donald E.
Malone, Joseph L., Jr.
Massie, Samuel P.
McCandless, Claude C., Jr.
McCrabb, Donald E.
McGee, James E.
McNeill, Neil E.
Mercier, Arthur G.
Merrill, Kenneth E.
Miller, Richard K.
Morehouse, Charles W.
O'Donnell, Terrence F.
Olson, Harvey T.
Osborn, Robert H.
Pardau, Orville J.
Paulsen, Raymond E.
Paulson, Raymond L.
Ranken, John T., Jr.
Rohleder, Richard P.
Rothenberger, Donald J.
Russell, Frederick R.
Salgado, Paul R.
Sankey, Harry W.
Sawyer, Preston, Jr.
Schlaufman, Louis C.
Schucker, Robert M.
Schwenz, Richard W.
Scolpino, Frank J., Jr.
Sullivan, Joseph P.

Temte, Knute P.
Thalman, James E.
Thomas, Norman C.
Thweatt, John G., Jr.
Vanscoyoc, James S.
Wadsworth, Ben A., Jr.
Waid, Stanley B.
Weber, Robert J.
White, Frank L.
Wilczynski, Jeremiah
Williams, Raymond L.
Williams, Rex M.
Wong, Ronald M.
Woodward, Ralph C.
Woodworth, Edward T.
Woolley, Herbert T.
Avary, James L.
Collicott, Purnel L.
Davidson, William I.
Faust, Delbert L.
Merrick, Walter F.
Taylor, Bayard A., Jr.
Wood, Lee, Jr.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Agee, Aaron B.
Allen, Roy L.
Bigelow, David S.
Burns, William J., Jr.
Chourre, Jack M.
Coates, Edward E.
Cottingham, Edward L.
Crowley, Irwin D., Jr.
Deady, Ralph E.
Falk, Harvey A., Jr.
Gaulden, Roy D., Jr.
Hartell, William K.
Haycraft, William R.
Haynes, Howard H.
Hughes, Edmund C.
Huston, Robert J.
Jones, Thomas K.
Koblos, Michael C.
Kreshin, Lawrence
Lapolla, Joseph
Lewis, Frank H., Jr.
Merica, Charles A.
Mitchell, Thomas J.
Morse, James W., Jr.
O'Leary, John F.
Ormond, Jay K.
Reedy, Roger F.
Reeves, Ronald B.
Robinson, Charles F.
Shaw, Robert W., Jr.
Smith, Matthias J.
Stewart, Stanley P., Jr.
Stump, Edward J.
Trunz, Joseph P., Jr.
Tyhurst, James E.
Verdi, Stanley N.
White, Robert K.
Wiederecht, Donald A.
Wilson, Dean G.
Yoshihara, Takeshi
Blough, Loney L.
Parrish, Oscar F., Jr.
Pinch, William C.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Adams, Chauncey C., Jr.
Bailey, Jack S.
Bauerschmidt, Alan D.
Cook, Paul E.
DeGrotte, Henry C., Jr.
Diaz, Gilbert A.
Dobbs, George I.
Feith, Joseph
Furrey, William R.
George, Robert E.
Howard, Vaughn
Jones, Daniel M.
Jordan, Ray D.
Nyman, George A.
Roach, Leon M.
Roller, Billie
Rowell, Dalton A.
Smith, Bill J.
Storms, Jack R.
Turner, David H.
Wagner, Carl M.
Wetzel, Orval B.
Wimberly, Clyde O.
Livingston, Lois R.

NURSE CORPS

Mueller, Dona D.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Edward J. Thullen
Theodore J. Toben, Jr.

The following-named (Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert B. Bittner
Donald L. Macleay, Jr.

The following-named Marine Corps Reserve officers for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Albert G. Borlan
Walter R. Brown
Pasquale L. Cacace
Willard I. Crumback
John L. Driefer
Robert D. Flint
Joseph F. Golden
Jesse R. Greer
Arthur R. Hickle
Harold F. Jones
Robert P. Leslie
Robert E. Lewis
Willie L. Lowe, Jr.
Jack "L" Maxwell
Melvin W. McCoury, Jr.
William I. Morgan, Jr.
Harry L. Myers
Paul J. Pardy
Oswald V. Scott, Jr.
Robert M. Sweeney
Lester D. Widick, Jr.

The following-named Marine Corps Reserve officers for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Albert G. Borlan
Walter R. Brown
Pasquale L. Cacace
Willard I. Crumback
John L. Driefer
Robert D. Flint
Joseph F. Golden
Jesse R. Greer
Arthur R. Hickle
Harold F. Jones
Robert P. Leslie
Robert E. Lewis
Willie L. Lowe, Jr.
Jack "L" Maxwell
Melvin W. McCoury, Jr.
William I. Morgan, Jr.
Harry L. Myers
Paul J. Pardy
Oswald V. Scott, Jr.
Robert M. Sweeney
Lester D. Widick, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 6 (legislative day of June 4), 1956:

ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

Charles J. Lowen, Jr., of Colorado, to be Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Frederick A. Seaton, of Nebraska, to be Secretary of the Interior.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who alone art acquainted with our many needs and knowest that we are not sufficient of ourselves to meet them, grant that in our walk and work during this day we may be guided by Thy infallible wisdom and guarded by Thy infinite power.

We beseech Thee to bless our President, our Speaker, and the Members of the Congress with Thy bountiful grace and prosper all the efforts that are being made to maintain our country's honor and security, health and strength.

May the hardships and adversities, which we are encountering in the great adventure of establishing peace on earth, never cause us to doubt Thy care or disturb our faith in Thee, but may we be strong and of good courage, assured that Thy divine providence will continue to protect and preserve us.

Hear us in Thy love and mercy through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3638. An act 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.).

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. 9720. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, 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. HILL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. THYE, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. POTTER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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. 10003. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill disagreed to by the House, and agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BIBLE, Mr DIRKSEN, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. BEALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1026. An act for the relief of Nihat Cengiz; and

S. 1244. An act for the relief of Eva Gershbein Rubinstein.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6143) entitled "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that for taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950, certain amounts received in consideration of the transfer of patent rights shall be considered capital gain regardless of the basis upon which such amounts are paid."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9390) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 to the foregoing bill.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9720)

making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FOGARTY, FERNANDEZ, LANHAM, DENTON, CANNON, TABER, HAND, and JENSEN.

KANSAS CITY, KANS., PRIME RIBS OF BEEF

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], who has a pleasant announcement to make.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker—

You have tried the rest, now taste the best: Kansas City, Kans., prime ribs of beef.

That is the first paragraph of a letter which should be on your desk and the desk of every Member of the House of Representatives. In case you have not seen it, the next paragraph, and the most important one, of the letter reads as follows:

You are invited to be my guest for the meat portion of your lunch Thursday, June 7, in the House restaurant, and enjoy a serving of Kansas City, Kans., prime ribs of beef. This taste treat is made possible through the courtesy and cooperation of the Kansas City, Kans., plant of Armour & Co., a recovered flood victim, the Kansas City (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce and a group of friends.

Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out in my invitation, you have had Wisconsin cheese, Indiana tomato juice, Idaho and Maine potatoes, Texas onions, California and Florida orange juice, Georgia watermelon, Virginia peanuts, and last, but by no means the least delectable, fish-sticks from Gloucester, Mass. They were all good. I trust you will find that this Kansas City, Kans., prime ribs of beef is the best yet.

I feel quite sure good beef is one subject that Republicans and Democrats alike will agree on, and I will be delighted to have you as my guests tomorrow.

FOREIGN AID BILL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have some remarks I wish to make about the bill which we take up in the House today, the foreign aid bill.

From the very beginning I have questioned the wisdom of trying to buy the friendship of other nations. Nevertheless, I was willing to give it a trial. I voted for this program with serious misgivings during my first term here in Congress. I am now convinced that history has shown that my doubts were fully justified. The time has long passed when there is any justification for burdening American taxpayers with economic aid for nations all over the face of the earth, and I have for a long time been voting to eliminate this burden. We have even given a half billion dollars to Communist Yugoslavia, over my protest, and $52 billion of our $27 billion national debt represents money we have given to foreign nations since the end of World War II.

It is alarming to me that we are blindly pursuing a course that is contrary to the fundamental principles on which this country was founded. A wise man may make a mistake. Only a fool refuses to recognize that he has made one.

We have spent billions on various forms of foreign aid. Today we have fewer friends than we had at the start. It is admitted that we are slipping from international leadership in many ways. I think it is high time that we stop and reconsider. We must do that before we lose all of our friends.

I said that our present course in international relations is opposed to the fundamentals upon which our Nation is built and I repeat it. We built a nation on the integrity and effort of the individual. We are proud of the fact that basically we are an honest, God-fearing, business-like people. It seems to me that we are forgetting these principles in our use of dollar diplomacy.

You cannot buy true friendship nor does any decent, self-respecting person like to be put on charity. Yet that is exactly what we are trying to do to all of our allies and friends. We are trying to make them wards of our charity. We are trying to put them on the dole and expect them to like it. They want our respect not our charity.

We state that our aid has stopped communism in many countries. We brag, openly for all to hear, that we have been able to buy elections in other nations. Have we forgotten that buying elections is a crime in this country? Do we have two sets of morals, one for us and one for the rest of the world? It would seem so.

Of course, others want our money. But they resent being made wards of an international charity. What decent, self-respecting nation would not?

We have been running a multibillion-dollar giveaway program, an international WPA program. Those initials mean it "Won't Produce Anything."

I am opposed to what we are now doing. I am opposed to the way we are doing it and the results we are getting. It does not make sense to me to spend money to get what you do not want. I think a good title for this measure would be a bill to spend money and lose friends.

I do not quarrel with what is supposed to be the intent of this measure, but I am violently opposed to the method. We can accomplish the intent—to increase world markets and make friends. We can do that without sacrificing any of our American ideals. But first of all, we must start treating all the nations as nations, not as wards of our charity or as corrupt political machines to be bought with our dollars.

This entire program can be handled as a business venture. We can introduce good, sound, American business practices into it and make friends instead of losing them.

First of all, we should say to each nation, we need certain raw materials and you need help to develop your resources. We will help you develop your resources as an investment. In return we expect, through trade arrangements and payments, to get our money back, plus a reasonable rate of interest. That is no more nor less than sound business. It would also remove the stigma of the dole. In other words, we would treat them as partners in a business venture. Both sides would be expected to profit directly, just as we do in this country.

We could then say, if you need any technical advice or assistance we can help you arrange for it at cost. Such help would be limited to the needs of the country and its ability to finance the project. This could be handled just as a management or industrial engineering firm assists private industry in this country.

I recognize that this would call for an about-face in our international diplomacy. I realize that it means practicing abroad what we preach at home. I firmly believe that if we did so we would gain respect in the eyes of the world. We would do so because we would be doing unto others as we do unto ourselves.

If such an approach were taken I would gladly lend my support. But it is long past the time to put an end to the bungling method we have been pursuing, of scattering taxpayers' money to every corner of the world while losing friends all the time.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE WILLIAM E. LEAHY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of William E. Leahy is felt with deep regret by his many friends. One of the ablest lawyers of the country, Bill Leahy devoted his unusual talents for the benefit of country and mankind. He was a great American.

His activity in civic affairs and charitable activities were known to all. His charming personality endeared him to all who knew him.

Bill Leahy was a man of deep faith. He loved and served God and country.

He was a devout communicant of the Catholic church.

An active practicing attorney for 42 years as prosecutor and as defense attorney, Bill Leahy was recognized by the bench and the bar as one of the outstanding lawyers of our country. His profound knowledge of law, his great ability in examination of witnesses, particularly in the important field of cross-examination, coupled with his eloquence in argument to court or jury and his keen analytical mind and charming personality—qualities very seldom possessed by one man—earned for him his preeminence as a lawyer. As has well been said, "His arguments to juries were considered masterpieces of oration."

I first met Bill Leahy shortly after I first came to Congress 28 years ago. A friendship blossomed at our first meeting which strengthened as the years passed. I valued his friendship very much.

Bill Leahy was always willing to do a favor for a friend, to help the sick, the afflicted, the unfortunate. Bill was loyal to his friends. He was a man of charity.

The death of Bill Leahy takes from the city of Washington one of its outstanding citizens. His death leaves to his friends a gap that will never be filled.

I shall miss my dear friend very much. Mrs. McCormack joins with me in extending to Mrs. Leahy and to his sisters and other loved ones our deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD following my remarks in relation to the late William E. Leahy, and that other Members may have 5 legislative days to do the same thing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 515) providing for the consideration of H. R. 11356, a bill to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one day, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 57]

Barrett	Harden	Patman
Bell	Herlong	Philbin
Berry	Heselton	Pillion
Bolling	Hillings	Polk
Brooks, La.	Holifield	Powell
Brownson	Holt	Prouty
Burnside	Jackson	Reed, N. Y.
Davis, Wis.	Johansen, Mich.	Scherer
Dawson, Ill.	Jones, Mo.	Seely-Brown
Deane	Kearney	Shelley
Diggs	Kelley, Pa.	Sheppard
Donovan	Kilburn	Sieminski
Dowdy	Krueger	Sikes
Doyle	Lane	Simpson, Pa.
Durham	McCarthy	Steed
Eberharter	McConnell	Taber
Frazier	Magnuson	Thornberry
Gamble	Miller, Calif.	Utt
Gubser	Miller, N. Y.	Wharton
Gwinn	Morrison	Wilson, Calif.
Hagen	Moulder	Winstead
Hale	Nelson	
Halleck	O'Hara, Minn.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 359 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for an open rule and 1 day's debate on the bill.

H. R. 11356 authorizes an appropriation of $3,563,475,000 for foreign aid deemed essential to the security of the United States.

The authorization for military assistance, that is, weapons, equipment, and training is $1,925,000,000. The Foreign Affairs Committee reduced the President's request by $1,109,000,000. The committee expressed the view in its report that if equipment already financed from prior appropriations and now scheduled for Europe is diverted to Asia, the Near East, Africa, and Latin America, this amount is adequate to carry forth the military programs in these countries. According to the latest information available, November 30, 1955, $6,405,643,000 of undelivered military items were in the pipeline. Of this amount $3,634,303,000 of military equipment was scheduled for Europe.

The amount for defense support to those countries receiving direct military assistance, and who are financing military programs too large for their own resources to support, is $1,147,700,000. Funds are also authorized for development-assistance programs in the amount of $243 million. This amount is for loans except when funds are used to finance sales of surplus agricultural commodities. There are 3 technical-assistance programs in which the United States participates for which a total of $157,500,000 is authorized. These are mainly in the fields of agriculture, health, and sanitation and education.

Other programs covered in the bill include the President's special fund of $150 million which may be used in furtherance of the purposes of this act or any act if the President determines that such use is important to the security of the United States; another $100 million is authorized to be made available to the President to take care of unforeseen contingencies affecting the security of this country.

Funds are earmarked for financing the export and sale to foreign countries of surplus agricultural commodities. Provision is also made for the payment of ocean freight on surplus agricultural commodities and relief packages. Two million, three hundred thousand is the contribution for 18 months for the United Nations refugee fund. Seven million dollars is provided for the United States escapee program to provide care, maintenance, and resettlement assistance to anti-Communists in Europe and the Far East. The United States contribution to the United Nations Children's Fund is $10 million.

Provisions under existing law relating to the investment guaranty program are broadened. It is hoped to encourage a long-term policy that will involve private investment, thus reducing the cost to the Government.

The atoms-for-peace program is included in three different parts of the security program—the Asian nuclear center is financed from the President's fund for Asian economic development; the training of individuals in the peaceful uses of atomic energy is financed from funds for the technical cooperation program, and section 11 of the bill provides the means to assist free nations in acquiring research reactors for the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Section 7 of the bill contains a statement of policy, that is, of continuing aid to free nations as long as danger to the peace of the world and the security of the United States persists. It is the belief of the Foreign Affairs Committee that this will give assurance to the free nations of the continued backing of the United States and, at the same time, permit the Congress to evaluate the situation each year and act accordingly.

I fully realize that the expenditure of billions of dollars in cooperating with free nations is a controversial problem and many Members of Congress, including myself, are apprehensive as to the degree and the extent that this Mutual Security program should be modified and curtailed. We have already spent billions since the shooting war stopped to help rehabilitate and reestablish the economy of nations that were bombed and annihilated during the shooting war. I am not in sympathy with those who say that most of this money was wasted. The people of the Nation realize that if this money had not been spent, the Communist dictators could easily have

all Asia, Europe, and Africa under their domination today. In fact, General Eisenhower in 1950 returned from Europe to testify before the House and Senate Foreign Relations Committees in behalf of the mutual security program. At that time, as general and leader of the European defense, he stated that the Marshall plan aid to Greece and Turkey and other expenditures and aid which had been spent since the end of the war, no doubt, saved Western Europe from capitulating to Soviet communism. I do not think it is proper to label these expenditures as gifts to foreign nations because the United States is recognized as the world leader and our future liberty and freedom depend upon curtailing the spread of world communism. The dollars that we are spending in a program of this kind is not only a contribution to the freedom of other peoples in the world, but it is an expenditure as insurance against the loss of our own freedom, liberty, and self-government.

I am very much in favor of the Members of the House giving close scrutiny and unlimited debate to different provisions of this legislation and especially the section of the bill that refers to mutual aid to Tito and Yugoslavia, considering the recent developments of the close relations and cooperation between Tito and the Kremlin. I believe the House should pass this rule without delay so that we can go into Committee of the Whole and debate and offer amendments to this legislation so as to continue a practical program of mutual security with other free nations in our program to preserve freedom for all mankind.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. As I understand it, the 10-year program insisted upon by the Administration is out of this bill. Is that correct?

Mr. MADDEN. That is my understanding.

Mr. GROSS. But substituted therefor is a statement of policy which provides that this program continue on an unlimited basis, perhaps for 20 years. Is that correct?

Mr. MADDEN. That is not my understanding. The committee reports that it can be reviewed from year to year by the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but the statement of policy has no time limitation. Is that correct?

Mr. MADDEN. The statement of policy can be reviewed from year to year by the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. A 10-year program could be reviewed from year to year by the Congress if the Congress was so disposed. One session of Congress cannot bind another.

Mr. MADDEN. It is not my understanding that it is not binding the Congress for any set period of time beyond 1 year.

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

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that the statement of policy has a time limit, that is, that we are going to stick to this thing as long as the danger of international communism to our own security persists? We are not going to lie down while that danger continues. That is the limitation of time in there.

Mr. MADDEN. That is my understanding, with the Congress reviewing this program each year.

Mr. GROSS. In the light of past experience, does the gentleman think this thing will ever end?

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman would not be in a position to determine what international complications may happen in the future.

But, if we should happen to get into a war next year or in the future, it is hard to tell when that war would end and what would be the consequences as to the future of our country and the free world if such a catastrophe should hit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the House has heard the description of the bill as given by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]. I come before the House now to urge the adoption of this rule which provides for a full day of debate on the Mutual Security Act of 1956. The committee in its report on page 2 has this rather condensed statement regarding the bill:

> The funds authorized in this bill, together with the funds already available from previous appropriations, and the changes in existing law which this bill provides should make it possible for us to meet our commitments to our allies, to help those newer governments which cannot continue to be free and independent without economic and technical assistance, and to take whatever other action may be necessary to counter new efforts by the men in the Kremlin and in Peiping to bring free nations and peoples under their domination.

Mr. Speaker, after having put in considerable time and effort to determine to my own satisfaction just what is involved specifically in this bill, I have come to the conclusion, and I believe the Members of the House will have to come to the same conclusion, that there is not enough information contained in the report on the bill or any other documents available to us to really permit a clear and careful determination in each of our own minds as to just exactly what we do when we pass this authorization bill. In other words, I think we have to take this particular legislation on faith. The foreign policy of our Nation, as we all know, is a matter for determination by the President and the executive branch. We ourselves cannot enter into a study of each and every detail of a program of this kind, and it is not our function. We are now in the process of considering the recommendations brought to us by the Chief Executive. In endeavoring to determine what those recommendations are we run into many difficulties, as I have said. I would like to know just exactly how much money is allocated to each of the separate countries under the various heads. I turn to the table on page 3 and I find, where the dollar figure should be, nothing but X's. I made inquiry as to why those figures are not given, and the response was they are considered to be classified. I then tried to find out, as some of you may have, what the relationship is between the aid incorporated in this bill and the total expenditures of other countries which we are aiding, to find out what the relation of our contribution is to their total. That is likewise classified material. The question is, Shall the recommendation of the President be approved? That is just about what it amounts to.

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

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Have we not for the last 11 years taken on faith the appropriations we have made for these foreign giveaway programs of something over $50 billion, and have we not been disappointed in many respects in our faith in Tito, in India, and in many of the nations to whom we have handed out these gifts?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The gentleman is correct, certainly on one point. That is that we have every year taken this entire subject on faith, just as we are required to take it on faith this year.

Mr. MASON. I am a man of little faith, and I have not taken any of it during these last 10 years.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

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

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman read from page 2 of the committee report in which it is stated that this authorization bill and subsequent appropriations is necessary to meet our commitments to our allies.

On page 11 of the same committee report I call the gentleman's attention to the following language:

> In nearly all of the countries where our troops are stationed a speaker receives hearty applause if he speaks against subservience to the United States and urges his government to follow an independent course.

In the light of that statement, I wonder what our commitment should be to our so-called allies.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. To give an answer in the way of a comment to the gentleman's question, we must all realize that you just cannot buy friendship with money from the United States Treasury. I think it is quite a misunderstanding to consider that we are expending this money for the purchase of friendship. I look upon the money authorized in this bill and the money appropriated for this purpose as being expended in intelligent self-interest.

In other words, with this money we hope to support the operation in other countries of 200 infantry divisions, 300 air wings, 2,000 naval ships, which we, I think, have a right to consider may be of help in preserving our own national security. It is this practical self-interest that motivates us, rather than any effort to buy anybody's friendship.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Now that the gentleman has mentioned the military aspect, was the Rules Committee given any information as to what has happened to 50 divisions that were supposed to be in NATO by the end of 1952? Does the gentleman think there are 50 divisions in NATO today?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I will have to say to the gentleman that the Rules Committee did not inquire into that detail. That is a matter that I think the general debate on the bill will have to reveal to the gentleman.

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

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I may say in answer to part of the question raised by the gentleman from Iowa that in a number of instances some of these indignities and insults hurled at our boys across the water have been Communist inspired and do not come from the leaders of the people of the country to which this aid is going.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I think there is no doubt about that, and those of us who have traveled abroad know that there are demonstrations of all kinds against the United States arranged by the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to discuss the merits of the legislation before us, but I think it might be quite appropriate at this time to call attention to the fact that when the final gavel falls on this session it will bring to an end an illustrious career in this House, the exceptional service rendered by the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, JIM RICHARDS, as we know him.

Recently an article appeared in the New York Times of Friday, May 18, and the writer went on to tell something about the history of JIM RICHARDS. That article is entitled "A Quiet Congressman." I call particular attention to the last paragraph:

He's just a real old down-to-earth South Carolinian who loves to hunt and fish, loves his farm, and loves his cows.

I would love to add: "And he loves his fellow man." What more can be said of any man?

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that later on at the conclusion of this session of Congress tributes will be paid to our distinguished colleague, but it seemed to me appropriate that as we get into the final phases of this, the last bill with which he will have something to do, that we call attention to the fact that he is leaving us. All the members of our committee have a high regard for him. He has so conducted the affairs of his committee that hardly at any time has there been any question of party politics. I think that is a splendid tribute to a great man, a great American, a soldier, a patriot, and a great statesman.

I call your attention to the full text of the article which I insert at this point:

[From the New York Times of May 18, 1956]

A QUIET CONGRESSMAN: JAMES PRIOLEAU RICHARDS

WASHINGTON, May 17.—The Pittsburgh Pirates lost a budding prospect for their outfield a few decades back when JAMES PRIOLEAU RICHARDS chose law over baseball.

As a result of that decision, Mr. RICHARDS now is winding up 23 years in Congress in a style that can only make the Republican administration wish he had stayed with baseball.

Today, as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Representative RICHARDS was in the vanguard of congressional forces that dealt the President's foreign-aid proposals a severe defeat. President Eisenhower, who was a pretty good pitcher at West Point, might well be wishing tonight that Mr. Richards had accepted that offer from the Pirates.

The foreign-aid action and the coming fight on the House floor will be Mr. RICHARDS' curtain bow on the congressional stage. He is quitting this year and going back to South Carolina to practice a little law, hunt, fish and tend to his cattle.

Though his position makes him one of the most important men in the House of Representatives, he remains relatively unknown compared to his compeer, Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

RICHARDS' ANGER RECALLED

The reasons for this are two:

First, Mr. RICHARDS, a persuasive southern internation nationalist of judicial training, is not given to the political grandstanding of which Washington headlines are made.

Second, the House committee never has attained the pivotal importance of the Senate group, largely because the Constitution charges the Senate with the greater responsibility for overseeing the conduct of foreign affairs.

On occasion, the administration tendency to treat the House group as a poor cousin of the George committee has moved Mr. RICHARDS to jealous defense. Last February, for example, he denounced the administration for treating the House like a "weak-minded, illegitimate son" and got an apology from the State Department.

The Capitol consensus is that the House committee has gained fresh prestige under his direction.

Mr. RICHARDS, born in Liberty Hill, S. C., in 1894, is now a robust 61 years old. He is a big man, tall and powerfully built, and his carriage still is that of the athlete. A full shock of silvery gray hair and a deep ruddy complexion round out the picture of a politician who even now would not look out of place in the role of baseball manager.

He began as a farm boy and took a year at Clemson College with the idea of mastering the agricultural sciences. At the end of the year, he was interested in law and shifted to the University of South Carolina.

By 1921, he was in practice back in Lancaster, near his home, and a year later he was launched into politics as county probate judge. He held that office until South Carolina sent him to Congress in 1933.

In World War I, he enlisted a few days after President Wilson's declaration, served in France with a trench mortar battalion and rose from private to second lieutenant.

His appointment to the Foreign Affairs Committee came in 1935. As chairman, he shares with Senator GEORGE the chief burden of congressional responsibility for this country's international affairs. The position also calls for him to share in the formulation and development of foreign policy through prior consultations with the executive branch.

The job is a full-time one and leaves little leisure for the hunting and fishing that are his favorite pastimes. He lives with his wife, Mrs. Katharine Wylie Richards, in Georgetown, and has a son and a daughter in college and another son practicing law in South Carolina.

He has not been entirely lost to farming. When he leaves Washington this summer, he will divide his time between law practice and his cotton and cattle farm at Health Springs, near Lancaster.

An old friend, summing him up today, said:

"He's just a real old down-to-earth South Carolinian who loves to hunt and fish, loves his farm and loves his cows."

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the views expressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin. As he has so well pointed out, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] has presided over the House Committee on Foreign Affairs at all times in a friendly, fair and equitable manner. We are all aware of the fact that sometimes when tensions were a little great and feeling ran somewhat high, his gentle humor in many instances relieved the tension and enabled a relaxed committee to reach proper decisions. He shall be missed by this House but his wise counsel and leadership will be long remembered. We wish him many pleasant years in his beloved South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman in his tribute to our chairman. Mr. Speaker, I confess that I come to the floor of the House at this time with a bit of a lump in my throat as I realize that Chairman DICK RICHARDS is headed for the last roundup as far as this mutual security legislation is concerned. I want to join with the gentleman from Wisconsin in the tribute he has paid and I want to commend the gentleman for bringing this up early in these proceedings today.

DICK RICHARDS is a great American and a good fellow and my very dear friend. I have fought with him toe-to-toe and shoulder-to-shoulder and I might say that I would rather be shoulder-to-shoulder with him than toe-to-toe. But wherever he stands in a fight you will find he is a fair fighter, a fast friend and a true American. I join in the tribute the gentleman has paid DICK RICHARDS.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I know what he refers to when he says he has fought toe-to-toe with him. I only hope that in this debate on the program now before us I do not become involved with the gentleman from South Carolina in such a way that he might use the old swamp owl treatment on me.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I want to join in the tribute of the gentleman from Wisconsin and the other gentlemen which has been paid to the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs who is retiring from the Congress after the present session. When the history of these difficult years that have followed World War II is written, the contribution DICK RICHARDS has made in the buildup of the strength of the free world, in the maintenance of unity in the United States, in developing this foreign policy that is so difficult a burden to carry legislatively, will rank equally with that of any other Member of either body.

A lot of tributes have been paid in the past to various Members of Congress. But DICK RICHARDS has carried a large part of this burden. He has carried it so well that he has received comparatively little attention from the press of the country. He has been like the ballplayer who makes the hard plays look easier.

Certainly when the analyses are made of the foreign policy program of any administration in power in the last few years that has been carried into effect with the cooperation of the Congress, the contribution of DICK RICHARDS will rank as the greatest of all.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Hon. JAMES P. RICHARDS, the very able chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. I have served with Mr. RICHARDS as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for the past 6 years. I feel that no one has given me a greater insight into the problems of our country and of the world than has Mr. RICHARDS. I am proud to have served with him, to have known him. He is a man of great ability, integrity, and honesty. I feel very badly that the State of South Carolina did not demand that he return to the halls of this Congress. I feel he has added much to our great institutions and that he alone is responsible for carrying us over this very difficult period in our history. However, since he has made this determination to retire, I hope that he, his wife, and family will enjoy health and happiness in the years to come.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I desire also to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman who has paid great tribute to our very beloved friend, DICK RICHARDS, of South Carolina. I wish him and his family well and every success in the future.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] is one of the outstanding Americans of this trying period. His service in this House of Representatives has been constructive and of a nature to occupy prominent pages in the history of our country when the history of this period is written, particularly when it can be written in an objective manner removed from the emotionalism of this period. I am sorry that the gentleman is voluntarily retiring from the Congress. He and I have been close personal friends for many years. He has been one of the strong chairmen of the important Committee on Foreign Affairs. Fortunately we have had great chairmen during my 28 years of service here, but none have been greater or stronger or more able than our distinguished friend from South Carolina. We shall all miss him very much, and we wish him every happiness and success for countless years to come. We hope he will come back to the House and visit us frequently in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join my colleagues in giving recognition to our highly esteemed chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. As chairman of the Far East Study Mission last year, I first heard of the voluntary resignation of Mr. RICHARDS when the study mission was in Teheran. All members of the group were deeply moved and disappointed. We wired Mr. RICHARDS and asked him to reconsider. His reputation is known throughout the world. As we traveled on throughout the Middle East, Southeast Asia, the Far East and Western Pacific, wherever we visited, everybody expressed regret at the news of Chairman RICHARDS' decision to retire. I join with my colleagues in wishing him well for many, many years to come.

He has served the people of this State and our Nation with exceptional distinction for over two decades. His wise counsel and leadership will be sorely missed in the Halls of Congress. It is the hope of many that in the future our Nation will have the continued benefit of Mr. RICHARDS' wide experience and ability.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying a tribute of appreciation to DICK RICHARDS. I have served under Chairman RICHARDS during his entire time as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. His wisdom and forethought have given guidance and direction to the work of this great committee; not only to the committee but also to the entire House of Representatives. I wish for Chairman RICHARDS and his family the greatest happiness.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard with deep regret the decision of the Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS, Democrat from South Carolina, to retire from the House of Representatives.

Mr. RICHARDS has served his country with exceptional skill and devotion as a Member of the House of Representatives since the 73d Congress. Early in his congressional career—the 74th Congress—he became a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and it has been my privilege to know and serve with him on that committee since the 78th Congress.

On May 15, 1951, following the death of the late Judge Kee, Mr. RICHARDS was elected chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which chair he filled with particular distinction for the remainder of the 82d Congress and again during the present Congress.

During his long tenure, Mr. RICHARDS has consistently won the admiration of Members on both sides of the table with his fairness, his firmness, his innate good sense, his leadership. We shall all miss this wonderful friend and leader.

Our beloved chairman retires from this House with the respect of all and with the best wishes for the well-being and happiness of himself and his family wherever they are and whatever they do.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity afforded me again to express my admiration, appreciation, and keen respect for the great public service rendered the Nation by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee. It has been my pleasure to know the gentleman for nearly 14 years and during that time I have observed many occasions when he has exercised that unusual quality of leadership which marks the statesman. Only last year at a time when our national affairs were being allowed to drift into the dangerous paths of believing that there was merit to the Communist proposal for peaceful coexistence, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina stood in the well of this House and delivered a stirring and moving warning on the dangers confronting our Nation as a consequence of the latest shift in tactics of the Kremlin. At that time I remarked that it took unusual courage and great dedication to duty to make such a bold and forthright analysis of the effort being made to manipulate our national affairs so as to make impossible any real opposition against the Communist propaganda and political offensive. We Members of the House have seen many other occasions when the able Chairman rose up to meet issues having a critical bearing on the future security and welfare of our Nation. To-

day he has again demonstrated that his first consideration is the national interest and that he allows no part for partisan consideration on questions that have to do with the security and welfare of the American people.

We will sorely miss this high quality of leadership in future sessions of Congress, but we will never forget our good friend and colleague and the high standard he has set for those who will follow in his footsteps. I join with my colleagues in wishing our esteemed colleague every happiness in the future.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by you to all Members to extend our remarks in the body of the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] I shall make a few on comments concerning the distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

In the House the word "distinguished" is referred to many Members rather loosely. However in the reference to JAMES P. RICHARDS, the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, considering the position he occupies and the contributions he has made in the field of foreign affairs, "distinguished" is the only word that properly applies to the gentleman.

I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. RICHARDS shortly after I became a Member of the House. I listened to what he had to say with much interest and respect. Here was a man who after mature deliberation, after hearings in his committee, was willing to speak his mind and tell the House what his conclusions or recommendations were. From others, especially one Member who is now deceased, I was told that "RICHARDS is courageous, honest, and reliable. You can count on what he says as being his real convictions." I think it is fair to state who this Member was as I feel certain that Mr. RICHARDS must have known the high regard the man had for him. That Member was Karl Stefan, of Nebraska, who was the subcommittee chairman of the Appropriations Committee that considered the needs of the State Department and made the appropriations therefor, after its recommendations had been approved by the Appropriations Committee.

Then later I came to know Mr. RICHARDS because my daughter married a fine young man who lived in the city of Lancaster, where Mr. RICHARDS and his fine son had their law office.

It is unfortunate that after all this comment on Mr. RICHARDS that I should differ with him slightly concerning his stand on the bill before us. This is because I have so much faith in what President Eisenhower wants to do that I simply cannot deny his request. He undoubtedly has a wider view of this problem than the distinguished chairman of the committee. Also, what he suggests sounds so reasonable to me that I think we should give him what he has requested, with one reservation. If an amendment is offered to delete from the President's requests or suggestions any amount for Tito of Jugoslavia I feel I must vote for such a minor amendment.

The distinguished chairman has been a distinct success in every field of human endeavor in which he has participated. As a husband, as a father, as a friend, as a legislator, and as a committee chairman he has been tops.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I support the adoption of this rule only because it should prove interesting to hear those who profess so much concern for the American taxpayer try to justify a continuation of this multi-billion-dollar giveaway program.

It will also be interesting to note who among the leaders of Congress, regardless of political complexion, who trooped to the White House last evening, will come into the well of the House today and tomorrow and attempt to restore the puny cuts made by the committee in this extravagant program which will have some $7½ billion available for the next fiscal year if not a single dime of new money is authorized through this bill.

Will these leaders resort to the old wheeze and assumption that communism has been and will be halted by continued flights into the realm of fancy; that patriotism, love of country, freedom, and national morality are items for the auction block and can be purchased with American dollars?

Incidentally, if and when these leaders take the floor to do the bidding of the executive department, let them state for the record what millions upon millions of dollars, bled from our taxpayers, has accomplished in Yugoslavia. It will be remembered that last summer Secretary of State Dulles, hat in hand, paid a visit to Dictator Broz, alias Tito, who brought out his newest speedboat and gave Dulles a fast ride. The spray had hardly settled when it was announced some 20 or 30 million dollars had been allotted the Yugoslavia dictator to build a nice, new, superhighway. For American taxpayers, this is one of the most expensive boat-rides they have ever given one of their public officials.

But the real payoff came a few days ago when the Yugoslav dictator, strutting in all his splendor in Moscow and Russian way points, announced to the wide world that never again would anything happen to divide him from his pals in the Kremlin. Who in this House now covets the role of apologist for Tito?

And let those who now seek to increase the giveaways under this program and continue these indefinitely, for the declaration of policy in this bill does just that, tell us where stand our so-called free world friends in terms of firm military support for NATO, upon which we have lavished hundreds of millions of dollars. Let them tell us what became of the 50 divisions that were promised for NATO by the end of 1952. Or, with the appointment of NATO's "three wise men," none of whom is a representative of this country, it is proposed to make this an economic and social organization—another spout to the funnel through which additional billions of American tax dollars will evaporate?

It will be interesting, too, if we may hear from our leaders where in the heavily populated areas of Asia our money has bought reliable allies.

Yes, let us vote this rule and then hear from these spokesmen the cold, hard facts of what has been accomplished and what has not been accomplished since the end of World War II through this program and the spending of more than $60 billion. This money has been gouged out of the taxpayers and they are entitled to a full accounting. It is the responsibility of this Congress—at long last—to provide the facts rather than assumption, presumptions, and flights into a dream world as has been the story of the past.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11356, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 40 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to express my appreciation for the kind remarks that have been so generously made relative to my service here.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us this afternoon H. R. 11356, the 1956 mutual-security bill. It contains authorizations for $3,563,475,000. Although it is $1,109,000,000 less than the Executive requested, it is larger than the amount authorized a year ago by $277,675,000 and larger than last year's appropriation by $860,133,250.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has held extensive hearings on the bill and has considered it very carefully. It is by no means a rubber stamp of the recommendations of the Executive. There have been important changes in the nature of assistance offered and in the conditions under which it is available. The committee voted 24 to 4 to report

this bill. It is my sincere conviction, and I believe it is shared by all of us who voted to report the bill, that the funds authorized are absolutely essential to the security of the United States.

Let me take a minute to remind you what the money in this bill is going to be used for. About 54 percent of the total—$1,925,000,000—is for military aid. This is used exclusively to supply tanks, airplanes, guns, ammunition, and training to the forces of other nations. The bill limits the amount of this military money that can be used for Europe to $450 million. All of the rest of it—almost a billion and a half—has to be used in other parts of the world. More of it will go to Korea than any other country.

The Executive does not permit us to make available the amounts of military assistance planned for individual countries. They maintain that it is essential to our security that this information should not be made public. We have to observe their requirements in this matter.

I would like to point out, however, that we have made available this year everything that we could. I was pleased to note that the Washington papers, on April 20 last, published a report entitled "Secret Hearings on Hill Decline," in which the records of the committees of the House and Senate in respect to the holding of public hearings were compared. This compilation showed that the Committee on Foreign Affairs was high on the list of those who held a great proportion of its meetings in open session. I believe that this record indicates clearly our effort to make available all possible information to the House and to the public.

In addition to this direct military assistance in the form of weapons, tanks, and airplanes which I have just mentioned, the next biggest amount in the bill, $1,147,700,000, is for defense support. Defense support is economic aid, but it goes only to countries which have definitely committed themselves to our side in the struggle against communism. This money goes to poor countries which are maintaining armed forces that are too big for them to support. Only two countries in Europe get any defense-support funds, Spain and Yugoslavia. The committee cut the authorization for Yugoslavia by 50 percent—from $30 million to $15 million.

The largest amount of defense support going to any country is $300 million for Korea. The other big recipients of defense support include Turkey, Greece, Formosa, Pakistan, Thailand, and the Philippines.

This means that over $3 billion of the funds authorized, including direct military aid and defense support, about 86 percent of the money, goes to support military programs in countries that have not the resources to keep the men under arms that they now have. The maintenance of these forces is an essential element in the defense strategy of the United States.

Now let me summarize what the remaining 14 percent of the money is for. There is an authorization of $243 million for development assistance. This is available only to countries in Asia and Africa, either on a loan basis or in the form of United States surplus agricultural commodities. Countries which need outside help to develop their resources can receive help under this authorization regardless of whether they have committed themselves to our side or not. This is about 7 percent of the total funds in the bill.

There is an authorization of $157,500,000 for technical cooperation. This is the point-4 type of operation and is limited to technical assistance. It does not include financing imports or the building of dams. Less than 4 percent of the funds in the bill go for this purpose.

The remaining authorizations cover administrative expenses, contributions to the care of escapees, the Children's Fund, and so forth. They are continuations of what we have been doing before. A detailed tabulation of all the authorizations appears on pages 5 and 6 of the committee report.

Let me emphasize that the big money authorized by this bill is not going to be spent on international psychological projects. There is so much talk about what Nehru says, and about where Khrushchev and Bulganin are going, and about the French Cabinet, that people think the cold war has become a sort of diplomatic fencing match.

Consider the situation in Korea. Let me remind you that this bill authorizes $1,925,000,000 for strictly military assistance, and that of this total by far the largest single amount for any country is for Korea.

A state of war still exists in Korea. American boys face Communist soldiers across a neutral zone only 4 kilometers wide. Although shooting stopped on July 27, 1953, when the Armistice was agreed to, no permanent settlement with the Communists has been arrived at and none is in sight. The Communists have flagrantly violated their armistice commitments. They have constructed airfields and based an air force in North Korea after agreeing not to increase their strength there. They have built up their forces in other ways.

All is not quiet along the Armistice line in Korea. Continuous patrolling and probing is going on. There are frequent incidents. The Communist policy is to shoot first and ask questions afterwards.

Our own boys are facing the enemy in Korea, but the largest part of the line is manned by Korean troops. This Korean Army is the largest force in Asia under arms in opposition to communism. General Lemnitzer, our commander in the Far East, says that the Korean forces are excellent. They are experienced in combat, well trained, and well equipped. His testimony before the committee includes this statement:

> I feel very strongly that the continuance of United States military and economic assistance to the Republic of Korea and military assistance to Japan is absolutely vital to the maintenance of our entire military position in the Far East, as well as to the security of Korea and Japan. The Republic of Korea armed forces and the Japanese self-defense forces have already assumed a substantial share of the defense responsibility for their respective countries. As they become stronger, they will be able to assume progressively greater responsibility for their defense. In the absence of these Korean and Japanese forces, we would have no alternative to maintaining sizable additional United States forces in this key area to insure its security in the face of a continuing Communist threat.
>
> It is also important to remember that the cost of maintaining the Republic of Korea armed forces and the Japanese self-defense forces, in their homelands is substantially less than the cost of maintaining comparable United States forces in these areas.

All this leads me to this question: Have we any choice as to what we do about Korea? Does anyone in this House believe that we should abandon Korea to the Communists? Does anyone here want to give up without a struggle the territory which thousands of American boys gave their lives to defend? I believe that Korea has become a symbol to the people of the free world. I believe that 99 percent of the American people are determined that Korea shall be defended until the world struggle against Communist domination has been won.

I repeat that we have no choice but to hold the line in Korea and this means that we have no choice but to give to Korea the very substantial assistance that this bill contains.

In the first place, the United States has to provide the equipment for the Korean Armed Forces. Korea is a poor country with limited resources. It was completely wrecked by the war. In addition, Korea is maintaining a military force much too big for its size. It has too much of its manpower in uniform and the country does not have a big enough tax base to support such a force. The resources just are not there.

In order to keep Korean troops manning most of the defense line the United States has to pay a large part of the bill. We have to supply their military equipment and pay about half of the military budget of the Korean Government.

Second, in addition to our direct support of the Korean military forces, we have to underwrite the Korean economy. We have to contribute substantially to repair the devastation resulting from the war, and we have to provide capital equipment so that the country can make some progress toward maintaining itself. We are paying for factories, including fertilizer plants. We are paying for part of their imports because they produce very little foreign exchange of their own, although I would like to point out that in this instance our dollars have a double value. The counterpart which is derived from the sale of these imported commodities is used to maintain the budget of the Korean Government as well as to pay part of the cost of internal development projects.

I am fully aware that no one is satisfied with the situation in Korea. Everyone of us wishes that things had worked out differently there than they have. It is easy to indulge in hindsight and to point out how things might have been handled differently. The fact remains, however, that the situation we face today is as I have just outlined it. I believe that there really is no choice as to what we do

about Korea during the next fiscal year. The program which this bill provides was worked out very carefully by the United States military commanders in that area and the skilled staff of the United States civilian officers. I think they know what is necessary to keep things going in that poor and devastated country. There is no doubt but what we want to hold what we have, and I think also there is no doubt that we can do so if we contribute our share.

Think for a moment about other countries such as Turkey, Formosa, Thailand, Pakistan, and Iran. Each of these countries is right up against the Communist guns. Each one has chosen sides in the struggle against world communism. Each one of them knows that if it stands alone it cannot hope to survive against a Communist military attack. Each of them is depending on us for help. None of them could have a military establishment such as it now maintains without our equipment and without our support of its economy. We certainly do not want them to quit. It is inconceivable that we abandon them.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that so far I have been retelling a story that you have heard before. We have all heard it before because the same old reason for the whole thing is still with us. I feel sure that everyone in this House believes that the Communists are still our enemies and that they are determined to subjugate the United States as well as all other nations not yet under their control. Their military strength is greater than ever. As long as the Soviet Union and its satellites maintain their enormous military forces in constant readiness for an attack we have no choice but to continue a worldwide defense effort.

Although much of the program is familiar, I want to make clear that the committee is aware that there have been important developments during the past year. The bill which we have reported has been adjusted in recognition of what has happened.

We are aware, in the first place, of the Russian smile. We have not been so attentive to the smile that we have lost sight of the Russian guns, but we know that the Soviet leaders are smiling and that many nations have responded to the smiles.

In Europe there is less feeling of danger and less enthusiasm for defense than there used to be. I wish this was not so. I wish the United States could in some way change this situation. We have to face reality, however. There is no use going ahead with a program for Europe as though nothing had happened. A large part of the French Army is tied down in north Africa. Germany has not yet passed the legislation for calling up the forces which we have planned to equip. The British are restricting their use of conscription. Italy cries for more economic aid and less emphasis on defense items.

There is no way we can make up for diminished zeal by increasing the flow of arms. The committee has cut the military authorization requested by $1 billion and set a ceiling on the amount of this which can be used for Europe. This action was taken because, according to the latest figures we were given, there were still about $3 billion of planes, tanks, and weapons and equipment already financed from prior appropriations awaiting delivery to Europe.

I believe that the thing to do under the circumstances is to slow down our deliveries to Europe and to divert some of this equipment that is in the pipeline to the countries of Asia and to Turkey. The cut in military funds should give assurance that action along this line will be taken.

I want to make clear that it is not intended to pressure on the nations of Western Europe in any way. Their present attitude is such that they do not place a very high value on military aid. When and if that attitude changes, I think we should respond and help them where needed and where they cannot meet the need themselves. As long as their present attitude persists I do not believe we can properly or prudently ignore it.

In speaking of the adjustments which we have made in the program for Europe in response to recent developments, let me remind you that we have cut the defense support—this is economic aid—to Yugoslavia by 50 percent, from $30 million to $15 million. The committee is fully aware that the gyrations of Marshal Tito during the past year do not inspire too much confidence. At the same time, our military strategists insist that it is in the best interests of the United States to continue its program for Yugoslavia. The committee has, therefore, not attempted to cut off the program altogether but has restricted the economic side of it.

Another problem which the committee has carefully considered is the problem of giving aid to neutrals, particularly to nations like India. Many citizens of this country do not like the attitude of the leaders of India in this world struggle against Communist domination.

The fact remains, however, that they have not joined up with the Russians. India is one of the largest nations in the world. It is better for us to have India outside the Soviet orbit. There is no advantage to the United States in taking any action which would force Nehru into the Soviet camp.

At the same time we have to recognize the uncertainties in the Indian situation, and we have to make sure that we do not treat countries better if they push us around than if they cooperate. The bill before you contains provisions to deal with these problems.

In the first place, we say that development assistance to countries to build up their capital equipment—such as railroads, highways, dams, and factories—has to be either on a loan basis or in the form of surplus agricultural commodities. There will be no more grant aid to such countries which permits them to take our money this year and deny any obligation to us next year. I am not sure that we will get all our money back in the future, but at least the country accepting our help has to sign a solemn agreement to pay us back, which will be called to its attention in the future.

Furthermore, we have put in a requirement that in the future nations getting development assistance will have to sign an agreement providing satisfactory assurances that they will permit the participation of private capital and private enterprise in their development.

Let me say just a further word about the Aswan Dam in this connection. No funds have been requested by the executive for the Aswan Dam for fiscal 1957, and no funds for this purpose are included in this authorization. The President has used his discretionary authority to set aside $54 million previously authorized and appropriated for other purposes to be used to finance part of the cost of the first phase of the construction of the dam should Egypt decide to go ahead with the project. According to the latest information available to the committee, the United States does not know whether Egypt intends to build the dam or not.

The United States has made an offer to help finance the later phases of the construction of the dam. No funds have been requested by the executive for this purpose. Although the President has great authority to transfer funds under existing law, I do not believe that it will be possible for the United States to finance the construction of the Aswan Dam without giving Congress an opportunity to pass on this matter.

I would like to call your attention to section 7, which appears at the bottom of page 11 of the bill. This section is a statement of policy which is intended to give to the free nations of the world assurance that the United States is ready to back them up in the future in their efforts to resist Communist aggression. At the same time it makes clear that such future assistance will be subject to action by the Congress in light of the situation existing at the time.

The Executive requested a more specific authorization to enter into future commitments, which the committee rejected. The language proposed by the Executive would have authorized the use of any nonmilitary funds appropriated for the mutual security program in the future to fulfill commitments previously made to foreign governments. This would have meant that in a case such as the Aswan Dam, our officials could enter into a commitment this year with Egypt but ask no money for such purpose. Next year, without asking for any specific authorization for the Aswan Dam, nonmilitary funds authorized for other purposes could be diverted to pay for such construction.

Although I opposed the authority which the Executive requested to enter into long range commitments, I am firmly convinced that it is essential to our own security that we give to other nations assurance that we are ready to back them up in the future. They are all glancing in our direction to see what our reaction to the Russian smiles is going to be. They are reluctant to continue to stand up against Communist pressure if there is any danger that our support will not be available to them in the future.

This statement of policy written into this bill by the Foreign Affairs Committee recognizes the realities of the situation which confronts us. The future of the foreign aid program is determined by the future danger to United States security. We are fooling ourselves and misleading our constituents if we say that this is the last year of foreign aid, or that we should limit ourselves to a 3-year or even a 5-year program. The fact is that we are going to try to counteract the thrusts of the Soviet leaders as the Communists pursue their objective of world domination. Since this in fact, we should go on record as to what our policy is so that other nations need have no doubt as to where we stand.

In urging the passage of this bill I freely admit that there are many uncertainties in the situation which confronts the United States today.

Let me say this in general about the bill which is before us. We are confronted with a choice between doing something to counter the new Communist strategy or doing nothing. We are not yet sure that we know exactly what to do next year or in the next several years. There is no escaping the fact that this is in certain respects an interim bill. As I have already pointed out, most of the money in this bill is going to support military programs of nations in Asia which are right up against the Communist guns. There is nothing new or uncertain or interim about what we are doing or what we should continue to do there.

Nevertheless, this bill does authorize a lot of money for carrying forward an effort that has not been fully mapped out. I have indicated that there are a number of situations in the world which make it clear that we should not continue to spend our money in the same old way or in the same old places as we have in the past. We believe that we have made cuts in this bill which will reduce the programs which should be curtailed. We believe that the materials in the pipeline, plus the new money authorized in this bill, will permit us to meet any new situation which may arise between now and next January.

The Foreign Affairs Committee cannot and, under the Constitution of the United States, should not attempt to invent a strategy for meeting the new Russian threat. That is the responsibility of the executive branch of the Government. It is something that cannot be done by legislation. We have had two basic jobs to do. First, we had to check very carefully what our foreign policymakers were planning to do next year to make sure that we were not voting money to carry on programs that have become out of date. We all know that there is a tendency for the bureaucratic wheels to continue grinding away in the same old manner as long as the funds are supplied to keep them going.

Second, we had to provide the executive with the authorization necessary to take the measures which are essential to continue our efforts to meet the Communist threat.

The bill before you, in my judgment, does both of these jobs.

It is no less true today, however, than it was when the Marshall plan began in April 1948, and in the year 1951 when the United States made its largest appropriation for foreign aid—over $7,900,000,000—that the biggest problem confronting the United States is the maintenance of our security in the face of Soviet aggression. This bill should be evaluated strictly in terms of its contribution to United States security. The test of this bill is what it does for the United States and not what it does for foreigners. It is good if it helps solve the problems which confront the United States. Whether or not it solves or fails to solve the problem or problems of any particular nation, or any particular area, is significant only to the extent that the solution of such problems is important to the security of the United States.

Some of our people have a tendency to lose sight of the fact that I have just mentioned. There are some who seem to forget which side is which. They apparently feel that if you do not like Nehru you should vote against this bill; if you disapprove of Nasser, vote against this bill; if you want to show some foreigner what you think of him, vote against this bill.

Let us, in our consideration of this bill, look at the problems with which it deals from the point of view of the security of the United States. I do not say that we will see all of them the same way, but I do say that we are not so likely to be carried away by our prejudices and emotions if all of us are careful to start from the same place.

I am afraid that many of our columnists and commentators fail to distinguish between what is wrong with the world and what is wrong with the mutual-security program. I recognize that there is something wrong in any part of the world that you look at.

That does not mean, though, that if we are dissatisfied with conditions in the world we ought to vote against this bill; that a vote for the bill means that we are voting approval of the situation in the world today. The reason we have a mutual-security program is that there are things wrong in the world.

Some of you probably are saying that I miss the point—that people are not opposed to the foreign-aid program because they are dissatisfied with conditions in the world today; they are opposed because they are dissatisfied with the progress that the United States is making in dealing with these unsatisfactory situations throughout the world.

Let us consider this argument a minute. How many of us are satisfied with the progress that is being made against cancer? I do not suppose any one can say that he is satisfied until a cure has been found. But I don't suppose that anyone argues that we should stop trying to find a cure just because we are dissatisfied with progress.

That is really the sort of choice that confronts this House today. It is whether we are going to try to oppose the Communists in their efforts to subjugate the world or not. Even if we are dissatisfied with progress, shall we keep a program going and try to make the necessary adjustments to meet the changing situation, or shall we abandon the whole effort?

Let me say just a word about this matter of making progress. Consider the argument that because we find something wrong in almost any part of the world that we look at, the mutual-security program has failed. It seems to me that this is about the same as arguing that after getting rid of the bears and mountain lions, your program against these maneaters is a failure because you are now having a lot of trouble with skunks.

The big danger that confronted the free nations of the world in the early 1950's was Soviet military attack. Many nations were so weak that all the Soviet forces had to do was march in. I do not believe that the Communist leaders believe that there are any pushovers in the world today. Our foreign aid program is largely responsible for that fact. It may be that the Soviet smile is a greater danger than the threat of armed invasion was. All I say is that our program did effectively meet the military threat to weak countries. It is not a failure just because today we are confronted with a different danger. Our problem is to equip ourselves to meet the new threat.

I am primarily for this bill because I believe it is necessary for the security of the United States. Admiral Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, made this statement to the committee:

> The military assistance program for fiscal year 1957 has been thoroughly coordinated with overall United States military planning and is approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.
>
> The program is designed to achieve the same objectives as our own military program and is an essential part of the defense of the United States and of the free world. In planning military programs of the United States, the existence and scope of the military assistance program is fully considered. There is no duplication. They supplement each other.
>
> Both are essential to our own national defense. By the cooperation of our allies, we obtain a far better defense at lower cost to ourselves than if we tried to do the job alone.

Secretary of States Dulles told us:

> The President, the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and I, myself, the Secretary of State, are all convinced that this expenditure is necessary for the security of the United States. The Mutual Security part of this program is a contribution to our security just as is our own defense establishment.

In the years since World War II, the period 1946 through fiscal 1956, the Congress has voted $345 billion for our Defense Establishment. During this same period we have appropriated $51,336,208,000 to provide assistance to other nations. Let me mention in passing that 82 percent of the foreign aid money last year was spent to purchase items in the United States so that there has been an important benefit to many of our industries as a result.

The House should not forget that a little over $11 billion worth of the products of our farms have been supplied to foreign countries since the war under the Mutual Security program and our earlier aid programs. If we include loan transactions and barter arrangements, the total exceeds $12 billion.

Let me get back to my point, however. It would have cost us a lot more than $345 billion for defense, and we would be a lot less secure than we are if we did not have our foreign bases, if we did not have access to the minerals of the Congo and Asia, and if the industrial potential of Western Europe was under Soviet control. It is possible that we could pull back to a defense of the Western Hemisphere, or even of the North American continent. I do not believe any qualified military strategist could advocate such a course. These are the alternatives that we might have to consider as a last resort. Surely we are not ready to quit trying to retain access to the resources of the free world. Surely we want the cooperation of other free nations in a common defense effort as long as we find nations who desire to cooperate with us.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that no one concentrate so hard on the shortcomings of this program or his initiation over instances of lack of appreciation and gratitude abroad, that he will fail to see how vital it is to our own security. Let us remember our strategic bases overseas, and that there are millions of people throughout the world who are on our side and who are dependent on our continued support.

Nothing has happened which could justify abandoning this program when we face the facts.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I wish the gentleman would stop addressing his remarks to that side of the aisle. You have converted over there. Here on this side of the aisle is where the conversion needs to take place and I wish the gentleman would turn this way.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that in his opinion if a nickel were not appropriated, there is enough in the bank now to run this program for 2 years?

Mr. RICHARDS. There is no question about that.

My friend here asked why I did not address my remarks to this side of the aisle. It happens to be that I am on this side. I happen to be a Democrat. I figure our Republican brethren will try to convert people in their own house. Sometimes people on that side do not like Democrats trying to convert them. I figure there will be a little missionary work done on that side. I do not know whether I am going to have trouble with my good friend, JOHN VORYS, over there today. He is a great fellow, he is a great friend of mine. I do not know whether he is going to stick by some of the doctrines he has been preaching to me for the last 3 or 4 years or not. I do not know. I do not know whether somebody has been blowing on his neck or not.

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

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

Mr. FULTON. May I congratulate the gentleman on his statement and say that I thoroughly join with him. I believe the cuts are necessary. When the Comptroller General of the United States says before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that he feels there are $400 million held by this agency illegally, and that there should be a resurvey, we in the Congress should listen. I believe the gentleman is right. I would like to point out further that these amendments are bipartisan amendments.

As a matter of fact, my amendment was a $1 billion cut, so it was a Republican amendment, and under the leadership of our good chairman was joined in on a bipartisan basis. We Members who have been working on this program are for it completely and we want to see it succeed, but we do not want to overspend. So, I believe the cut is necesary, and I want to join with the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman. That statement is correct. It was the gentleman's amendment. There were also some other amendments. Some wanted to cut military assistance more than $1 billion. The amendment to cut more than $1 billion originated on the Democratic side. The amendment of the gentleman which was finally adopted was an amendment to an amendment. Our acceptance of this amendment proposed by a Republican shows bipartisanship.

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

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

Mr. MASON. I think, sir, if some on this side are getting hot breaths on their necks, that you should give a little hot breath on their faces to kind of even up the thing.

Mr. RICHARDS. I hope you will help me out.

Mr. MASON. And I would welcome that.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Prior to this time I did not know the prowess of the gentleman as an evangelist. He certainly has converted me, and I am glad to join with him in cutting the spending under this bill.

Mr. RICHARDS. I want to say that anybody who converts the gentleman against his will has great evangelical power.

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

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

Mr. NICHOLSON. I want to say to the gentleman that there are a lot of us over here that do not need to be converted. There are a lot of us who have voted against these foreign aid things for the last 8 years on this side of the House when perhaps we did not have anybody from your side associate themselves with us. I do not know the reason.

Mr. RICHARDS. Oh, we had plenty of gentlemen on this side just like yourself who are honestly opposed to it. It was not all on one side.

Mr. NICHOLSON. There were only 12 of us the first time. It has gradually gotten better, and I certainly hope we have arrived at the time now when we can spend money for our own defense without taking care of these foreigners.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman says there were only 12. Remember, there were only 12 disciples, but they succeeded in preaching their doctrine all right. Do not forget that.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. I want to congratulate the gentleman and the committee upon this reduction. Last year I was opposed to the committee 100 percent. On the program this year I am only opposed to it three-quarters of 100 percent. I agree on the 25 percent.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is heartening.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take up any more of your time. There will be plenty of time to discuss the different aspects of the bill as we go along, and there are other Members who want to speak. But, in closing I want to say I would not have anyone misinterpret what I have said, particularly my good friend from Massachusetts. I have not weakened in any way my original opinion that this program is part of the security program of the United States. Each of us has an obligation to his people and the committees of this House have an obligation to this House. The Committee on Foreign Affairs held long hearings on this bill. We held session on 31 days and heard 74 witnesses.

The various amounts involved were carefully considered and thoroughly debated. The figure for military aid was reached after voting on several amendments which proposed different amounts.

I do not see how the Committee could fulfill its obligation to the House if it did not support the authorizations which are contained in the bill as reported.

I have great respect for the President of the United States and for the objectives of his foreign policy. He has too many duties and responsibilities, however, to know all about the bookkeeping which the Pentagon does.

The program which was submitted to the committee was the result of work begun by the executive department more than a year ago, before many of the developments which disturb us today occurred. I do not believe the program was adjusted by the Executive to reflect the new situation, and I do not believe the President is familiar enough with the details of the program to be aware of its shortcomings. He has to rely on the recommendations of his subordinates.

The committee discovered some of the weaknesses in the program, and we have made adjustments to correct them.

I believe that it is absolutely essential that we go ahead with this program and we will need the money which the bill authorizes if we are to do so.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the last year of the mutual security program. This bill contains a provision which gives formal recognition to the realities of the situation. Section 7, beginning on page 11, contains a statement of purpose which makes clear to other nations which today are wondering whether we may be relaxing a little as a result of the Russian smiles that it is the intention of the United States to continue this program as long as international communism is a menace to free government and free people. It states that it will continue to be our policy to help those nations abroad that need help, that request it and can effectively use it, as long as it does not endanger the financial integrity of the United States. It makes no specific commitment to anyone. It would be unwise to promise any other nation anywhere, any amount, for any specific project for the years ahead. The Congress has an obligation to review the situation each year and to make the necessary adjustments. As soon as it is safe for us to do so, we should stop the whole thing.

Let me repeat, however, that I believe, from the bottom of my heart, that a reasonable program, including this cut of $1,109,000,000 is as essential as any part of our defense program. It will do more than an equal amount of dollars added to our own defense program to combat the wave of international communism that is sweeping some areas of the world with such force that people fear that they will be unable to stand up against it.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersay.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to my friend from South Carolina that in 1950, when we had before this House a bill to provide Mr. Tito's government in Yugoslavia with some $38 million, it was argued by those in charge of the bill that Mr. Tito's break with the Kremlin was incurable. I argued otherwise. We know now that that break was not incurable.

I rise to ask the gentleman how much money there is in this bill now before us for Mr. Tito's government in Yugoslavia.

Mr. RICHARDS. There was a certain amount of military money proposed for Yugoslavia in the bill, but the figure is classified. The economic aid to Europe goes to only two countries, as I have said; a small amount to Spain and some to Yugoslavia. There was $30 million of economic aid requested for Yugoslavia. The committee cut out half of that—$15 million. $15 million remains in the bill for Yugoslavia.

Mr. CANFIELD. Would the gentleman be good enough to tell us how much money the American Congress has appropriated for economic and military aid to the government of Yugoslavia?

Mr. RICHARDS. I have not those exact figures at hand. I could get those figures but the figures for military aid is classified.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RICHARDS. Perhaps the gentleman from Wisconsin has those figures. The gentleman from New Jersey is talking about aid going all the way back to the beginning of the program?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes.

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I might say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] that in the appendix of the minority views the gentleman will find a tabulation showing the money that we have spent on the program since its beginning.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am told that the figure runs close to $1 billion.

Mr. RICHARDS. I have not the figure here going all the way back to the beginning, but I remember that it is a large amount. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that it has been a mistake to give assistance to Yugoslavia, even if Yugoslavia is a neutral and remains a neutral. The money was well spent, if in case of war Yugoslavia merely tells the Russians it insists on maintaining its neutrality.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I should like to refer for just a minute to page 17 of the bill. Is it proposed to pay the costs of health and accident insurance for foreign participants in any exchange-of-persons program? Is that something new?

Mr. RICHARDS. This is new. It applies only to the few foreign students and leaders who come to this country at our expense. These people do not have money to finance a trip to this country and when they get sick or have an accident here it creates a very serious problem.

Mr. GROSS. This reads as follows:

> United States Government agencies are authorized to pay the costs of health and accident insurance for foreign participants.

Does that mean individuals?

Mr. RICHARDS. That means individuals who participate in this program.

Mr. GROSS. Then that does mean foreign nationals who participate in this program?

Mr. RICHARDS. Foreign nationals who are engaged in this program, if you pay them out of American funds.

Mr. GROSS. So that we are going to pick up the bill for health and accident insurance costs for foreigners?

Mr. RICHARDS. Only those who come here at our expense, because we believe that the reports they will give to the folks back home justify the cost to us.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I do not want to leave the opinion with the Members of this House that there is only $15 million in this bill for Yugoslavia. Will the gentleman agree that there is an undistributed amount?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Will the gentleman also agree that there is another secret amount?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes; this military fund I just mentioned is classified.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. It is classified?

Mr. RICHARDS. The committee did not want to classify any of these figures, but the Defense Department classified them, just as the executive department classifies the Defense bill figures. I do say there is only $15 million economic aid for Yugoslavia. The gentlewoman is right; there is military aid in addition.

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

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Is this report antedated then? On page 3 of the committee report it is noted that there is $30 million in the bill for Yugoslavia. Is that correct?

Mr. RICHARDS. The table on page 3 shows the amount requested by the Executive, which was $30 million. The committee cut this to $15 million.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Going back to the Yugoslav question, the question the gentleman from New Jersey raised about the amount in this bill, $15 million, is it not a fact there is likewise in the pipelines considerable for Mr. Tito?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes. I believe that there is a lot in the pipeline. There is $3 billion-plus in the military pipeline for Europe and Mr. Tito is included in that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should like to express my very deep regret that the gentleman is leaving the Congress of the United States. He has been an extremely able and extremely courageous Member. I am very sorry that being in the minority I could not serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee under the leadership of the able chairman. I worked with the gentleman for years. I greatly admire his integrity, his fairness, his kindliness, and his great love of America. He will be terribly missed.

Mr. RICHARDS. I deeply appreciate the gentlewoman's kind remarks.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TUMULTY. Do I correctly understand the gentleman to say that it is the opinion of the administration that Yugoslavia is still neutral? How close to communism do you get and still retain neutrality?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not think it is a partisan matter for one of the leaders of the world today to visit Russia. The Soviet leaders came to Tito and apologized and begged his pardon. He did not go to them.

Mr. TUMULTY. Does that make any difference to us if he goes against us?

Mr. RICHARDS. I believe in a conflict with Russia Yugoslavia would be neutral. That is my personal opinion for what it is worth.

Mr. TUMULTY. If you are going to buy somebody, does not the gentleman think they ought to stay bought?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not think you can buy anybody's neutrality.

Mr. TUMULTY. Then it is foolish to try. Yet that is what we have been doing.

Mr. RICHARDS. The question is whether or not it is good for the United States. The military people think it is.

Mr. TUMULTY. Do you think, under the circumstances, when Tito visited Moscow and where he said that the Kremlin and Tito will never be divided again, that we should continue to supply money to a Communist who has said that he will never be divided from our enemy?

Mr. RICHARDS. Well, if Mr. Tito were over here—and he may come—I would expect that he would say that the United States and Yugoslavia would not be divided again for that matter. It is not a question of what Mr. Tito wants. It is a question of what the military people say it would be worth to us for him and his divisions to stay neutral.

Mr. TUMULTY. I am not concerned now with what the military people said. I want to know what you believe and not what the military believe. I want to know what you think—whether you think that money should be extended to a Communist who has gone to our enemy and said that he will not be divided from them again. Should any money go to Yugoslavia under those circumstances, sir?

Mr. RICHARDS. There is $15 million of economic aid in this bill for Tito's Government. I would not have voted for it if I had not thought it is wise. I may be wrong. I have no affection for Mr. Tito. I think it is a good investment and that we are justified in taking the chance.

Mr. TUMULTY. That is the same thing we have been doing for the past 10 years. Tito declared war on us the day he became a Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I join in the applause that took place just now on the termination of the speech of our beloved chairman, Mr. RICHARDS. I call him Chief. I want to say to the Chief, "You have made a great speech. I disagree with parts of it, but I agree with roughly 85 percent of it." He said something about somebody breathing down my neck to change my views on what the military amount in this bill ought to be. I would like to remind my beloved chairman that I tried to breathe down the necks of the committee to make a cut of a half billion dollars in this program, and while I am willing to be convinced, to date I have not changed my mind on the amount this bill can stand.

This is a $3½ billion bill. Our chairman wanted a $1 billion cut. I wanted a half billion dollars cut. That is $500 million between us, about 15 percent of the bill. I figure he is 85 percent right on this bill—and he has to concede, I think, before I am through, that I am at least 15 percent right.

He quoted the criticism made by the Comptroller General of the administration and accounting of the military funds in this bill. It is certainly true that we ran into a hassle last year when the Committee on Appropriations cut out nearly $600 million from this bill, not because the program was unjustified but because of the method of accounting in the Department of Defense. Since the program was not criticised, that put a $600 million dent in the pipeline supplies that must go forward on long leadtime in order to keep this mutual-security program current. The Comptroller General referred to $400 million that had been retained in violation of law prior to June 30, 1954. Administrative actions in the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense have more than offset any such amounts erroneously certified prior to June 30, 1954. Defense has corrected criticisms which he made. I understand the allegations as to the $400 million are not yet supported by documentary evidence furnished the Department of Defense.

After the speech that has been made, and in view of those that will be made, I simply want to make a few general observations about this legislation, then run over parts of it, and then answer questions if I have time.

I want to remind the committe that this is a package bill. It is not just one proposition. It is 19 different programs involving 54 countries, 36 of them with military programs. It includes in the 19 programs 4 connected with the United Nations Organization nations, which may affect 78 nations.

It has to do with the military support in other allied countries of 200 divisions: The United States has 20.

Two thousand Naval craft: That is more vessels than are in the United States Navy.

Three hundred air squadrons: That is about the same number of squadrons that we have in the United States Air Force.

As to the economics of this bill on the military side which is part and parcel, says Admiral Radford, of our own defense; it costs the United States $6,600 a year to maintain an American soldier abroad without a gun in his hands, that is, his maintenance without any arms. This bill will cost us $789 to maintain one of our allied soldiers for a year with a weapon in his hands, at the place where our Joint Chiefs say it is vital to our own security as well as the security of the country he serves. So that when you figure the cost of an American soldier abroad and of helping to support a foreign soldier allied with our own mutual defense, you can see that there is economy in this plan, as was pointed out by Admiral Radford.

I want to point out also that this is a policy bill. It does not appropriate a dime. All we do in this bill, as far as amounts are concerned, is to place limits on the amounts we are later going to let ourselves appropriate. When it comes to appropriations, we can second guess. We do it all the time with our deficiency bills and supplemental bills, but we do not do that ordinarily on legislation. So that it is important at the policy level, which is involved in this bill, that we do not tie our hands too tightly, that we give the Committee on Appropriations a chance to review this program.

This bill deals with foreign aid in terms of American security. I received a letter about this bill, which referred to this year's "donations abroad." The Governor of Utah is conducting a revolt against paying taxes for what he calls these give-away programs.

I want to say, on the constitutional question involved, that in my opinion the Congress has no constitutional right to give away the taxpayers' money to foreigners. Every dime of this program is to promote our own security, our own welfare, or it is not justified at all. I think that since that is the situation, we make a mistake to make anyone, in this country or abroad, think it is mere generosity, bighearted charity. It makes the foreigners suspicious and it makes our own people mad. Both of them say "What right has Congress to be charitable with other people's money," when we are not being charitable. We are promoting our security and our own welfare. It is all for our own selfish interest. Generous, enlightened, farsighted self interest, sometimes failing of its objective, but the purpose is the security and welfare of the United States of America.

Since it is not charity, we cannot expect much gratitude. We cannot buy friends and we cannot buy subservience, but we can arrange things so that other nations find it worth their while to stay in the free world and defend themselves and develop themselves, not because they love us, but because our mutual security is good for them, as well as for us. We help countries in war, hot or cold, because they can resist more effectively. We help them in peace, because developed countries make better customers.

Now, how are we doing? I have heard some woeful wails, and we will hear some more about how everything we are doing is such a failure.

We are told that the Communists are outsmarting us everywhere. If they are so smart what do they think of what we are doing on the military front? They think we are doing so well with mutual security that they have not started a war for 6 years. They think that NATO is so good that their whole European policy is aimed at breaking up NATO. If NATO were the feeble instrument that has been suggested by some Americans, we would not find the Kremlin aiming its diplomacy at breaking up NATO.

On the nonmilitary front the Communists think we are doing so well that they have started to imitate our programs of economic aid and technical assistance. As Secretary Dulles says, if imitation is the sincerest flattery we should be flattered with what they are doing.

Their new look creates new problems for us, but it creates a lot of new ones for them, too.

Now a few moments of time to review the program. First I want to pay my tribute to John B. Hollister, the Director of the ICA, a former Member of this House, former law partner of Bob Taft, longtime friend and associate of Herbert Hoover, Executitve Director of the

Hoover Commission, level-headed, fearless, with vision and commonsense. I saw him in action in five countries in the past year, observing the programs and the reaction of the people in the countries involved in our programs, hearing the problems of his field force, and hearing him explain to them the policies that are developed in Washington.

On the military side of this program I want to pay my tribute to one who is the head of it, who has been in the business of mutual security for some time and had considerable experience. He has had the experience of waiting abroad for promised supplies from the United States to come to NATO. He is a man named Eisenhower, formerly General Eisenhower, now President Eisenhower. He was the head of SHAPE. He was, as we call it, in MAAG, himself, part of a military-assistance advisory group. He understands this program and its worldwide significance in extraordinary detail and is deeply interested.

I have seen the work of these people, the MAAG's, and the ICA people, in 25 countries in the last few years. Of course, there are misfits, but for the most part they are devoted Americans, trying their best, working hard.

As for the program, let us look at the bottom of it first. Let us look at page 22 of the bill and page 52 of the report, and talk about the last item "Foreign research reactor projects," $5,950,000. This is a dramatic, imaginative atoms-for-peace program which challenges the interests of the whole world. The only nation in the world that has dropped an atom bomb in wartime leads the world in establishing a program of atoms for peace. We are going to contribute up to $350,000 each for these reactors, and they are to be labeled as coming from the United States. Each one is to have a 9-pound core of uranium that costs $60,000. This is leased, not given, to other countries. The uranium core is of nonweapon character. The power generated will equal that required to run 2 electric ironers or 1 electric stove. The core can be reprocessed every 2 or 3 years. Therefore, this hunk of uranium will last somewhere between 200 and 300 years. That is one of the important imaginative items in the bill that may not have attracted your attention in this bill.

In the latter part of the bill you will find an item for ocean freight for voluntary relief. There is $1,400,000 to ship voluntary relief packages abroad that last year totaled $28 million. There is $14 million for shipping abroad agricultural surpluses. There is $10 million for the children's fund. Then there is economic aid.

Of the $3,563,475,000 total, $1,550,700,000 is for furnishing military weapons, equipment, and training; $2,012,775,000 is for other purposes. This year, economic aid for direct forces support in the amount of $374,300,000 was carried in the general military assistance request of $2,925,000,000. Even though this request has been cut to $1,925,000,000 in section 2 of the bill, I understand that the Executive is not planning to cut the spending for direct forces support, which is economic aid—food, clothing, gasoline, and so forth, for the support of troops.

Thus the authorizations for economic aid in the bill are as follows:

[In millions]

Direct forces support	$374.3
Defense support	1,147.7
Development assistance	243.0
Technical cooperation	157.5
Other programs	90.3
Total (rounded)	2,012.8

The first two items are for support of military effort. Every item is designed to promote our own security. Most of the money authorized, however, is for economic aid, not weapons and training. The amount for guaranties is increased $400 million in the bill, but is a contingent item and therefore is not shown as an increased authorization in the totals. If we add this amount to the authorizations available for economic aid under this bill, the total would be $2,412.8 million for economic aid compared to $1,550.7 million for strictly military aid.

This bill involves a considerable reappraisal of the executive requests for economic aid, especially as to long-term aid to underdeveloped countries.

There is no termination date in the mutual-security law and therefore, any amendment expressed in terms of years would be shorter in duration, technically speaking, than the law it amended. We also realize that no Congress can pass a law its successor cannot amend or repeal.

Therefore the committee adopted a carefully worded statement of policy—see section 7 of the bill—of continuing aid to free nations as long as the danger to the peace of the world and our own security persists, and then rearranged and combined the various programs of development assistance.

Assistance for economic development of their resources has been furnished to many countries in the past, including countries carrying on military programs as part of their defense support—see title I. This can be done under the present bill. In recent years, however, the words "development assistance" have come to have a special meaning: substantial economic aid in addition to technical assistance in countries which do not have military programs in the common defense. This applies especially to underdeveloped countries.

This year a number of separate programs of this character were requested. The requests were for $370 million, as follows:

President's Asian fund	$100,000,000
Title II—Development assistance:	
Near East and Africa	63,000,000
Asia	80,000,000
Latin America	27,000,000
Total, title II	170,000,000
Middle East	100,000,000
Development assistance request	370,000,000

We put the request for Latin America in title I—Defense support, as being more appropriate for neighbors who are joined together in treaties for defense against communism, even though they may not be carrying on joint military programs. We increased this amount by $5 million. This left $370 million in the development assistance category, as follows:

Development assistance request	$370,000,000
Deduct Latin America (transferred)	27,000,000
Development assistance request	343,000,000

We reduced this total request by $100 million and, in section 4 of the bill, authorized $243 million to remain available until June 30, 1960, for economic development in free Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. We did not divide the amount among these regions, but not more than 25 percent is to go to any one nation. All of it is to be in loans or surplus agricultural commodities, except for regional projects involving two or more nations. We wish to encourage regional projects, but, although the present law requires preference for such programs in the Asian fund, we learned—hearings, page 453—that only one-third of the $66.6 million programed is for regional projects.

The present law provides in three places that the program shall emphasize loans rather than grants, wherever possible. The efforts this year have been disappointing, to quote Mr. Hollister, Director of ICA—hearings, page 49—probably about the same as last year's $209 million.

The requirements of the development-assistance section should improve this record.

The Soviets furnish all of their economic aid, except for technical assistance, in the form of loans or barter deals. There is little or nothing in the record to show that we need to make outright grants to compete with them in neutral underdeveloped countries.

There is a popular misconception, stimulated by banking minds and by giveaway enthusiasts, that aid loans amount to grants, are never paid, and create hard feelings.

The record is otherwise. For instance, we received last year $502 million in principal and $273 million in interest on foreign-aid loans made since World War II, according to the Department of Commerce. About one-fifth of our postwar aid of $53 billion has been in credits. Under the mutual-security program and its predecessors 50 loans to 23 countries, totaling about $1,868,000,000, have been made. This year $15,126,672 is being paid on principal and $37,651,945 in interest on these loans.

We are becoming a have-not country in essential raw materials. Any long-term development plans for other countries should include long-term repayments which can be made in raw materials we will need increasingly. This bill stresses this policy.

This bill—section 6 (k)—provides authority to guarantee $400 million in private investments by an amendment I offered, in addition to the estimated $100 million which will be issued by June 30. A fractional reserve is set up, in line with insurance practice instead of a 100-

percent reserve. In addition to insuring convertibility of currencies, and against expropriation or confiscation, coverage may include losses caused by war, revolution, and insurrection.

Up to date we have had no losses on investment guaranties, and the reserve is maintained by issuance of notes which do not require appropriations. Over $293 million in applications are now pending. We charge a fee for guaranties. Our whole foreign-aid program is to assure that we will not have a war, and that we will end up with a peaceful free world where people respect private property and pay their debts. If we can secure private investment in underdeveloped countries by charging a fee to protect the investor against the risks we have spent billions to prevent, we can cut the amount of Government-aid programs.

Up to date Government officials and bureaucrats here and abroad, and also businessmen here and abroad, when given the choice of grants, loans, or guaranties in foreign-aid programs, have usually chosen grants. In this case, flexibility has been expensive. When the choice has been loans or nothing, they choose loans. As grant money has been reduced, interest in guaranties has increased. By tightening up on grants, but opening up on loans and guaranties, for economic development, we hope to encourage a long-term policy that will involve private investment costing our Government nothing, or loans, where we are repaid. That is the capitalistic system that developed our country and most of the free world. We believe it is better than the Communist system, and will prove itself in competition.

Last, a few words as to the military program. Strictly speaking, $1,550,000,000 of the present bill is for military purposes. There are fixed charges of $378 million to come out of that amount. That leaves only about $1,172,000,000 to spread around.

The European military program is $760 million. Even if this were reduced, look at the other areas.

The Asian program alone, where we have Korea, Formosa, Vietnam, Pakistan and other countries, amounts to $1,168,000,000. Can we cut those countries? The Middle East—Greece, Turkey and the northern tier of nations—calls for $471 million. Can we cut these countries? Then there is $530 million requested for advanced weapons. This is vitally important. Do we cut this out?

When you try to cut all this a billion dollars, I think you are cutting too much.

As has been said, we recently passed a defense appropriation bill providing $36 billion by a vote of 377 to nothing. We passed a military construction bill for over $2 billion, including $780 million for overseas bases, by a vote of 377 to 3. Many people do not think we have enough money in our own military program. We recently passed the defense production bill, continuing priorities, by a voice vote. No one wanted even to challenge the vote. But, when we come to this, which Admiral Radford says is "an essential part of our own defense," being "part and parcel of our own defense," we cut off 33⅓ percent, or if you want to include only military weapons and training, we cut it 40 percent. I say that is too big a cut, and those that are interested in the defense of their country, who voted unanimously or nearly so, for these other items for our own defense, should not cut so deeply this item which is for our own defense.

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I listened very carefully to the gentleman's statement, and I think the gentleman has made a very fine statement. But certain questions were directed at the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], in respect to this Yugoslav question. I notice the gentleman passed that over. I wonder if the gentleman is in a position, after his White House briefing, to state the administration's position on this aid to Communist Tito.

Mr. VORYS. I understand that the administration's view is that it would not be wise to eliminate all aid to Yugoslavia.

Mr. BOGGS. Is that the administration view, after the meeting of Tito and Bulganin and Khrushchev on this weekend?

Mr. VORYS. I am just going to give you my own theory about Yugoslavia. Here is the point. When Tito is recognized as an independent Communist, that sets a pattern that must soon be followed in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria, because you cannot continue to have satellite Communist states and independent Communist states very long. So, the problem is, should Tito become the head of a satellite state or should he remain, as he claims he is going to be, even while he is being wined and dined in Moscow, head an independent state? If we have independent Communist states among the satellites we start to break down the monolithic Soviet system. That is worth thinking about before we determine to eliminate aid to Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I asked the gentleman to yield in order that I may pursue my questioning of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. Did I understand the gentleman from Ohio to say that it is the administration's position that the administration approves of continued aid to Communist Tito?

Mr. VORYS. I said that I understood the administration's view to be that they would not favor a further cut in the amount for Yugoslavia.

Mr. BOGGS. Then, one other question and I shall not bother the gentleman any further. It was my understanding that the gentleman contends, even after the recent meeting, that Tito is independent of Moscow. Is that correct?

Mr. VORYS. I cannot tell what the gentleman's understanding of what I said is, but I stated my own views a minute ago just as well as I could.

Mr. BOGGS. May I ask the gentleman one further question? Was this matter specifically discussed at the briefing this morning?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I am attempting to be courteous to the gentleman——

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman can be whichever way he wants although he is always courteous——

Mr. VORYS. I am attempting to be courteous to the gentleman but also to refrain from discussing what was said at the White House. I did not intend and do not intend to discuss what the President said or anybody else said at that meeting.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is perfectly in order at this point that the American people know the position of the administration on this issue which is now before the House. That is why I asked the questions. For my own part I am opposed to aid to communism of any brand. I will support the amendment to be offered to strike aid to Tito.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TUMULTY. I was wondering if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] who has just been addressing himself to the queries of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] would not answer this question. How does he explain the administration's position in continuing aid to Yugoslavia, a potential enemy, a probable enemy and refusing military aid, as the report says on page 9 thereof, to a friend—Israel?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I should like to point out to my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] that I do not know what was said at the White House this morning, but there is considerable on the ticker about what the President said at his press conference, and if the gentleman is too busy to go out and read it, I think he might have it brought in to him. It is about Yugoslavia and I think it might be very enlightening.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, the legislation we have before us has a long history. It began as the Marshall plan in 1948, when the Russian Communists threatened to take over all of Europe after we had withdrawn all but a handful of our Armed Forces from the European theater. At that time President Truman warned Congress of the grave danger of another world war unless the Communist aggressors were stopped. Consequently the Marshall plan began as a program to stop Communist aggression and to preserve democracy, free institutions, and civilization as we know it.

Each year since 1948 Congress has had before it a major piece of legislation authorizing foreign aid assistance and foreign military assistance. During that time the management of the program has changed names several times and

today it is administered by the International Cooperation Administration. Members of the House are quick to recognize that the authorizing legislation before us is among the most complex ever to confront the Congress.

During these years I have strongly supported foreign aid programs and foreign military assistance programs because I felt they were necessary to the security of the American people. I have on several occasions in past years directed attention to what I considered to be phases of this law completely inconsistent with the original purposes of the original plan, to wit: The strengthening of the security of the United States and other free people. I refer specifically to the tragic misuse of American public funds to support the Communist dictator Tito, and to strengthen his hold over the good people of Yugoslavia.

I believe it is timely that we ask ourselves how far away from its original purposes has the foreign aid program slipped since 1948. I think it is imperative that we know whether the United States public funds put in to our foreign aid and foreign military assistance programs are intended to defeat communism or whether there is some new objective which has crept into the program of which the American people have not yet been informed. I raise these questions because of the following reasons:

First. The legislation now before us contains several authorizing provisions for continuing assistance to Communist dictator Tito of Yugoslavia. According to unofficial information which I have received, there is $50 million plus buried in this bill for the tyrant Tito. While the information made available to Congress only lists $15 million as going to Tito, I am reliably informed that another $35 million for Tito is hidden in this legislation and kept from Members of Congress and the American public by virtue of a completely unjustified claim that it is necessary to keep such information classified.

Second. One of our sister republics right here in the Western Hemisphere, Guatemala, occupied for almost 10 years by the conspiracy of communism, less than 2 short years ago tore loose the tentacles of communism through a genuine revolution led by a group of national patriots. When the revolutionary leaders marched on the capital city of Guatemala, the Communist occupiers fled, but before they did they looted the national treasury and left this little country very deeply in debt. The victory of individual liberty and human decency over the conspiracy of communism in that Central American republic gave great hope to the friends of freedom everywhere in the world. At the time of the revolution many authorities stated that the defeat of communism in Guatemala was a major stroke in turning back the tidal wave of Russian communism. Yet this sister republic has had a tremendous struggle on its hands during these past 2 years to build a solid, stable, and free economy and to make possible a fuller life for the people of Guatemala than they have had under Communist tyranny. It is strange to me that the technicians in the Department of State regard the cause of Guatemala as relatively unimportant to the ultimate defeat of communism because they recommended to Congress that United States assistance to this country be limited to $5 million. The House Foreign Affairs Committee increased that sum by another $5 million, but it is apparent to me that we are being penny-wise and pound-foolish in our efforts to help the democratic leaders of Guatemala build a solid and free economy for their people. The funds now contained in this bill fall short, in my judgment, of what is needed to help Guatemala speed up its recovery from the occupation, exploitation, and looting by the Communists who are now thrown out of this country.

Third. This legislation also contains authority for the United States escapee program to continue the misuse of United States public funds in the Far East. I refer to the use of the American taxpayers money to pay the ocean transportation through Hong Kong of so-called White Russians now living in Red China to various countries of the free world. I appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee and there presented to it irrefutable evidence to the fact that contrary to the requirements of the law, there is no security investigation whatever made on these White Russians before they leave Red China because no security investigation is possible on the mainland of China. Even the International Cooperation Administration admitted this to be the fact in a written report to the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Moreover, the vast majority of these so-called White Russians are traveling on valid passports issued by the Kremlin—a fact which is indeed startling because only the trusted friends and agents of the Kremlin are ever given such passports. In addition, these so-called White Russians have no difficulty whatever securing an exit permit from the Chinese Communists in order to leave the Chinese mainland, but it is amazing that our own American civilian and military personnel imprisoned and detained there find it impossible to leave because they cannot obtain an exit permit and most of those Americans who have received such permits have paid exorbitant ransom fees for them. These incredible circumstances are climaxed by the hard, cold facts that at least one top espionage agent of the Kremlin who posed as one of the so-called White Russions in order to get into a Latin American Republic has been uncovered, apprehended, and deported from that country. This so-called White Russian was, in fact, the Russian security agent in the Polish Communist Embassy in Peking.

I find myself at a distinct disadvantage in discussing the bill before us and I am sure my feeling is shared by many of my colleagues. This results from the fact that the veil of secrecy has been placed over so much of the information as to how the funds we are asked to authorize will be used, the amounts that are to be received by each country, and the specific purposes and uses each country shall make of these funds. As Members of Congress, all of us are faced with the necessity of going before our constituents this fall to give an accounting of the manner in which we have discharged our responsibilities. One of the greatest responsibilities shared by every Member of Congress is the study of, the debate, and action on the foreign-aid legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that so much vital information in regard to this bill is being withheld from Congress by the Departments of State and Defense under the pretext of security, that it is virtually impossible for all individual Members to properly discharge the high responsibility with which our constituents have entrusted us.

It is apparent that certain reasonable restrictions must be placed on information to be given out publicly on vital military matters, but I fail to see why, Mr. Chairman, the shield of secrecy should now be employed to cover not only the so-called defense support program, but even the development assistance program as well. I would like to know why the Congress of the United States is not entitled to know how much each of the various countries is to receive in defense support and the purposes for which the money is to be spent. I should also like to know why Congress should not be informed as to how much economic aid is proposed for Guatemala or Israel and the Arab countries of the Middle East. Finally I see a grave danger in using the cloak of secrecy to withhold from the American people knowledge of the amount of their money that is proposed for Yugoslavia for military assistance or any other purpose. Surely there is no Member of this House who doubts for a single moment that the Russians will be informed down to the last plane, tank, rifle, or pencil as to every dollar Communist dictator Tito receives from the United States and for what it will be spent. Moreover, I believe it is childish for us to assume that the recipient countries under this proposed legislation do not already know the exact amount of money for whatever purpose which is included for every other one of the recipient countries.

There can be no question of the need for exacting security measures to be applied to projects carried out here in the United States such as the former Manhattan project and the need for keeping secret the development of certain programs in foreign countries which have a bearing upon the security of the free world. However, the maintenance of secrecy on such matters has nothing whatever to do with keeping from the American people knowledge of how much of their money is to be spent in each foreign country. Khrushchev and Bulganin know how much Tito will try to milk the American taxpayers for this year, but the poor American taxpayer is not permitted to know how big a bite Tito is going to be permitted to take out of our public funds this year.

I am sure that every Member of this House is aware of the love feast now taking place in Moscow between the Communist dictator Tito and the Kremlin leaders. Only last Monday dictator Tito, according to the daily press, stated

in Moscow that never again would there be any separation of Yugoslavia from the Communist camp of nations. Yesterday Tito said that Moscow was the city of his first love and that he was most enthused to be back again in the center of world conspiracy where he had spent so many years in the past preparing for his role as Russian proconsul over the good people of Yugoslavia.

This is an appropriate time to recall that just a year ago Khrushchev and Bulganin visited Tito in Belgrade following which there is reason to believe that several secret understandings were entered into between Tito and the crowd in the Kremlin. One of those evil understandings has been made current by a United Nations report made public yesterday which points up the likelihood that all Titoists who sought refuge in Yugoslavia shortly after the Cominform stated that Yugoslavia had been expelled from its ranks, would be forcibly repatriated. Last year I had the privilege of appearing before the distinguished members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, at which time I drew attention to this secret agreement between Tito and the Kremlin crowd as an indication of the unreliability and treacherous character of the dictator Tito. It is important that we Members of Congress keep in mind that Tito, who some people claim to be a friend of the United States and an enemy of Communist aggression, is about to hand over to the crushing caress of the Russian bear all those who took asylum in Yugoslavia and who opposed the Russian autocrats.

It is also important to recall that during the time of the Khrushchev-Bulganin visit to Belgrade last spring, the joint communique, joined in by Tito and the Russians, contained, among other statements, these two anti-American proposals:

First. That Red China be admitted to the United Nations;

Second. That the use of nuclear weapons be outlawed and permanently barred—under the infamous Russian formula.

The Russian formula, of course, authorized the Russians to go ahead full speed with their program of creating an atomic stockpile and a huge airport to deliver the A- and H-bombs on the people of the United States and all other free people, while the United States is required to destroy its stockpile of defensive power. It will be interesting to see what Tito and the crowd in the Kremlin call for in their communique that will conclude the renewed oath of allegiance that Tito has taken to the banner of the international Communist conspiracy. Of one thing we can be certain, that communique will call for action calculated to weaken the cause of human freedom and individual liberty while advancing the Russian dream of world empire.

But some good is bound to come out of Tito's oath of renewed allegiance to world communism. I am hopeful, now that the true character and intentions of the dictator Tito are clear to the world, that all the talk and nonsense about Titoism as a third force has been laid to rest. It now should be clear beyond any reasonable doubt that it is impossible to be a Communist and at the same time a national patriot and that all Communists owe their final allegiance to a small band of tyrants in the Moscow Kremlin. If we can learn the lesson of not falling into another very obvious Russian trap such as that posed by Tito, then it can be said that some good came out of Tito's return to his beloved Moscow.

I hope and pray that the illusion that Tito, while a Communist, is a different kind of Communist, which has engulfed so much of our officialdom, has finally come to an end. This illusion has caused untold damage to the cause of human freedom. This illusion has permitted the Russian agent Tito to send his deputies throughout all of the free world, and to plant the evil seeds of Communist propaganda and espionage. This illusion caused our Department of State to maneuver our proven allies, Turkey and Greece, into an unnatural alliance with a trojan horse of the Kremlin. This illusion has, in fact, given birth to the equally false notion that communism and human freedom can coexist and that through a process of political evolution, a new civilization will eventually take root on this earth. The illusion of Tito as a friend of human freedom and an enemy of the Russian despots is as false as the new theory of political evolution which presupposes that by some accident of nature, evil can be mixed with decency and that the future civilization it heralds can be at the same time both good and evil. I trust that the misguided advocates of this unworkable concept of political evolution will have learned, through their experience with Tito, that it is impossible to mix fire and water.

Two years ago I offered an amendment to the Mutual Security Act which read as follows:

Provided, That no part of these funds shall be used for or on behalf of Yugoslavia.

The obvious purpose of this amendment was to prevent the dictator Tito from using United States public funds to assist the international Communist conspiracy. I regret to say that amendment was rejected. Last year I was informed in advance of debate on the bill that there was very little likelihood that if I offered a similar amendment it would have any chance of adoption. This was due to the persistance of the illusion on Tito which has so misguided many of our decisions in the past. Consequently I offered an amendment which provided that no funds would be given to Tito unless and until members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee made a complete on-the-spot investigation in Yugoslavia of the end use of our funds and equipment theretofore given to Tito by the United States Government and that a favorable report thereon was submitted to the Congress. The wording of that amendment was and I quote:

No loan or assistance shall be made or given to Yugoslavia under this act, until the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives completes an on-the-spot investigation of all the military installations, depots, roads, and railroads in Yugoslavia, and certifies to the Clerk of the House that continued assistance to Yugoslavia is in the security interest of the United States.

This amendment was defeated. However, I then introduced a second amendment which made it mandatory on all recipient governments to grant to the United States the right of complete inspection of the end use of all grants and assistance. This amendment was adopted and incorporated into the act.

Tomorrow at the appropriate time, I intend to submit an amendment to the foreign aid bill, the object of which is to deny to Tito any aid whatever. I feel this amendment merits the support of every Member of this House and I ask my colleagues to give careful thought to it between now and the time it comes up tomorrow.

Our feeling with respect to the cause of Guatemala is, of course, directly opposite to that which I have expressed on Tito. Guatemala has demonstrated its allegiance to the cause which the United States has been called to lead throughout the world. Guatemala has thrown out the Russian "stooges" who only a short 2 years ago held control over the government. The Government of Guatemala today is struggling to overcome the blows to its national life struck by the Communists, and to bring about a prosperous, free-enterprise government. In my judgment Guatemala presents a splendid opportunity for us to demonstrate that life is better and more full when it is free and under a representative form of government than it ever can be under a Communist dictatorship.

Throughout Latin America the agents of the Kremlin are working unceasingly in an effort to undermine representative government and to bring about chaos and class conflict. This conspiratorial movement was given a setback when the Communists were thrown out of Guatemala because there is abundant evidence to demonstrate that Guatemala, before delivering itself of occupation, was a center of Communist intrigue and espionage throughout all of Latin America. But the Communists now consider their setback in Guatemala to be only a temporary one. At a Marxist meeting in New York City on April 13 of this year the principal speaker, touching on events throughout the world of importance to Marxists, stressed the fact that Guatemala was a focal point and at the same time deplored the temporary setback to Marxism in Guatemala. The former Communist president of Guatemala is now living behind the Iron Curtain in Prague, Czechoslovakia. It is a known fact that the Communists are preparing an effort to reoccupy Guatemala.

In face of this great opportunity which I believe we have to exploit freedom's victory in Guatemala, it appears as though we are not aware of this opportunity or that we are unwilling to cause a rapid economic advance in this recently emancipated country. I believe that the democratic leaders of Guatemala will put to maximum use for the cause of human freedom and decency and against the conspiracy of communism every single dollar authorized for Guatemala in this legislation. It is also my understanding that an amendment will be offered from the floor tomorrow increasing the grant to Guatemala. I intend to

support that amendment and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

I refer back to my earlier statement on the misuse of funds through the United States escapee program for so-called White Russians residing in Red China who are attempting to infiltrate the free world through the crown colony of Hong Kong. Last year I spent 8 weeks in the Far East on an official inspection trip for the House Committee on the Judiciary. In that capacity I uncovered the misuse of United States public funds authorized under the legislation now before us and reported this violation of law to the House Judiciary Committee. I called for an immediate correction of this disregard for both the letter and the spirit of the law. I also appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee to present all the evidence available to me on this subject. For all those who would be interested in the details of this violation of law, I invite attention to page 925 of the committee hearings on the Mutual Security Act of 1956.

I am advised that the only way to prevent the further use of United States public funds to pay the transportation costs from Red China to countries of the free world of any more Communist espionage agents is by amending the law to expressly prohibit the use of United States public funds for that purpose. Therefore I will offer an amendment tomorrow to close up this dangerous breach in the security of the free world.

It is shocking to me to find that funds authorized by Congress to defeat the Communist conspiracy are, in fact, being used to open the doors for a wave of Russian espionage and propaganda agents to invade some 30 countries of the free world. Under the cover of what appears to be humanitarian action, a grave blow has been struck at the very foundation of the free world. I urge you, my colleagues, to look into this matter so that you can raise questions with me tomorrow in order that this scandalous matter can be given a full public airing and stopped forthwith.

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

M. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. May I congratulate the gentleman on his statement and inquire if his amendment will cut out current deliveries? Over the past years I have tried time after time to prevent the shipment of United States jet airplanes to Tito.

Mr. FEIGHAN. The amendment which I propose to offer will stop forthwith any delivery, that in the pipeline as well as what might be provided otherwise under the bill.

Mr. FULTON. I will be glad to support the gentleman's effort.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. With respect to Guatemala, does the gentleman know that I offered an amendment in the committee to increase defense support or economic development aid to Guatemala by $5 million, and that it carried?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes; and I heartily support the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I, too, support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO].

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the question of what shall be our national policy with respect to foreign aid is again before Congress for consideration and decision.

The principal issues to be decided are as to the amount that should be appropriated and how long the extending of aid should continue. With each succeeding year there is more and more controversy as to how much, and, for how long, are we to continue to pay out large sums as aid to our allies throughout the world. The decision of these two questions should be based on how great is the necessity for a continuation of such aid.

Following the end of World War II, there was almost general approval of a policy of giving aid to our allies who had been so terribly distressed by the war. There was little doubt in the mind of anyone following the conclusion of World War II that a great need existed to rehabilitate and strengthen the war-torn countries of Europe. Their industries and their homes had been in large measure destroyed. Accordingly, the so-called Marshall plan was adopted. It was adopted, however, with the thought that it was to be temporary only. There was no intention that it should become permanent or even long extended. However, it seems that year after year reasons, both new and old, have been given, or, necessities shown that have caused a continuation of appropriations to be made. Thus, from the day that the Marshall plan was adopted, we have continued to extend aid, but, in a constantly reducing amount. However, notwithstanding, the reductions that have been made in the appropriations during the intervening years, the amount is still great.

It cannot be denied that there is a constantly growing thought that the time has come when there should be a substantial reduction. It does seem that a giveaway program, whether it be for domestic or foreign uses, is hard to discontinue.

Those who are of this opinion point to the fact that the Allies for whom we inaugurated the policy have been substantially, and, in most cases, fully rehabilitated. This may be true, generally speaking, with reference to industrial rehabilitation. It is gratifying to realize that such is the case, and, that our financial aid has really brought beneficial results.

It should also be kept in mind that the cause for all this aid is not alone to rebuild the industrial economy of the distressed nations, but, also to stave off and prevent communism from moving in and taking over these distressed nations and their peoples as a result of their distress. In this objective, I am glad to say, we have been as successful as we also have been in improving the economic stability of the European nations.

Now, it seems that the military necessities of not only European nations, but, also of Asia are being pressed as the reason to continue, or, to extend the area, in which financial aid is to be given by us. In this connection, it is to be noted that in many parts of Asia, as well as in the island nations contiguous thereto, there is also a growing demand for industrial and economic aid, and not military aid alone. Again the reason is advanced that such economical, as well as military aid, is necessary if we are to stop the growth and influence of communism in that part of the world. And, so it seems to go on and on.

Unpleasant though it may be for our people to be called upon to make these contributions, yet, we have done so with the feeling that we are thereby doing our part to prevent another war. The destruction of material things, and, above all, the tremendous loss of life, that would result from another world war, is beyond our power to estimate in this day of highly perfected weapons of war. To contrast the cost of war, on the scale it would have to be fought, with what we are spending in foreign aid to build a more peaceful world and to strengthen those whom we would expect to have as allies in case of war, is relatively small in the latter case, although we cannot help but feel that our financial sacrifice is great.

Although the cause of peace and foreign aid have a close relationship to one another, and, although we acknowledge an obligation to improve and strengthen our allies, yet, we cannot be entirely unmindful of the needs that are so pressing in our own land, and, that because of our generosity to others, are not being met as fully as we would like. We need hospitals, nursing homes, facilities to improve the welfare of our handicapped persons, both mental and physical, and, our aged. These are but a few of the needs that are apparent in our land. Too often we find that our world obligations are curtailing or preventing the fulfillment of our domestic obligations. It is conditions such as these that make it imperative for us to give close and careful consideration to maintaining a proper balance between our foreign and our own domestic obligations.

Our Nation cannot be accused of being stingy in foreign aid. During the 10 years that have intervened since the conclusion of World War II we have contributed more than $50 billion. As I have already said, this has produced some gratifying results, but, now that there has been such a substantial economic recovery and military strength regained by our allies, it seems that the time has come when he should make a careful reexamination as to what further commitments should be made for foreign aid. Certainly, there is no need, in my opinion, for an increase in appropriations for this purpose, nor, any justification for legislation that would provide a

future 10-year program of foreign aid. We should go carefully, making certain that aid should not be extended one year longer than is absolutely necessary, nor, for any amount greater than is necessary.

Last March the Congress was asked to appropriate $4,900,000,000 for foreign aid. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs has reported this bill with $1,109,000,000 cut from the sum requested. I am in accord with the action of the committee. I believe it is fully justified. As a matter of fact, in my opinion, the cutback could have been larger as all of the appropriations for the preceding 2 years have not as yet been expended in full. The committee has also shown good judgment in refusing to commit our Nation to a future 10-year program.

I have always supported the foreign-aid program under previous administrations, as well as this present administration. I do so now, but, I am convinced the time has come when there can be some reduction, and, I hope the time is not far distant when the necessity to continue making such appropriations at all will disappear.

Of course, whatever our policy it must of necessity give full consideration to the aims and purposes of the Soviet Union in world affairs. If Russia continues to think and plan from the standpoint of world domination, then, we must act accordingly and do all that is necessary in the matter of financial aid to make certain of our own security and the peace of the world. And, it is hoped that all the aid we extend will be helpful in maintaining our own security.

If we could only be assured and feel safe in accepting what seems to be a new Russian policy as 100 percent sincere, it would make possible a much larger reduction in the appropriation for foreign aid than the $1,109,000,000 now contemplated. In view of our long experience in broken promises by Russia, we cannot take too much for granted. Certain it is that we, as a peace-loving nation, will be glad to find that Russia is really sincere this time, as it would mean not only an increased peace of mind for everyone, but also a decreased need for large appropriations for armaments at home and aid abroad. The coming of such a day cannot be too soon for me, and, I know I speak the mind of all our people in this respect.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD], ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of H. R. 11356 to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954. These are difficult times for the American people, for the Congress, and for the executive branch—when international affairs are viewed against the permanent peace and security yet to be attained. Events move swiftly but the usual Soviet tactics continue, sometimes in this direction and sometimes in that direction, but always taking advantage of the developments in world affairs. I feel it is particularly important at this very time for the United States to be steadfast in its continuation of the mutual security program.

Let us remember the deteriorating situation and almost chaotic conditions which existed in the world at the end of World War II. Communism was running rampant, subversion was the order of the day, government treasuries were empty; many people were ill-fed, ill-clad, and psychologically ripe for conversion to Communist doctrine. Today, through the mutual security program and its predecessor programs, the economy of Europe has been substantially restored, Communist subversion has been minimized, and Soviet armed power is confronted with the deterrent power of NATO. Deterrent power, however, must not only be continued but must be increasingly strengthened in every possible way because the dangers which we face from Communist imperialism continue as before.

I know that there are some who are disillusioned with the mutual security program. In support of their disillusionment they cite the insecurity which still exists and the continuing threat from the Soviets. But I want to point out this fundamental principle which they overlook. No program of foreign aid or mutual security can, in itself, wipe out the danger confronting the free world. What it can accomplish, however, is to prevent the danger from coming to life and by making it clear to the Kremlin leaders that the cost to them of aggression would be too great for them to bear. This, I feel, the military part of our mutual security program has accomplished and is accomplishing today. It is for that reason that I opposed in committee the cut of $1 billion in military aid which the White House and the Pentagon say is essential to the security of the United States. Funds for military assistance in the mutual security bill are in reality for our own defense. I think this is an essential fact which cannot be too strenuously emphasized. I feel that the cut of $1 billion was a grave mistake. The cut of $1 billion in military funds is cutting the very heart of our military effort and to that extent will diminish the deterring effect of our program. This is the very time, when despite the diminishing efforts of other countries, our own efforts must, if anything, be increased so as to give the world leadership and reassurance. I hope that at least a substantial portion of the cut will be restored when this bill finally reaches the President's desk for his approval. However, I want to point out that I voted for a $500 million cut.

I likewise feel that the nonmilitary aspects of the mutual-security program are vital to the security of the United States. While these programs do not involve guns and ammunition, they involve fulfilling to some extent the basic needs of people and to fight not a military fight but a human fight against hunger, poverty, disease, and illiteracy.

I am pleased to note that the committee voted $5 million in additional funds for defense support in Latin America, which amount is to be added to the amount requested for Guatemala by the executive branch. Guatemala stands in the unique position of being the only country in the history of the world which has been able to throw off the yoke of Communist tyranny. This country is a vital and much needed anti-Communist bastion in an area which is definitely linked to the security of the United States and the whole Western Hemisphere. Certainly, defense support assistance to Latin America to help nations maintain internal defense and economic and political stability is vital to our own peace and security and deserves the support of all of us.

Because the mutual-security program is so important, and because its policies and objectives are so vital to our own security, it is essential that they be constantly reappraised and, wherever possible, improved. That is why I proposed in committee an amendment to the bill including a provision which would give congressional sanction to the creation by the President of a Commission on Mutual Security. I do not look upon such a Commission as an abdication of congressional responsibility and control. It is the responsibility of the Congress, and particularly of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to study and evaluate on its own the effectiveness of existing programs. But I do feel that such a Commission as proposed by the President, particularly if it is made up of individuals of high caliber and unquestioned qualifications, could do much to assist not only the Executive in the formulation of foreign policy, but also the Congress in making the implementation of that policy possible.

There are still many world problems left unsolved. The world still faces in the Soviet menace the greatest danger it has ever confronted. But the main reason we are now at peace is because of the deterrent effect of the mutual-security program against Soviet aggression. Without such a program, without the United States assuming the responsibilities of leadership, and without the moral impulse behind our efforts, we would be faced not only with a grave danger but with chaos. The mutual-security program has thus far been successful. Just because of the Soviet's blandishments that they want peace is no reason we should cripple or abandon the program at this crucial time.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield me a minute?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask for this opportunity to make an inquiry of the ranking minority member of this committee. Many people have been of the impression that when foreign aid was allocated to certain foreign governments the money actually went to those governments and was spent there. Would the gentleman from Ohio comment on that?

Mr. VORYS. Some people have the idea that we ship dollars all over the world. As a matter of fact, the dollars stay here. In the 1955 program, 82 percent of the commodities purchased were bought right here in the United States; that is 82 cents out of every dollar was spent in the United States.

As to offshore production where we purchased equipment overseas, and salaries paid our overseas people, of course, the dollars are of no value until they are finally spent in the United States. That is why people in other countries want dollars. But the idea that the dollars themselves are shipped around the world is a mistake. At least 82 percent of them stay right here and the rest of the money comes home soon after.

Mr. SCHENCK. As I understand the comment of our colleague from Ohio it is that the money allocated in this bill is actually to be spent in this country and produce employment business and industry in this country.

Mr. VORYS. It goes to American industry, business, and agriculture. For instance, here are examples of ICF purchases in Dayton, Ohio, in the gentleman's district, that I have learned about since the gentleman spoke to me on this matter earlier today:

Dayton Rubber Co	$900,000
Master's International, Inc	60,000
Globe Tool Co	73,000
International Clay Machinery Co	180,000
Garrison Machine Co	16,000

This does not include subcontracts, or purchases made through exporters. The following companies produce under defense contracts—I understand that part of their output goes to this military defense assistance program—National Cash Register Co., Dayton Rubber Co., International Tool Co., Chrysler Corp., Standard Register, Globe Industries, General Motors, United Aircraft Products.

Mr. SCHENCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, before addressing myself to the bill under consideration, I want to pay tribute to our distinguished and beloved chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. This is the last large bill to be piloted through the House by Mr. RICHARDS. For myself this is an occasion of personal regret. In the 16 years we have served together in the House and on the Committee on Foreign Affairs I have enjoyed his friendship, his warm personality and wise counsel. We are a committee of 32 members, rugged individualists, each with firm ideas and strong opinions. But under Mr. RICHARD'S leadership we have moved forward as a group and emerged from sharp debate without any ill-feeling on the part of the members. He has the unusual and happy faculty of keeping all of us in the best of humor during long and tedious sessions. More than that, he abounds in commonsense and good judgment. These are qualities that everyone of us appreciates and all of us will miss. I wish him and his dear wife only the happiest days.

From this side of the House we have heard the clear analytical speech of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. With his usual zeal and diligence he has plunged into the details of this bill. I know of no other Member who has the capacity to analyze elaborate statistics and to derive from them a better understanding of the ramifications of this program. On the basis of his detailed analysis, he is able to put into succinct and colorful language the essence of each part of the bill, and thereby make it more intelligible for us to follow. He has been the real workhorse of the committee on this bill.

This bill that we are considering today authorizes the appropriation of $3,563,475,000 to carry forward the mutual security program. This is $1.1 billion less than the Executive request. I was 1 of the 11 members of the committee who voted against the drastic cut on the basis that it was far too severe and that careful enough analysis of all the factors involved had not been made. Anyone who has watched the development and spread of communistic power since 1917 and even before as I have done, cannot but recognize this last change of tactic as just another and exceedingly dangerous approach to the goal from which they have never swerved—that of complete control of the world. It would be folly for the free world to relax its vigil. It would be disastrous to lessen our military strength. That strength does not emanate from the United States alone. It is a combination of strengths of all the nations of the free world. To the end that we may continue building security for freedom, we are here today to consider H. R. 11356.

I shall not repeat the many points made by those who have spoken before me.

Mr. Chairman, as in other years we begin by emphasizing the controversial parts of this legislation. We should place great emphasis upon the things we do to help countries wanting to uphold freedom—but we should not fail to paint the picture of those things we are doing that are unbelievably good and constructively successful.

I do want to emphasize two areas, the Near East and Africa, which are important to the West, and I use the word synonymously with "the free world." In these African areas we have airbases and listening posts. Any slackening of our determination to hold these for the west would be suicidal. In addition, I must repeat what you have often heard—the importance of the areas of the Near East, from Turkey down, the great bridge between the East and the West. I must remind you that the Communist leapfrog tactic, going on at the same time that they were changing the external look of their method into one of greater friendliness, is a most dangerous one. It is my earnest hope that nothing will be cut out of this bill that could make for strengthening of this area.

It is my intention to discuss other parts of H. R. 11356—parts which have to do with development assistance, technical assistance and some of our activities within the United Nations. The development-assistance program has as its purpose to help meet economic crises which are considered a threat to the United States and to the interest of the free world. These build those greater values and uphold those ideals that the people of the world seek—the nonmilitary aspects of living which are necessary if supplies and commodities and funds are to be available in these freedom-loving countries.

To me it is more than just serious that the cut included one of $100 million in the development-assistance program. That money is intended to serve as a catalytic agent to strengthen the desire and the capacity in the countries of the Near East and southern Asia that they may stand firmly against Soviet penetration. The rather small sums that we are giving them provide the incentive for them to use far larger amounts of their own money to make the effort that will assure a more orderly development of their economy and so of their strength. It is in keeping with the traditional and historic method of the United States in the world.

The committee gave especially serious study to the portion of the bill having to do with technical assistance and made no cut. If one considers the far-reaching implications one cannot but feel that technical assistance programs are perhaps the greatest achievement of the world today—the greatest contributions we can make to our civilization. The sharing of our trained technical know-how with other countries of the world which have not been able to develop their national and human resources to the extent that they are in a position to meet the national need of their people, the provision of trained peoples of other countries in leadership capacity and preparation to return to their own country to assume roles of leadership in the years to come perhaps will be the greatest contributions of this small program. While it accomplishes this, it is building understanding between the United States and freedom-loving nations that have dared to share in such programs. Technical assistance programs are helping to meet the aspirations of the people, not by costly and ill-conceived ventures, but by small, sound demonstrations and the exchange of information.

Because I spent more than 3 months in Africa and the Near East, I shall confine myself to putting before you the results of my own experiences in a number of individual countries. I can assure you it was good to see our people working side by side with natives in the different countries, teaching them simple techniques to improve their agriculture, to raise their health standards, and to provide elementary education.

Few Americans understand how down to earth our technical assistance programs are. The ordinary transient who visits the capital cities has no opportunity to observe the diversity of our activities and no occasion to understand the appreciation with which our efforts are met. Let me illustrate my point by reference to our programs in a few countries in a part of the world with which I am familiar.

Egypt is essentially a country of desert. More than 90 percent of its 22 million inhabitants are concentrated in the narrow valley of the Nile River. In order to provide for its increasing population, the Egyptian Government is reclaiming sandy areas as water becomes available, determined to become a more

than one-crop country. Her uses of the new acreage are going into general food supplies to feed her own people.

In the western desert the Government of Egypt has set aside a 25,000-acre area that will serve as a pilot project in desert range development. Already forage production on parts of the area has been increased as much as tenfold. Fencing, reseeding, water-spreading and other soil and water conservation practices have been used to accomplish this. To complete the project, sound methods of grazing must be adopted and demonstrated and improved animal handling and breeding practices introduced. Like many other governments of underdeveloped countries, Egypt has undertaken extensive agricultural extension service. Already 510 Egyptian extension workers are on the job. It is expected that this number will shortly be raised to 1,000. Extension projects have been started in 3 of the 15 Provinces. The purpose is to show the actual operations of all phases of a planned extension program.

Training schools have been set up on the national and the provincial levels. Underground water development and drainage improvements are an important part of Egypt's soil reclamation program. Drainage studies are in progress in a pilot area of 43,000 acres. Crop improvement is being studied through field and laboratory research with a view to finding efficient varieties of the various crops commonly grown in Egypt. One of the most important developments to date in this field has been the introduction of hybrid maize.

The United States is contributing to the health activities of the Institute of Public Health in Egypt. Our work there is essentially of a technical character, providing assistance in the training of personnel and the operation of equipment. In talking with individuals who are working in this field I was told that already there are plans to reduce our personnel as trained Egyptian personnel take over. In the field of education the training of teachers for rural elementary schools has been made possible by our assistance. This project embraces all phases of elementary education, including health education, the preparation and utilization of visual aids, and the planning of buildings and facilities. United States technicians are helping to develop a pattern of general education on the junior-high-school level and, with the assistance of the Ministry of Education, are developing plans for training centers for secondary schools teaching homemaking, agriculture, and industry.

In Ethiopia our program has been established principally around the fields of general education and agricultural education. During my visit to Ethiopia last fall, I visited a number of the projects in the field of agriculture. I came away with a feeling that our work there was based upon sound principles that contributed to the economic development of the country. Ethiopia is one country in which we have a number of small projects in the field of agriculture, but all of them are coordinated toward the development of its agricultural base. The agricultural college and extension service have benefited from the technical-assistance advice which we have given. A countrywide system of agricultural extension and agricultural experimental stations has been started. To meet the perennial problem of locust control, a special pest-control unit has been set up in the Ministry of Agriculture. Demonstration work with farmers in one of the areas near Addis Ababa is devoted to the improvement of livestock breeding and marketing of cattle. Ethiopian coffee has been increasing in popularity in the last few years. Our contribution has been to improve the methods of producing, processing, and marketing this important item. In one of the Provinces of Ethiopia an urban health center has been established to serve as a demonstration of a modern public-health department. Included in this project is the construction of a health-center building, the provision of technicians, and the training of Ethiopian nationals to staff the unit. Perhaps one of the most thrilling sights is to see the contribution which we have made in the field of education in Ethiopia. Technical assistance is being provided to the Ministry of Education for the development of a modern educational program and a school system adapted to the needs of Ethiopia. Education technicians are now working in several activities, including visual aids, school publications, and curriculum development. Teacher education is being provided for a very modest amount. Next year we are planning to spend $15,000 for the establishment of a training school in the capital. Ethiopians, like many other peoples in Africa, have an unusual talent for handicraft work. Unfortunately, the products have a limited market. Through our technical-assistance program we are training Ethiopians to make their products adaptable to foreign markets. A vocational trade school and a nurses' training school are two other projects in which the United States is playing an important part. As is so frequently the case, the success or failure of the program depends upon the quality of personnel. I am aware that last fall and running on into this year there were certain personnel problems that slowed up our technical-assistance programs in Ethiopia. Mr. Hollister's alert office in Washington, aware of this situation, has taken steps, through the transfer of various individuals, to make it possible for our program to operate more smoothly.

United States technical cooperation program in Israel is designed to promote maximum utilization of Israel's total resources through the improvement of its technology principally in management of industry, minerals development, irrigation, and transportation.

I wish you could have been with me in Israel. I wish you could have gone with me to the many installations where the Hadassahs work. There was a wonderful school where boys in their early teens were learning how to make precision instruments and at the same time learning how to be foremen. There was a little 14-year-old boy who was teaching two 13-year-old boys how to make a precision instrument, and it was one of the most exciting things I have ever seen; he was so proud.

Then there is another school where men who had finished their army service and were learning how to make equally important but a little cruder machinery. This particular project has help from our point 4 program.

One need only move around Israel to see the importance of our contribution to that country's growth. Our technicians are helping Israel in a wide variety of fields of activity. Up to the present the greatest emphasis has been on agriculture, with considerable progress made in plant breeding, animal husbandry, soil conservation, water spreading, and irrigation. Emphasis is now being shifted to industry where contributions have already been made in the textile industry, chemical and fertilizer production, glass and ceramics manufacture, and metalworking. For the next year our programs of assistance will be in the development of managerial skills, the technology of industrial engineering and industrial design. Assistance will be continued in mining and public administration, and on a slightly decreased scale in such other fields as public health and sanitation, education, transportation, and community development.

Liberia is the only independent nation in West Africa. The United States played a leading role in its formation. Peoples south of the Sahara are now seeking to achieve the political status now over 100 years old in Liberia. Everywhere they are on the move, politically and economically. The effect of our technical cooperation programs in Liberia is certain to have a profound influence on the opinions of the United States held by large populations of native peoples in Africa.

The prime objective of our aid is to help Liberians locate and recognize the potential wealth of their country and to assist them in learning ways of doing things to develop their resources more fully. The country is rich in agricultural, mineral, and forest resources. With technical guidance the Liberians will be able to gain income from these resources with which to help themselves, to support and improve education, health, and other public-service programs essential to their continued growth.

Until our program was inaugurated, Liberia was deficient in many of the essential phases of government administration and organization by which its programs could be effectively administered. A department of agriculture has been built up and a basic staff trained in the rudiments of operating an extension service and a central experiment station. A successful demonstration of swamp-rice production has shown the way to high rice yields on former unused land. The first step in developing plans for the utilization of its potential forest resources was the development of a bureau of forest and conservation. A highway department has been established and most of the basic staff trained. Within the last few years the discovery of large iron deposits in the interior of the country has increased the interest of private investors in Liberia. The exploitation of these resources requires the progressive development of a trained labor force as well as

the training of professional people. Through contracts with American universities initiated under our aid program, professional and technical services are being developed to provide the requisite training.

The program in Iraq conforms more nearly to what a technical assistance program should be. This situation arises from the fact that the Government of Iraq has adequate revenues of its own in the form of oil royalties. During the current year, for example, it will have at its disposal about $140 million, which is almost exactly the equivalent of the rest of the Government's regular budget. The big need of Iraq is the services of competent technicians to assist in implementing its development program. For that reason the United States has eliminated practically all equipment, including demonstration equipment, and has concentrated its small budget of about $2 million in supplying technicians and providing training assistance for Iraqis to go to the United States. United States personnel is assisting in organizing and staffing the newly established agricultural college. They are serving in advisory and policymaking positions to the irrigation directorate. They are providing guidance and program direction in agriculture extension and in the use of agricultural machinery. To meet the pressing transportation needs of the country American personnel are establishing a modern bureau of roads. Practically the entire field of public health is being developed under United States guidance and according to United States standards. Iraq is one of the few countries in the Near East capable of absorbing more people on the land. One of the factors delaying the settlement on public lands is the lack of administrative talent in providing developed land sites for the people. With the assistance of American technicians, extensive plans are under consideration for the implementation of a countrywide program that will provide for the settlement on these lands. Iraq's problem is not one of money, as I have indicated earlier. Rather, it is the wise use of this money that has troubled the Iraqi Government. The Iraq Development Board, which is an overall planning organization controlling the economic development of the country, draws heavily upon American technicians both at the executive and advisory levels to give guidance in its expenditures for development purposes.

In presenting in some detail the programs in each of these five countries I have tried to show the variety of projects in which our Government is engaged. Naturally there are some real problems which we face. Frequently the local governments desire to progress more rapidly than is physically possible and are disappointed if results are not forthcoming promptly. They tend to place too great emphasis on physical construction and not enough emphasis on human values. There is, too, a lack of appreciation of the necessity for adequate preparation and coordination. In other cases, a shortage of appropriately educated personnel who can be given further specialized training by our technicians is an obstacle to progress. We are, for example, constantly scraping the bottom of the personnel barrel in engineering, agriculture, public health, and many other areas. It is difficult to find appropriate counterparts as there is too great a demand for their services everywhere. There is also too great a tendency to rely on foreign technicians. Finally, rather frequent political changes have impeded the orderly progress and operation of the programs.

Most of these problems are basically the kind of problems we like to have. They are growing pain problems—problems arising from a rapidly developing economy. They are problems of guidance and coordination in making a moving economy proceed in a balanced manner. These are much easier to deal with than the problems of stagnation, depression, and inertia. While it is easy to criticize many features of these programs, the basic fact remains that from the total point of view the elements of strength far outweigh the demerits.

All of the programs which I have described heretofore are bilateral programs, that is, between our Government and the local government. This bill carries a small authorization of $15,500,000 for United States contributions to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance. Judging from the inquiries which I have received there is some confusion in the public mind that this sum represents a reduction from the amount which the Congress voted last year. I would like to clear up any confusion on this point. The United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance operates on a calendar year basis. Last year the Congress voted $24 million to cover the United States contribution for 18 months, that is to say, for the period running through December 1956. Of that amount $8,500,000 was pledged for the last half of the calendar year 1955 and $15,500,000 has been pledged for calendar year 1956. The amount requested in this bill, therefore, is identical with that pledged for the current calendar year. The Congress has stipulated that United States pledges for this program can be made only on the basis of funds appropriated. This coming October there will be a meeting of the United Nations Technical Assistance organization to lay the plans for its program for calendar year 1957. In order that the United States may make a pledge at that time it is necessary that we authorize the sum in this bill. The committee's comments on its reasons for recommending this program will be found in the committee report. Because they succinctly express our views I should like to quote them:

> United States leadership in the United Nations is strengthened by our continued strong support of this program. The substantial contributions made by this Government have been interpreted by other countries of the free world as evidence of our good faith in desiring to promote the economic development and well-being of underdeveloped countries. Indication of the appeal of the program is the Soviet "about-face" toward it. For several years the program was denounced as a tool of "United States imperialism." Since 1954 the Soviet has pledged 4 million rubles, equivalent to $1 million. Similarly the satellites have made pledges. The committee was informed by the Hon. Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, that "No payment would be made to Soviet bloc experts from the United States contribution to the United Nations technical assistance program." (Hearings, p. 483.)
>
> In the light of this participation, it is more important than ever that the United States continue its support.

One other portion of our mutual security program that shows the concern of the United States for the human element is our continued support of the United Nations Children's Fund. This marks the 10th anniversary of the Fund. Originally established as an emergency operation to help meet the conditions of hunger and want among children in Europe following World War II, the Fund has expanded its interests and resources in recent years to assist the less advanced countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America in the development of permanent child health and welfare services, and in the control and eradication of debilitating diseases.

An estimated two-thirds of the world's estimated 9 million children still live in areas where malnutrition and disease and outmoded maternal and child health practices threaten to deprive them of an opportunity to develop into healthy self-supporting adults. From a global, long-range standpoint, raising the children of today to be productive and good citizens of tomorrow is a most important consideration in our total effort to achieve worldwide peace and economic stability.

The underdeveloped countries lack the financial means to cope with the vast problem of restoring and improving the health of children. Outside assistance is sorely needed. The Children's Fund has been the focal point through which international aid for children has been provided. It is in our Government's interest to continue its support of the Children's Fund, both for humanitarian reasons and for the abundant good will which the United States has gained through its participation in the program.

Prior to this year, the Soviet Union remained completely aloof from the program. In recognition of the good that has accrued to countries aided by the Fund, the Soviet Union last summer announced a pledge of 2 million rubles, the equivalent of $500,000 to the calendar year 1955 program of the Fund. Now that the Soviet Union has come into the program, it would be unfortunate if the United States allowed its position of leadership to weaken.

Mr. Chairman, there is little in this bill that is new. In one form or another most of it has been before us for a number of years, though there is some shift in emphasis. The course of international events has necessitated other adjustments. But the basic philosophy has remained consistent through the years.

No one who supports this measure will represent it as a cure-all for the world's ills. But it is a constructive program responsive to the challenges we face today.

I have spoken of the necessity for the large military funds, and of my op-

position to so drastic a cut in our national security. But it is equally important for our national interest that we not pin all our security to armaments. Men live by faith more than by guns. It is our responsibility as a world leader to offer constructive alternatives. This is the purpose of the nonmilitary funds in this bill. Some critics of this program say callously that we are trying to buy friends. I reject this suggestion. We are offering to those who are free and want to remain free some hope that freedom has advantages infinitely greater than subservience and slavery.

This bill provides modest amounts, not to buy freedom, but to build freedom. In the process of building there will be trials and errors; mistakes that all of us deplore. But we must never lose sight of our goal.

I sincerely trust that this House will see fit to restore a large part of the cut, and will pass the legislation with few changes.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from Ohio yield?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentlewoman has made a brilliant analysis of an area with which she is familiar. I should like to ask this question. Through her own studies and travels in the Near East and Africa, she has made many of us feel that the great continent of Africa is the new frontier, culturally, economically, and perhaps militarily. Would that be an accurate statement?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. The gentleman expresses it exceedingly well. To my mind, Africa is the great new frontier. She is becoming a tremendous force in the world. Do not forget that she has all the raw materials that we need so desperately.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. May I congratulate the lady on her excellent statement and say that she is awakening America as well as Africa to the prospects of this great new continent.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I thank my colleague from Pittsburgh very sincerely.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, approval of the bill before us will launch an international race in competitive economic aid. The dangers that lurk in such a program must be obvious to all. It could bankrupt the economy of our country and with it demoralize existing economies abroad.

Communist aggression is chiefly political and it is time that the makers of foreign policy understand that fact of life. Yet we seem to be at a loss to meet that issue. On the other hand, the Communists know where they are going. Their economic policies are always slanted toward the political and therein lies their strength. Conversely it is our weakness.

The Soviet theme or propaganda line alleges that the West or the free world is imperialistic; that the Western Powers are determined to insure policies favorable to a continuance of colonialism. Colonialism is feared by all Asians as we must know. It is true that they are not yet afraid of Communist imperialism but they still remember the British, French, and Dutch who at one time were their absentee rulers and with whom we are now allied.

They know or should that the historic policy of the United States is opposed to colonialism but nevertheless they make the charge on the basis of guilt by association. In short the argument goes: All capitalist nations are imperialist—therefore the conclusion that we are imperialist. This is utterly false; but millions of Asians and north Africans believe it.

Soviet propaganda presents a positive picture of world policy and offers economic aid within a wide ideological framework. It broadcasts daily that it stands for a world without domination by any one nation over another. It blatantly states that all peoples under the Communist banner will cooperate in creating a peaceful brotherly international order based on Socialist and Communist principles. All this, they say, will certainly raise the living standards of people everywhere.

Mr. Chairman, if we are so foolish as to enter into a competitive economic aid race with the Communists, we will come out second best. We know that they can offer a sales program that promises the moon or everything that the peoples of Asia desire. They continue a constant harangue to the effect that capitalism is bound to fail and that communism offers the only real program for survival and a better way of life. In short their approach is not based upon the principle of fear but upon the principle that communism is bound to succeed.

Our approach, on the other hand, Mr. Chairman, is negative. It is based on fear and it is defensive. We in the United States by our advocacy of the legislation before us, state unequivocally that this program of necessity involves our own security and that we must give assistance to the underdeveloped areas in order to keep them out of the Communist orbit. This is purely a self-interest approach and I believe is self-defeating. Why should other nations be asked to assist us in the matter of our own security?

I would call attention, Mr. Chairman, to a phase of the legislation before us which I think is fatal to the establishment of sound relationships with other nations in the world. We should know that the people of Europe and Asia too do not want war. Yet the emphasis in this bill is primarily upon the military or military assistance to support it. We are blind if we fail to recognize at this time that other nations will not fight to preserve our national security. "Neutralism" is on the march among our friends in Europe and Asia. There is some doubt at this time that they will fight at all, even though they are associated with us in military alliance.

One writer recently made a pertinent observation on this very point, and I quote:

> In all this welter of western insistence upon self-interest and self-defense, one looks in vain for any consistent exposition of a positive policy of foreign aid, for some general political philosophy to match Communist confidence in world brotherhood based upon Socialist production, some framework of solidarity between givers and takers of aid, some aspect of common concern beyond the narrow limits of common fear.

We need not necessarily agree completely with that statement but we must admit it contains some thoughts that should have the attention of the free world. I repeat that our only policies today are based on fear and that is a completely negative concept.

Mr. Chairman, for 12 consecutive years now, the Congress has considered foreign-aid authorizations and appropriations. This program was initiated at the close of World War II and except for a few changes in terminology, its purpose and objectives are the same.

In this long period of time the people of the United States have assumed the burden of foreign aid hardly without complaint yet with highly questionable results. Communism marches on and is expanding its perimeter not by war but by political infiltration. Our "one-two" punch has been reliance upon increased military appropriations and economic aid. Today we are being told when the question is asked that a termination date of this program cannot be fixed. In other words, the program goes on and on and on. There are those so bold as to suggest that it might be a 50-year program, yea, a permanent program ad infinitum.

At this point, I shall include a brief summary of foreign-aid money paid out by our taxpayers from July 1, 1945 to June 4, 1956. This covers the postwar period of World War II to date. It also shows the amount of foreign-aid funds available from July 1, 1955, to this time.

[In millions]

Grants paid out July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1955	$41,842
Grants unexpended as of June 30, 1955	8,700
Appropriations provided for fiscal year 1956	2,703
Total grants	53,245
Less: Returns on grants to June 30, 1955	1,493
Net aid in grants	51,752
Loans paid out July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1955	12,117
Grants converted to loans and not included in grants above	2,256
Loans authorized but not paid out June 30, 1955	2,433
Total loans	16,806
Less: Principal collected on loans to June 30, 1955	3,386
Net aid in loans	13,420
Total net aid	65,172

This year, Mr. Chairman, the Congress has been asked to consider a much larger request than it did for fiscal 1955

and 1956. The President asks for $4.9 billion which is $2 billion more than requested in the 2 previous years. I submit that there has been no adequate explanation to justify this request.

Again this year we are confronted with a recurring condition, namely, that of large unexpended balances in the fund. It is evident that the executive department cannot spend the huge sums of money that Congress has been authorizing and appropriating. The fact seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that neither the executive department nor the Congress has but little knowledge of the real situation that exists under this program so far as spending goes. Is it fair to charge that the Congress is guilty of fiscal irresponsibility? The situation can be corrected if we set our minds to it. However, under this bill no relief in that regard is suggested.

Our committee has cut more than $1 billion from the total amount requested by the President. It was prompted, I am sure, by the large unexpended balances from previous years. If I understand the figures correctly it appears that there will be approximately $6.8 billion unexpended at the end of the present fiscal year—and if the amount now provided in the bill before us is approved, there will be available in excess of $10 billion for fiscal 1957.

Mr. Chairman, the special task force under the Hoover Commission which was assigned to make a study of overseas economic operations submitted a report to Congress a year ago in which it expressed great concern over the continuing large outlays for foreign aid. The Commission made this pertinent observation, and I quote:

> Surely, after almost 10 years, the time has come to apply some brakes to this overseas spending program. We believe, therefore, that the Commission should recommend substantial reductions in expenditures for this purpose. By no other means will the growing trend toward permanent foreign spending be halted.

It was, Mr. Chairman, with some surprise to many that notwithstanding this admonition by the Commission the President and the Secretary of State should recommend increased spending for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us may be divided into three parts: First, military; second, economic; and third, technical assistance. I shall not take the time now to discuss the details of the program and especially the military aspects of it. I shall limit myself to a very brief statement regarding economic and technical assistance.

Economic aid if offered at all should be approved on a loan basis and not in the form of gifts except where there may be a showing of absolute necessity on the part of the recipient country. Such a case might be Korea and there may be others.

Mr. Chairman, the heart of the foreign aid program, if it has one, is in the so-called technical assistance field, but this is a field which does not require the expenditure of huge sums but rather limited appropriations, perhaps over a long period of time. The original philosophy behind technical assistance was the transmittal of knowledge, skills, and know-how to the peoples of the underdeveloped countries.

I regret to say, Mr. Chairman, that as the program has developed in the last few years, the administrators of it have gone far afield from the basic philosophic concept. Last week, I was surprised, no, not surprised but shocked, when Mr. Hollister, the Director of International Cooperation Administration, testified before the Senate committee as to the extent that his agency intended to disburse tax dollars on projects overseas. He was quoted in the press as saying when asked how the money was to be spent on several schemes:

> These include the $20 million nuclear research center in the Philippines; harnessing the Mekong River to control floods, provide transport and bring power to Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam; building roads between India and Nepal and Afghanistan and Pakistan; and constructing piers to help India ship iron ore to Japan.

This kind of program, Mr. Chairman, is, as I see it, a perversion of the philosophy underlying technical assistance and it is an unjustified waste of American tax dollars.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that as the debate on this bill continues, there should be a searching analysis on the provisions of it and I am satisfied that it would not be necessary to authorize the spending of another dollar this year—without damage to the program.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. RICHARDS]. During the short period of time I have been a member of this committee, I have learned to admire and respect the chairman. As you know, the chairmanship of the Committee on Foreign Affairs carries with it great responsibilities and Chairman RICHARDS has always discharged those responsibilities in a fair and statesmanlike manner. It was with deep regret that we learned he would not seek reelection and I, for one, shall sorely miss his wise counsel and warm friendship. I join with his many friends in wishing for him and his charming wife many future years of happiness and good health.

Mr. Chairman, the contents of the mutual security bill, which is now before us, comprise a number of items. Many of them had their origin at different times in separate pieces of legislation. But all the items have a common purpose. The annual cycle of authorizations and appropriations for mutual security has become so much a part of our legislative routine that this purpose is often forgotten or obscured by our attention to the details.

This program has developed to meet the postwar challenge of the Soviet Union. For almost a decade that challenge was presented in military terms. The Soviet Union took over the Baltic States. The governments of eastern and central Europe were brought under its domination. It threatened the nations of Western Europe. In Iran, in Korea, in Vietnam, in Laos, in Indonesia, and in other countries of Asia and the Middle East the Soviet Union directly or indirectly has sought to overthrow established governments.

In the last year, however, the Soviets have reversed their tactics. Many people in the free world have interpreted the smiles and sweet words of the latest Soviet leaders as a new Soviet philosophy. I cannot agree with this conclusion. All of the present leaders of Russia owe their survival and positions to strict adherence to the teachings of Lenin and Stalin. None of them has denounced or even questioned any part of basic Communist doctrine. Only last fall, Nikita Khrushchev told the East German Communists:

> If anyone expects us to forget the doctrines of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, he is making a tremendous mistake.

There is no real evidence that the Soviet changes in tactics constitutes a change in basic policy, and the awareness of this fact by the people of the United States is reflected in the extraordinary appropriations voted by Congress for our own Department of Defense. Only recently the House approved without a dissenting vote a defense appropriation for fiscal year 1957 of $33.6 billion in new funds.

The defense plan of the United States envisions a coordinated effort by ourselves and our allies to repel Soviet aggression. The only difference between our own defense appropriations and the military funds contained in the mutual security bill is that the former supports American forces while the latter assists friendly foreign forces. The purpose is the same—to maintain and increase the military position of the free world.

We have been advised repeatedly that if we fail to assist our allies in strengthening their forces with the military assistance supplied through the mutual security program then our own defense expenditures must be greatly increased. This is easily understandable when we realize that it costs the United States at least eight times as much to maintain a United States solider overseas as it does to contribute to the support of a foreign man in uniform.

Mr. Gordon Gray, Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs, Department of Defense, emphasized these facts in his testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee this year when he said "but for the military forces generated, stimulated, and assisted by our military-assistance program, to attain the same measure of military security in the world our own forces would have to be larger."

Admiral Radford pointed up the close relation between the two programs when he informed the committee that the mutual-security program "is an essential part of the defense of the United States and of the free world. In planning military programs of the United States the existence and scope of the military-assistance program is fully considered. There is no duplication. They supple-

ment each other. Both are essential to our own national defense."

Secretary Dulles, as the final witness before our committee, summed up the interrelation of our own defense expenditures and those provided for in this bill in the following words:

The total figure for all forms of national security, domestic and foreign, is about $40 billion. Of this, about 90 percent is spent on our own United States Military Establishment. Approximately 10 percent is spent through foreign governments, for the most part to help our allies hold positions which are vital both to us and to them. This 10 percent makes up what we call a mutual-security program.

The testimony of these and other key officials that mutual security military funds are vital to our own defense caused several members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, including myself, to attempt to ascertain the reasons for including these military-aid funds in the mutual-security bill rather than in the Defense Department's annual appropriation bill. Most of the witnesses failed to present any substantial reasons for the procedure now being followed. In fact, Mr. Gray said that "the Defense Department could live under either structure."

Therefore, in the preparation of the committee's report, I suggested that there be included a recommendation that military-assistance funds be henceforth included in the Defense Department's annual appropriation bill. The committee adopted this idea. Although the language in the report is not as strong as I would like it, I believe it is a step in the right direction.

It is never too difficult, Mr. Chairman, to criticize a large-scale operation such as is involved in the mutual security program. There are instances of overprograming, inefficient staffing, delivery lags and mistakes in planning and judgment. Some projects have not only failed to add to the strength of our friends but may have even weakened them.

Yet, we can point with equal emphasis to the program's accomplishments. There is little doubt that the Marshall plan—the forerunner of the mutual security program—put Europe back on its feet and created in those Western nations a will to resist Communist advances. Turkey is a stronger ally as a result of our aid. So is Spain. The strongest non-Communist military force in Asia is the battle-tested Korean Army. Without the aid of our mutual security program, Korea could not have withstood Communist pressures. Formosa has been able to remain as the visible symbol of free China only because of the mutual security program. This is also true in other areas.

The program is not all black or white, not all pluses or minuses. It is necessary to balance the failures against the successes in order to arrive at a reasonable assessment of the program's worth. Using that test, Congress has reached the conclusion each year that the mutual security program is in our national interest and has continued it.

The recent shift in Soviet tactics has emphasized to us all the immediate need for a comprehensive review of the entire mutual security program by the Executive. Pending such a review, it would, in my opinion, be extremely unwise at this critical stage to abandon the program.

The possibility of executive review does not lessen, however, the responsibility of the Congress and, in the first instance, of the committee, to seek a full justification of the authorization request that has been made by the executive branch of our Government. This should not be a pro forma exercise but a full inquiry into the program's past performances as well as future plans.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has made every effort to measure up to their responsibility. For a period of more than 8 weeks we carefully examined the requests of the Executive. During the period of time, we received testimony from representatives of every branch of the Government connected with the administration of this program. At the close of the hearings, the committee voted to authorize an appropriation for the mutual security program of $3,563,475,000 for the next fiscal year, a decrease of $1,109,000,000 from the Executive request. Of this amount, $109 million was cut from the economic assistance program and the remaining billion dollars from the military. These reductions were adopted by a bipartisan committee vote.

Protests against these cuts in our mutual-security program have been made by the Executive, as well as by Members of Congress, since the committee's action. Statements have been issued that the program will be seriously impaired or even wrecked unless funds are restored. It is interesting to note, however, that in the 7-year period between 1950 and 1956, inclusive, Congress has reduced the requests of the executive branch of the Government for the mutual-security program anywhere from $600 million to $1.9 billion each year.

Each time these reductions have been made, protests similar to those now being voiced have been heard. Yet the program has continued to operate and, at the end of the present fiscal year, it is estimated that the program's unexpended balance will be approximately $6.6 billion. That amount is sufficient to continue the mutual-security program without any further appropriation for nearly 2 years.

These indisputable facts have conveyed to many the impression that on occasion more funds are requested than are necessary or that can be spent. This impression was strengthened when the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Joseph Campbell, testified recently before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. He accused the International Cooperation Administration, which handles nonmilitary aid, of "overprograming" and said it frequently has asked Congress for more money than it could spend in the subsequent fiscal year. He was equally critical of the Defense Department's handling of funds allocated for military aid, as is evidenced by his following remarks:

The program for furnishing military support to designated foreign countries is based on a projection of troop strength which such countries have agreed to supply. In many instances this commitment by the foreign country is not met, requiring the reprograming of items to be furnished within fund authorizations already approved by the Congress. The planned force goals for the several countries are contained in various State Department documents. Estimates as to when the countries will bring the desired units into being have been overoptimistic.

In addition to the problem of reprograming, the failure on the part of the countries to meet their strength commitments also resulted in the creation of excesses in certain of these countries. These excesses are both of an actual nature where inventories are available for distribution subject to the willingness on the part of the country to permit its return or redistribution to other countries, as well as "paper" excesses which represent items in the hands of troops which have been diverted for use in specific conflicts.

In another portion of his testimony, Mr. Campbell made this point:

At least $400 million of military-assistance appropriations, representing unpaid obligations overstated at June 30, 1954, has been retained by the Department of Defense in violation of the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954.

Notwithstanding this information, other important factors indicated a substantial reduction in the military was justified. Almost $5.6 billion of unexpended military funds is now in the so-called pipeline. Of this amount, more than $3.6 billion is earmarked for European programs. Most of these programs were worked out when German rearmament was scheduled to follow a more accelerated pace, before France moved a large part of her forces to North Africa, and before several NATO countries indicated contemplated reductions in their military budgets.

These facts, coupled with the knowledge that the equipment to be supplied by the European pipeline funds can be transferred to other areas, were sufficient to convince me and other members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that a reduction in military funds could be made without injuring the program.

Accordingly, I initiated the amendment to cut that portion of the bill by $750 million. This amendment was further amended and the military part of the bill was reduced by $1 billion. The committee also removed the delivery ceilings on military equipment for the four principal geographic regions. Together with provisions in the law giving the President authority to transfer limited amounts from one title or function to another, the funds recommended by the committee should be ample to carry forward programs which must be reexamined constantly in the light of new attitudes and capabilities on the part of our allies.

Of the $1,925,000,000 remaining in the bill for military assistance, $374,300,000 is intended for direct forces support. This is a term that covers soft goods for friendly military forces, items such as food, uniforms, and other consumables. Even though it is carried under military assistance, it is a form of economic aid. By deducting this sum from the $1,925,000,000, military assistance in the form of military equipment and training is $1,550,700,000.

The balance of the $3,563,475,000, or $2,012,775,000, is nonmilitary money. The programs for which this money is authorized are designed to keep the resources of the free world from falling under Communist control and to strengthen the ties of cooperation with the economically underdeveloped nations of the world.

Among those classified as nonmilitary are the technical-assistance programs. These programs, modest in amounts, are designed to improve the economic basis of the underdeveloped countries. Through demonstrations of techniques in agriculture, health, education, and other basic fields, technical-assistance programs bring to these countries some of the skills that have marked the development of our own country.

In developing technical-assistance programs the mistake has been made in some countries of encouraging and assisting an expansion of agricultural output beyond the requirements of the country itself. This has resulted in the production of surplus commodities in foreign countries that are now in direct competition on the world market with our own surplus products.

I called this matter to the attention of Mr. John B. Hollister, Director of the International Cooperation Administration, when he appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Mr. Hollister assured the committee that he was "fully alive to the fact that we ought not to be spending directly to weaken or decrease the possibility of our distributing to the world market our agricultural surpluses." He assured the committee further that—

> In certain countries where their chief product is one of those commodities of which we have surpluses, we are attempting to divert some of the acreage into other agricultural crops which are needed for a more balanced diet.

The members, particularly from agricultural districts, will, I believe, be interested in Mr. Hollister's full statement on this subject. I therefore quote from the hearings:

> Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman. Mr. Hollister, are we continuing under this new program to give technical assistance to any nations who have now expanded their agricultural crops beyond their own requirements?
>
> Mr. HOLLISTER. That is a very big question. We are doing our best to see that the technical assistance and the development assistance we give does not directly affect the ability of countries to export the things that our country has in surplus, or decrease the amount of imports that those countries would have with respect to those agricultural commodities of which we have surpluses.
>
> It is obvious that if we have an agricultural training force some place in this country, or our experts go abroad with general agricultural measures and fertilizer, it cannot help but affect all kinds of production.
>
> But we are fully alive to the fact that we ought not to be spending directly to weaken or decrease the possibility of our distributing to the world market our agricultural surpluses. That is the thing you are interested in?
>
> Mr. SELDEN. Yes.
>
> Mr. HOLLISTER. Any work that is done around the world to raise the standard of living of a country disturbs to some extent the equilibrium of the world market. But we do our best to see that we do not directly contribute to that situation.
>
> Mr. SELDEN. I would like for just a moment to call your attention to the following paragraph on this particular subject that was included in the report of this committee's study mission to Europe:
>
> "An aspect of United States policy which, in the judgment of the study mission, should be carefully reexamined and reconsidered is our policy of giving technical assistance and other aid to nations to help them continue to expand their production of agricultural crops beyond their own requirements. In Greece (a comparable situation exists in Turkey for wheat and certain other crops) the production of cotton for export is being assisted even though such cotton competes with United States cotton in the markets of the world. We cannot object to any nation producing and selling cotton or other goods on a competitive basis, provided we do not subsidize this production. The situation is entirely different, however, when we spend our own funds in a manner which aggravates one of our most difficult problems and adds to the financial burden of our taxpayers."
>
> This is very important for those of us who live in agricultural regions where we have surplus agricultural commodities.
>
> Mr. HOLLISTER. We are fully alive to that. I would like to give you a copy of the memorandum which has been sent out to all of our people on this subject, because it is something that we have been watching pretty closely.
>
> I want to add that we have even tried to work the other way. In certain countries where their chief product is one of those commodities of which we have surpluses, we are attempting to divert some of the acreage into other agricultural crops which are needed for a more balanced diet. It is not easy, but we are trying that out.

Development assistance is a relatively small part of this bill. Its purpose is to promote economic development or to deal with other problems whose solution is necessary to create or maintain economic and political stability. It is limited principally to countries which do not receive military assistance. Under this part of the program the United States has given assistance to a wide range of projects such as road building, irrigation systems, and the construction of industrial plants. Hitherto development assistance has been made available to other countries on either a grant or loan basis.

The bill before the House continues this program but changes the rules. Development assistance under the terms of this legislation is entirely in the form of loans except when funds are used to finance the sale of surplus agricultural commodities. Grant assistance is limited to regional projects, i. e., projects involving two or more nations. Not more than 25 percent of development assistance may be used to assist any one nation. We have added a further condition—a nation to receive development assistance loans must enter into a written agreement permitting participation by private enterprise in conformance with the provisions in the Mutual Security Act dealing with the encouragement of free enterprise and private participation.

The amount authorized for development assistance represents a merger of the funds recommended by the administration for that purpose together with the money for the Asian economic fund and the Middle East Fund. The sum of $243 million that is authorized in the bill constitutes a reduction of $100 million in the Executive request.

According to information submitted to the committee, not more than 10 million of the $100 million in the present Asian fund will be obligated by the end of this fiscal year. Section 201 (a) continues the availability of the unobligated amount of that fund. Thus, to the $243 million in this bill can be added $90 million of unobligated money in the present Asian fund. Also, the course of events in the Middle East makes the planned use of money requested for the Middle East Fund most unlikely. Moreover, in section 6 (f) of this bill we are continuing an authorization of $45.3 million already appropriated for the relief, rehabilitation, and resettlement of the Palestine refugees. That is the No. 1 problem in that area. Other projects will depend upon the solution of that problem before they can be initiated. Finally, should there be opportunities to move forward quickly with projects, the President can always draw upon the special funds voted to him under section 401 of the Mutual Security Act. In view of the availability of these other funds, I offered the amendment that made possible the $100 million reduction. This amendment received strong bipartisan support in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the mutual security bill, as reported to the House, has been greatly improved by the actions of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. However, there are other improvements that I feel should be considered. These are set out in the supplemental views that were prepared and signed by me and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

In the supplemental views published more than a week ago we stated, among other things, that:

> We are also opposed to the inclusion of certain so-called neutralist countries such as Yugoslavia and India. In the first instance, Yugoslavia, a Communist country, has been drawing closer and closer to the Soviet orbit since the death of Stalin. We are opposed to aid to any Communist dictator as a matter of principle and we do not feel that the United States has any assurance that Tito would be on our side or would even remain neutral in the event of another war.
>
> India, although only receiving economic assistance, also apears to be swinging more and more into line with Communist thinking. On almost all issues of foreign policy, she follows the Soviet and Chinese Communist line quite closely. Although the United States has given or loaned to India since 1950 nearly $600 million, the United States has not achieved gratitude, friendship, cooperation or even genuine neutrality. We feel that our foreign policy, of which foreign aid is an arm, has failed in this instance.
>
> The real danger in continuing to help such countries as India and Yugoslavia is the attraction which the United States places on neutralism, even of a technical variety. If the United States desires to win and to hold allies, it should not make it so advantageous or profitable for a country to be neutral. There is a very definite trend toward neutrality in the world today and this country appears to do nothing to discourage it.

The events of the last few days, highlighted by Tito's statements that has been made during his visit to Moscow, only strengthen my views on further aid to Yugoslavia. The amendments that will be offered to reduce or eliminate funds to these nations deserve the serious consideration of this House. Other proposals that are offered in an effort to improve rather than wreck this legislation should also be carefully considered.

The very fact that the administration has proposed an overall study of foreign aid is compelling evidence that we should move with caution in voting increased sums for the program. This proposal in itself suggests to me that the administration is uncertain, not about the need for a mutual security program, but the emphasis that should be given to the various parts of it. If an emergency arose within the next few months, it would necessarily have to be met from money previously appropriated. Should there not be an emergency, the funds in this bill are ample to keep the program moving steadily, at least until it can be carefully reexamined.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, after 2 months of careful review, has presented a mutual security bill they feel is in the best interests of this Nation. I trust the Congress will uphold the committee's action.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I support H. R. 11356, the Mutual Security Act of 1956, as an expression of United States leadership in world affairs, which gives the executive branch the essential tools required by it in order to carry out our foreign policy.

The mutual-security program has given the United States and the free world positive advantages and accomplishments which must be continued and even increased. I regret that the committee saw fit to cut $1 billion out of the military assistance funds which President Eisenhower requested to fulfill the military aspects of our mutual security responsibilities around the world. I hope that in its wisdom Congress will restore this amount and thus give the President the congressional backing which is so essential to our position of leadership in a world beset by critical problems.

The other aspects of the mutual-security program are equally as important as the military. This is particularly so in view of the fact that the Soviet Union has recently adopted new tactics in the economic arena, while retaining its fundamental philosophy and objectives of world domination. It was my privilege to serve, with my colleague on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Honorable BROOKS HAYS, on the United States delegation to the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations which met from September 20 to December 20, 1955. In that capacity I had occasion to view at first hand and observe closely the actions and deliberations of the Soviet delegation. The tone of voice has become somewhat less harsh, but it was clear to all of us that they remain dedicated to the destruction of the free world through subversion, propaganda and discrediting of our foreign policies and programs. Cognizant of the success which the mutual-security program has achieved, they are now concentrating their efforts in the same nonmilitary fields as our own. This made a tremendous impression on the United States delegation to the United Nations and compelled them to send the following communication to the Secretary of State:

> Impelled by a unanimous feeling that economic and social questions are assuming increasing importance on the international scene, the United States delegation to the 10th General Assembly has joined in framing this statement.
>
> The present period in history may one day be recognized as a major turning point in the struggle between communism and freedom. It appears to be clearly a shift in the cold war, in which economic and social problems have moved to the forefront.
>
> Members of the United States delegation during this General Assembly session have observed the effectiveness of Soviet tactics under these new conditions. This can be seen both in the way the Soviet bloc delegates work in various United Nations meetings, and also in the voting that occurs in many committees. As we observed maneuvers, we were conscious that the Soviet Union, elsewhere in the world, was using economic and social collaboration as a means for jumping military as well as political barriers. Examples of this can be found in India, Egypt, and Burma.
>
> We believe that the United States must counter these Soviet efforts. We can succeed, not by outbidding communism in sheer amounts of economic aid, but by making newly independent and newly articulate peoples feel that they can best satisfy their wants by becoming and remaining part of the community of free nations.
>
> We welcome more emphasis on economic and educational endeavors, for we have a proven experience in these fields.
>
> We are in a contest in the field of economic development of underdeveloped countries which is bitterly competitive. Defeat in this contest would be as disastrous as defeat in an armament race.
>
> We could lose this economic contest unless the country as a whole wakes up to all its implications.

The Secretary of State, at the express wish of President Eisenhower, made the statement public on January 11, 1956.

As we consider the Mutual Security Act proposed for 1956, it is essential that we crystallize the economic leadership of the United States as we encounter the new tactics of the Soviet Union. I am of the firm conviction that United States participation in the United Nations and its specialized agencies, always increasing in effectiveness, is one of the major means whereby we can meet effectively the new Soviet challenge. In referring to the United Nations, President Eisenhower said in his message to Congress of this year:

> In the pursuit of our national purposes, we have been steadfast in our support of the United Nations, now entering its second decade with a wider membership and ever-increasing influence and usefulness.

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

Mr. MERROW. I prefer to finish my statement before yielding, if the gentleman please.

Many years ago I began advocating the formation of an international organization to preserve the peace. Prior to the inception of the United Nations I said in many speeches throughout my State and other parts of the country that man must develop an international organization to help in preserving the peace. In response to the new order of affairs produced by the nuclear era, men in the field of political activity have developed the United Nations and its specialized agencies. As a supporter of this system, the United States has a unique opportunity for exercising leadership in this troubled world.

The United Nations has completed its first 10 years. This is an exceedingly short span in any political institution. The United Nations has grown and developed during the past 10 years and has a long array of worthwhile accomplishments to its credit. I can testify to the fact that during the Tenth General Assembly great progress was made by the United Nations including: the admission of 12 new member states; the endorsement of President Eisenhower's open-sky proposal for the exchange of military blueprints and mutual aerial inspection; the adoption of a method for charter review, and the adoption of a method which will establish an international atomic energy agency which was urged by the President of the United States before the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MERROW. In a moment, please.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from New Hampshire will proceed.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, as recently as April 18, 12 nations completed a 2 months' drafting conference on the atoms-for-peace agency. Next September there will be a conference at the United Nations headquarters for the ratification of the charter by all the member countries of the United Nations. Thus the United Nations has made another great accomplishment at the suggestion of the President of the United States. As evidence of the success of United States leadership in the United Nations, under the able statesmanship of Ambassador Lodge and his predecessor, Senator Austin, the United States has never suffered a reverse on an issue of major importance. With the passing of each day, the United Nations grows in influence and effectiveness. The United States can be proud that she has played such an important part in this international organization.

The big four specialized agencies of the United Nations are the Food and Agriculture Organization with headquarters in Rome, the International Labor Organization and World Health Organization in Geneva, and the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization in Paris. These agencies are combating hunger, poverty, disease and illiteracy. What an opportunity for leadership. Half the world is undernourished. Over half the world is illiterate.

Poverty stalks the earth in many places. Millions are racked with disease. Certainly we have a moral obligation to give assistance within our capabilities and to provide leadership in fighting these scourges. Communism thrives on discontent and on human misery. To the extent that the impact of these scourges is mitigated, to that extent will we be successful in helping to stem the tide of communism.

We can well be proud of the United Nations and the role the United States has played in establishing this organization. We can justly be proud of the leadership which the United States is giving in its participation in the United Nations and that the General Assembly is backing the President in his suggestions on the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The United Nations programs contained in this bill are small when considered from the point of view of authorizations involved: $2.3 million for the United States contribution to the United Nations Refugee Fund; $10 million for the United Nations Children's Fund; an authorization of the carryover of the unobligated balance of $45.3 million for the United Nations Relief and Work Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, and an increase in the United States contribution to the Food and Agriculture Organization from $2 million to $3 million. These are programs which bring much good will and understanding of United States efforts in areas where such understanding is very much needed. These are "grass roots" programs which permeate to the people involved. These United Nations programs give strength and meaning to the whole mutual-security program. They prove conclusively that the United States is ready, able and willing to cooperate with all other nations of good will in helping to solve the difficult problems which face the millions upon millions of people in the world. As we stated in our report:

> This is an area in which our leadership can be very effective and very potent, for the United Nations itself deals with political issues and is a great forum for developing world opinion, and the specialized agencies are fighting hunger, disease, illiteracy, and poverty. When we consider the fact that the total United States per capita cost for calendar year 1955 of the United Nations, the specialized agencies and the voluntary programs was 40 cents, it is obvious that the cost is not exorbitant. What a tremendous opportunity for our Republic, the leader of the free world, to make a historic contribution to this worldwide struggle to insure the continuation of free civilization and its expansion for the millions of peoples in the world who are now struggling to attain their freedom and security. Never has a nation had a greater opportunity to make its influence and power felt for the well-being and happiness of all mankind.
>
> We are engaged in a great international effort to spare our children from the holocaust of a battlefield in a nuclear era with the utter devastation that such a battle would bring. That effort requires the cooperation not only of nations with one another but of individuals themselves who make up the nations. To us the support by the United States of the United Nations and its specialized agencies constitutes a great crusade for peace and freedom. Only by viewing the United Nations system in that light can we understand its implications for the future of the world. (H. Rept. 1980, 84th Cong., pp. 30, 31.)

At a time when there is talk of a reappraisal and the possibility of establishing a commission to study mutual security, I hope that whatever study is made will consider the ways and means whereby United States leadership in the United Nations and its specialized agencies can be made even more effective. As our participation increases in effectiveness, so our mutual security will increase. In the long run, I believe such effective participation and full support will make possible a diminishing demand on our own resources.

I hope this bill will receive the overwhelming support it deserves.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY].

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, we have before us for consideration today the Mutual Security Act of 1956, which, in more understandable terms to the public, means our foreign-aid spending program. This bill authorizes an appropriation of $3,563,475,000 to carry forward the mutual-security program. The amount of aid extended to foreign countries since the inception of this program has reached staggering proportions. It seems appropriate that we reexamine our commitments thus far and attempt to arrive at the correct position in regard to a continuance of these expenditures.

The aid which this Government has extended to all countries and international organizations for the period covering World War II and the postwar period ending June 30, 1955 amounts to $108,847,779,000. This total does not include United States capital investments in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—$635 million—and the International Monetary Fund— $2,750 million.

Summary of aid

Lend-lease, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1955	$48,767,777,000
Grants-in-aid, July 1, 1940 to June 30, 1955	43,459,158,000
Net loans, July 1, 1940 to June 30, 1955	16,620,844,000
Summary total	108,847,779,000

The foreign aid program began with the lend-lease shipments on July 1, 1940. In the postwar years, one appropriation after another has followed in rapid succession until our foreign-aid spending program, together with the taxes that are paid for carrying it, amounts almost to one-half of our Federal debt.

The extension of these huge sums during World War II in foreign aid is understandable. We were engaged in all-out war, and we felt the need of winning it at any cost. But let us look at the aid extended since the close of the war. Between July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1955, the United States disbursed gross foreign aid in the amount of $60,719,482,000. It is difficult for the average individual to understand the impact upon our economy of such huge sums. If we were to spread this postwar cost over the householders of the Nation, it would be found this program will cost every householder of the Nation $1,277.

When one is trying to reach a decision relative to his vote on the mutual security aid legislation, he is faced with many cross currents of opinion. Just about everyone feels there are nations in the world which deserve our assistance. This program, however, is just about all-inclusive. We have extended help to many nations which are in better financial position than we are. Not only that—we have extended help to nations which have never aided us in a military conflict and which have profited from our own involvement. Examples in this category are Brazil, which has received $381,686,000, and Sweden, $116,220,000.

An analysis of our foreign-aid spending program reveals that through our lend-lease program from July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945, 62 nations and territories were assisted by this program. In the years that followed, July 1, 1945, to July 30, 1955, 24 nations participated in our lend-lease program. The grants-in-aid during this postwar period reached a total of 88 nations and territories.

It should be noted that not all of these nations are friendly. The following countries which are certainly not allies have benefited by our mutual security program:

China	$2,861,376,000
Czechoslovakia	1,211,837,000
Yugoslavia	750,730,000
Russia	11,241,614,000

Most of the aid received by Yugoslavia has been extended during recent years while that country has been under a Communist dictatorship. The aid extended to Yugoslavia amounts to more than $44 for every man, woman, and child in that country.

There is a general impression that the corporations and the rich pay the bulk of these expenditures. This, however, is not the case. The President in his budget for 1957 reveals that more than one-half of the taxes collected by the Federal Government are derived from individual income taxes.

It should be remembered, too, that a considerable sum is collected in hidden taxes. Taxes upon about every purchase made: theater tickets, transportation, purses, jewelry, alarm clocks, hand lotions, and many other articles. Telephone companies have calculated that taxes on each telephone installed in the home amount to more than $3 per telephone. Yes, we meet these taxes at every turn, and it is time the working men and women become conscious of the inroads of taxes upon their economy.

No one would challenge for one moment the motives behind this giveaway program. The nations of Europe had been devastated by the ravages of war. Their industrial potential had been largely destroyed. In the rebuilding process, our aid was badly needed. However, this program began, 1948, supposedly, for a 5-year period, but it has continued in force until the present day—notwithstanding the fact that many of the original recipients of aid have been balancing their budgets and reducing taxes. This situation has occurred in recent years when our own budget was running a deficit.

In the light of facts here presented, it seems that, in addition to our efforts to

make our Nation secure, we must make certain that we keep our economy strong and our currency sound. Would it not be better to think more of the homefront for awhile and take a vacation from foreign aid grants? We may be surprised how well other nations can get along without us.

H. R. 11356 is an omnibus measure. No one knows where all of this money will eventually be spent. The time has come when I feel we must begin to think of safeguarding our economy in this country in order that we may continue strong economically as well as militarily. It is most difficult to support a program of this nature, although there are certain countries of the world one would like to assist. In view of the fact that there is a considerable backlog of spending already available for the Mutual Security Agency, it is my belief that this bill should not receive the favorable support of the Congress.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is appropriate during the debate on this foreign aid bill to briefly discuss a subject of far-reaching importance to this country and to the free world. I refer to what is being done, and what is not being done, by the West in the encouragement of students to attend college and receive other training on this side of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

At this time an alarmingly large number of young people are flocking behind those curtains to take advantage of educational opportunities offered inside Red China and elsewhere. I am thinking now of the area located in southeastern Asia—a most vital and crucial spot in the whole world picture today.

I am informed that some 7,000 overseas Chinese students went behind the curtain in 1954. Of this number, two-thirds were in regular courses and one-third of them took makeup courses—an introduction to and the learning of spoken Chinese.

In the fall of 1955 the number increased to 10,000 of the overseas Chinese. I am informed by the State Department that comparatively few of that number included Malayan, Burmese, Indochinese, and so forth.

It is also reported that comparatively few of those students who go in ever return to the free world. Most of them, once they finish their technical courses and graduate go right into Chinese industry in China.

It is interesting to note that only 700 to 1,200 of the overseas Chinese in that area go to Taipei. Most of those who do go to Formosa for their training are from Hong Kong and the Macao area.

Now, I am not raising this question for the purpose of offering a remedy. I do think it is somewhat alarming and should be considered when methods and techniques are sought whereby we can cope more advantageously with the Communists in this battle over human minds. These college and technical students are all potential leaders of the future.

I have talked and corresponded with Dean Knowles A. Ryerson, of the University of California, about this problem. He is well informed on conditions in the area and he is very much alarmed. He thinks that if we spent more money on school facilities for the students I am speaking of, the investment would pay a much bigger dividend over the long run than other expenditures we are making in this foreign aid bill.

Dean Ryerson points out that there is a shortage of facilities of this type in Taiwan. Also, existing institutions in Malaya, Hong Kong, Manila, and Bangkok, can be expended to attract more of these students. It is not known what can be done in Manila, but the College of Agriculture at Los Banos had quite a reputation as an international center for southeast Asia before the war.

This same authority—Mr. Ryerson—for whose judgment I have high regard, speaks of the tremendous importance of building up centers for native leadership.

Comparatively small amounts of money go a long way in construction of facilities in many of these places. For example, in Taiwan, where costs are presently going up, a dormitory to house 485 students, which cost $70,000 2 years ago, is now estimated to cost $120,000. A dormitory to house a similar number in this country would cost well over $1 million I am informed.

I am not prepared to say just what we should do, or what we should not do. But, again, in considering the foreign assistance program, it does seem to me more attention should be given to this phase of the problem, as viewed from the standpoint of the West.

Dean Ryerson reminds that there are large numbers of American-trained Chinese from our best institutions that are already at the University of Taiwan or in other activities there, who could teach. Would it be to our interest to spend a little more money in the expansion of the university facilities in the National Taiwan University and in the provincial colleges such as Engineering, with which Purdue already has a technical aid contract? And the Teachers College at Taipei, where the Pennsylvania State University has a small contract with the thought of supplying a small staff?

It is only natural that the Free Chinese are very anxious to provide facilities for "overseas Chinese." Since the proposed university at Singapore under the direction of Dr. Lin Yutang was definitely thwarted through Communist activities, there is more reason than ever, it seems to me, why it is important to provide opportunities for these students elsewhere, and thereby save them from the fate of gravitating behind the Bamboo Curtain. I am not saying that we should underwrite that sort of thing, but I am saying some solution should be found for it.

In any countries that have counterpart funds, it may be that at least a portion of the costs of expanding educational facilities can be met from that source. If buildings and facilities, and then scholarships, can be provided, there is no doubt but that a substantial number of students can be induced to take advantage of such opportunities—students now going to Peking for their training.

I have heard it said that strong efforts are being made now to entice Chinese university people away from Taiwan and back on the mainland because the shortage of such people is so great inside Red China.

Moreover, I understand that in Saigon there is a wide-open field for development of schools and technical training centers.

Obviously, the matter of providing schools and educational facilities is essentially a local responsibility. We have our hands full here at home with overcrowded schoolrooms and other shortages. But so long as we are spending billions overseas to help secure the free world from the ravages of communism, and in that way to add strength and stability to the people who believe in freedom, let us consider this phase of the problem in the proper perspective.

We are reminded that under the United Nations technical assistance program the Soviet Union is setting up a technical school in Bombay for technical training of Indians. And, earlier this year, following the visit of the Russian officials to India and Burma, the Soviet Union made a gift to Burma of a large building, technical equipment and a technical staff for training the Burmese. News reports at that time referred to similar offers made to Afghanistan.

Again, I am not here critizing anyone. I am simply raising some questions that occurred to me in looking at this entire picture of foreign aid, and the purposes for which this money is being expended.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, first I want to join the other members of my committee and of the House in paying tribute to our very able and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, DICK RICHARDS. He is not only a wonderful leader of the committee but he is as fine a gentleman as I have known. When our study mission in Asia last fall heard that he had announced his intention to retire from the Congress, we sent a cablegram urging him to reconsider. Unfortunately his mind could not be changed. It is a great loss. We certainly wish him well in the years ahead.

Mr. Chairman, it is too bad that the many good programs in this bill about which there is little or no controversy are therefore given very little discussion by us or attention by the public. The result is that a lot of people here and around the world, in their preoccupation with the things we argue about, do not realize a fraction of the real good that is being done by the programs carried on without fanfare which really represent our country at its best.

It is hard in a democracy to put our best foot forward, because even if a bill finally goes through with all the funds that have been asked, the things that are said in debate sometimes hurt so badly that they partially neutralize, if not more than offset, the good that our money and other forms of aid do.

But, since most of the money authorized in this bill goes for military assistance of one form or another under title I, and since most of the opposition this year seems to be to that portion of the bill, I, like the rest, have to give priority in these remarks to the military considerations.

Why has the Executive requested funds for a military-assistance program, which is roughly three-fourths of the bill as it now stands? There is only one reason, and that is because the security of the whole free world, and that means the security of our Nation, are gravely threatened.

There is only one threat, and that is, of course, the avowed purpose and the unwavering will and the increasing capacity of the Communist world conspiracy to seize control of the whole world by one method or another.

Lest anyone have any misunderstanding on that point, Mr. Khrushchev recently reaffirmed it, stating that Communists would abandon their concepts and their program of world communization only "when shrimps learn to whistle."

Mr. Chairman, there can be no real peace or relaxation for us until the Communist movement fades or changes.

Our peace and freedom can be secure only when their purpose is changed or their will is weakened, or their capacity to conquer the world is reduced.

We cannot do much directly about changing their purpose or weakening their will; those must be done from within the movement or by pressures within the countries already conquered. But we can do something about reducing their capacity—their ability to impose their will on the free world. And the whole mutual defense assistance title of this bill, of course, has to do with that one task. It is to keep our enemies from ever getting to the point where they have the power to cow or to conquer the world.

There are two main means by which we can try to achieve that objective. One is to prevent the enemy from winning any more victories that will make him stronger. That is why we must resolutely oppose resumption of trade with Communist countries. That is why we must oppose the admission of Communist China into the United Nations. We must not do anything that will give the Communists more prestige, more power, more influence, because that would build up the capacity to destroy us of an enemy that is openly dedicated to our destruction.

The other means is the positive effort to keep our own country strong and sound, and to help other free countries become strong and sound also, so that they can defend their independence and block any further gains by the Communist cancer anywhere.

In a sentence, our job is to prevent any increase in the strength of our enemy and to build up the strength and unity of ourselves and our allies.

How well is the Kremlin doing? And how well are we doing in this worldwide struggle?

Let us look first at the overall picture with the individual countries and problems of which the various sections of the bill deal. It seems to me, looking at it in the large, the Kremlin is making three major shifts in the tactics by which it pursues its never-changing objective of world conquest and follows its never-changing strategy of world revolution. Each of these three shifts, if successful, will increase our danger, not decrease it.

The first is a geographic shift from West and East to South. The Kremlin naturally tried to push to its west following the end of the war, because Western Europe is the most important prize, second only to ourselves. It tried to get Greece as a means of flanking Germany and picking off weakened, infiltrated, and divided Italy and France. We met the push with firm resistance in Greece.

The Kremlin then tested us with the Berlin blockade—which served also to divert our attention from its operations in China. The West responded with the Berlin airlift, refused to be intimidated, and the Kremlin backed off.

It then threatened all sorts of disasters if we did not abandon NATO. But we did not fold up. We do not give in to threats; it is when they smile and talk peace that we seem to lose our heads. We went steadily ahead to build and arm NATO. It did not lead to the threatened disaster. The Kremlin made no move against NATO.

Then the Communists everywhere warned that if we and Western Europe were to organize the Western European Union and allow Germany to regain her full independence and to rearm, there would be dire consequences. To underline its threat, the Kremlin unilaterally abrogated the Soviet Union's pacts of friendship and nonaggression with Britain and France. But the Western World kept its nerve and stood firm. The Paris pacts were signed. Germany was given her independence and authority to rearm. Did it lead to war as predicted? No, indeed. Instead, the Kremlin proposed a chummy little conference to settle peacefully the problem of Austria.

It was clear that faced with strength in the West, the Soviet leaders were not going to start a war there. They promptly changed their approach and said, "Let us work out a stabilization of the European front. Let us have a security pact. Let us neutralize Germany."

Anything to free themselves from having to tie down most of their strength facing the West, because the fishing was not very good in Europe for the time being.

At the same time they were pushing to their east. They got control of Manchuria at Yalta. They got North Korea just before V–J Day. They pushed ahead like a glacier over weakened and exhausted China, while we were bemused by the myth that we should not help resist them in earnest because they were not really Communists, only democratic agrarian reformers, eager to improve the lot of the long-suffering Chinese, and to cooperate with us in building freedom and peace in Asia.

When they had overrun China, they moved into South Korea from which the blind and the faithless had persuaded us to withdraw our forces. Once more we responded as we generally do to brazen aggression, and turned them back. Once more they played their usual trick when faced with firmness. They said, "Let us have a truce." It was not, of course, because they wanted to end the struggle, but because they hoped to win at the conference table what they could not win on the field of battle. They wanted to shift from Korea, where they could not win, to Vietnam, where they had a better chance. They got North Vietnam.

The two objectives that they wanted next, naturally, were the great natural resources of Southeast Asia and the industry of Japan. China's great usefulness is to furnish the base and the manpower with which to move to control of Southeast Asia and of Japan. But there was one major obstacle standing in the way. That was the island of Formosa, with a good many strong airbases on it. Unless they can seize Formosa or persuade us to neutralize it, so as to get its airfields and armies off their flank, they do not dare go too far south or move against Japan. That is why they have to get Formosa, if they can. That is one reason why we cannot let them have it.

Just as they had done when we gave military aid to Germany in Europe, they blustered that if anyone gave military help to Free China, it would greatly increase the danger of war; and that nobody could stop them from taking Formosa. Our President said in a press conference, "Well, they will first have to run over the 7th Fleet." Apparently they took a good look at the 7th Fleet and decided not to attempt to seize Formosa. Instead, they pulled the same old trick again—it seems always to work. They went down to Bandung and said, "Let us have peace."

Confronted with strength and firmness on their west and strength and firmness on their east, they shifted their major efforts for the present, to their south. Here they face, in the Middle East and in South Asia, not strength and firmness, but awful weakness, division, and disunity.

In the Middle East three explosions are taking place, all made to order for the Kremlin: First, Greece against Turkey and England over Cyprus. Anything that weakens Greece, anything that weakens Turkey, anything that weakens good relations between them, and between them and Britain can only hurt them and help the Kremlin.

Then there is the Arab-Israel explosion. It involves an area with more than half of the known reserves of oil in the world. It is the bridge across to Africa, that great, undeveloped but stirring giant of a continent about which the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] spoke so illuminatingly and instructively this afternoon. And through it runs the Suez Canal, control of which would enable the Kremlin to cut East from West. Obviously, here is a prize, second only to Western Europe. Besides, mastery of it by the Kremlin would lead relatively easily to mastery of Europe.

Then there is the third explosion, the North African colonies against France.

One can hardly imagine a more ideal situation than the Middle East and North Africa for the Communists to exploit with their usual pattern of stirring up even greater trouble and disorder than

already exists. If the Kremlin can gain control in the Middle East now, it can come back to its eastern and its western fronts later.

In South Asia are other weak spots. Here is a vast area, from the Middle East clear over to New Guinea and the Philippines, which was controlled for centuries by European powers. While they differed among themselves, they still maintained, throughout the area, order of a fairly uniform pattern.

The European controls with their stabilizing influence are ended and the area, as someone has put it, has been Balkanized, just as Southeastern Europe was by the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian Empire after World War I.

Here are these newly independent countries with a fourth of the world's population—Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, Vietnam, Malaya, and Indonesia—all striving to pull together their internal factions, develop national unity, establish sound political institutions, and build sound economies.

Their first desire is to preserve their freedom from alien control; their second is to improve the lot of their people by industrialization, better agriculture, health, education, and so forth; the third is to develop democratic government. We wish them well in all three. In the meantime, they are weak, divided, and insecure. The cohesion of the area has been destroyed. They might be easy prey to Communist machinations and guile, bribes and threats. Naturally the Reds, both in Moscow and in Peiping, want to fish in those troubled waters to their south.

And naturally most of the governments there want to be neutral in what seems to some of them to be only a foolish quarrel between the United States and the Soviet Union, with both of whom they would like to be friends. Some of them are as blind to the Communist threat as many in America have been—and still are. What they need, as many of them see it, is just a chance, with friendly assistance from the outside, preferably from both sides, to try to get their own internal houses in order.

Obviously South Asia offers several ideal trouble spots for the Communists to exploit with their plausible prescriptions of quick cures for all ailments.

One of the special weaknesses in the area is the fact that several of the countries are so preoccupied with ancient feuds with their immediate neighbors that they fail to appreciate the overall Communist peril. For example the Indians seem more disturbed about their dispute with Pakistan over Kashmir than they are about the Communist glacier moving down on them from the north.

A couple of weeks ago we heard here an eloquent and moving address by the President of Indonesia. His country already has 80 million people, the sixth largest population in the world. The 2,000 islands are spread over an area 3,000 miles long and 1,500 miles wide. They have vast undeveloped natural and human resources. You would think Indonesia's internal problems would be enough to keep the country's leaders busy for some time. But many of them are more concerned with their dispute with the Dutch over a million or so Papuans in West New Guinea, whom they do not have—perhaps half of whom are still living in the trees—than they are about the 80 million people they do have.

In the whole area from Korea and Japan to Greece and Turkey, there are these local feuds which loom so large to the participants that the Communist danger is considered secondary, or even not fully realized.

This is true also of the Arab-Israeli dispute. What each side needs most of all in order best to serve its own people's need is peace and a settlement of the differences between them so that they can stand together against the common enemy of both—the Soviet Union.

Yet the bitterness and the hatreds and prejudices, and the suspicions and fears, and the sense on each side that it has been done a great historic injustice by the other—these keep them so preoccupied with the conflict between themselves that the Kremlin seems to have almost an open door, or even an invitation, to move in and destroy the independence of all.

I do not say this in criticism. It is a human reaction. It is like a patient who goes to a doctor with a painful boil. The doctor on examination finds the patient has also TB or a cancer. The doctor tends to forget all about the boil in his concern to tell the patient what he has to do to prevent this more serious affliction taking his life. But it is the boil that is causing the patient pain. His main interest is in relief from that and he will go to some other doctor who will take care of his immediate discomfort due to the boil rather than worry just now about the possible danger to his life from the cancer.

In contrast to these weaknesses in Asia which the Kremlin can so successfully exploit to its advantage, there are some strong points in that area. This bill has a lot to do with preserving and further strengthening them. One is Korea, one is Formosa, one is Pakistan, another is Turkey. In those four bastions, lying around the Communist bloc, are more than 2 million well-trained and equipped soldiers. It is possible for those countries to keep them in the field only because of the assistance provided in this bill.

Korea has the second largest standing army in the free world, Turkey the third, and Formosa the fourth. In these major bastions, plus Japan, the Philippines, Thailand and Iran, there are two and one-quarter million soldiers right on the job. They have splendid morale and the will to defend their countries, but they cannot do so unless they have assistance and support from the United States.

Occasionally somebody comes along and claims that we are using other countries' men to fight our battles. That is categorically untrue. We are not trying to get other people to fight our battles for us. We are trying to give other peoples, in response to their request, the capacity to fight for themselves, to defend their own freedom. That does serve our interest, to be sure, just the same as our aid to Mr. Nehru, if it enables him to keep his country free and out of the control of the Communists, serves our interest in addition to serving his. But our objective is not to get other countries to provide cannon fodder for us, as our enemies charge; it is an effort to give these people the ability to retain their own independence—even their neutrality if they prefer that.

There is no reason why we should refuse to help a friend just because it also helps ourselves. In fact, it is my conviction that whenever we do what is right for others, it will turn out to be beneficial to ourselves, too.

About one-third of the military assistance in the original Executive request this year for $3 billion was scheduled to go to those four bastions I have mentioned. If we vote to cut down the assistance to those allies, I do not think, Mr. Chairman, we are going to be saving money. I am sure it will mean still greater expenditures.

For example, we had eight divisions in Korea. Now we have two divisions there. Why? Only because we have built up and are supporting 21 South Korean divisions. It costs about 10 times as much money to keep an American soldier on duty for a year—disregarding the dislocation to his life and income and family from his being in the service—as it costs to keep one Korean or Free Chinese soldier in the field. If we cut funds for Korea so that it has to reduce drastically its armed forces, then we will certainly have to send more American units back into Korea. Does anyone want that? It will cost more money, not less, than we are authorizing in this bill.

I get letters, and so do you, saying, "Why send all this aid abroad? Why not use the money to build highways, hospitals, schools, and give better old-age assistance to needy Americans, or to reduce our taxes here at home?"

The argument is based on the belief that, if we do not spend this money for our defenses abroad, we will have that much more to spend on ourselves here at home. Unfortunately, it is a false belief. We will not have more to spend for things needed by civilians here; we will have to put all that money, and more, into expansion of our own Armed Forces. We will have less to spend for the well-being of our people, or for reducing the national debt or cutting our taxes.

This mutual-security program is about 10 percent of our total defense budget; that is all. If we reduce this 10 percent for those countries that lie around the only threat there is to our security, and those bastions are weakened, I do not hesitate to predict that it will cost us far more just to rebuild enough power of our own to approach the strength we now have through the existence and the combined strength of these allies.

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

Mr. JUDD. I would prefer to complete my statement.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman going to have any time in which he can yield?

Mr. JUDD. I do not know. I am willing to stay here, no matter how late, to answer questions.

Mr. GROSS. So am I. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and five Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, the first shift that the Kremlin is making, lessening for the moment its pressure against Germany and Europe on its west, and against Korea, Formosa, Japan, and Southeast Asia on its east, does not mean that the Communist threat to those areas is removed or even reduced. It means the Soviet Union is merely accepting temporary stabilization of its eastern and western fronts where it is confronted with strength, in order to press to its south and into South Asia where it is confronted only with weakness and disunity. In my opinion, its present tactics make it more dangerous to us rather than less dangerous; and permit less relaxation of tension on our part, rather than more.

The second shift that the Kremlin is making in its world maneuvering is from power to deception, from threats to tricks. It is doing exactly what a good football coach does when he has tested out his opponent's strength by a few power plays and finds he cannot break through the line. Stopped on the ground and unable to make gains through the line, the coach does not spend the rest of the afternoon calling the same power plays that do not work. No, he shifts to end runs and forward passes and trick plays. That is what the Communists are doing.

Our Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, has said the Kremlin has been compelled to make these shifts because of the success of our policies. That is true. But, the fact that we have stopped its power plays on the ground does not mean that we can let down, assuming that we will be equally successful in stopping their trick plays and their open field offensives.

Furthermore, if we relax or open up too much in order to defend ourselves against their passes and their deception type of warfare, they can promptly shift back to power plays and come right through our line. They have not weakened their military power. That is, they are at least a double threat now, instead of a single threat.

They could not easily get through Turkey and the northern tier in the Middle East, so they threw a forward pass over it right into Egypt's arms.

They met firm resistance in Southeast Asia, so they are seeking to throw a forward pass over Southeast Asia to Indonesia.

Faced with firmness in Germany and Austria, they are seeking to throw passes to infiltrated France and Italy; or to flank Western Europe, including Spain, by an end run through North Africa.

The fact that we have pretty good defensive plays to block their power plays does not mean there is any guaranty—unless we are extraordinarily smart, clever, and on top of the ball every minute—that we will be equally skillful and successful in defeating this new tactic.

Then there is a third shift that the Kremlin is carrying out, namely, a shift from vinegar to honey. Our mothers taught us we could catch more flies that way. Apparently the new leaders in the Kremlin are belatedly learning it, too—learning that Stalin's old policy of intransigence and threats was a mistake. It only stiffened our resolve. So they are making a drastic change in approach. They could not intimidate us with their tough tactics; we do not fold up under threats. So they are shifting from vinegar which only kept us awake and made the free world stronger and more united, to honey which regularly has lured the tired, or the gullible, or the peace dreamers into their traps.

What does this mean for us? It means that we have got to have better honey than they have—not necessarily more honey, but better honey.

Our programs must be clearer, more attractive, and more convincing.

Mr. Chairman, when we are faced with a situation like the dangerous and frustrating one that confronts us in this year of 1956—every year the fundamentals are the same but the details this year are different—there are about three courses, it seems to me, that we could decide to follow.

First, we could say that since the mutual-security program has not succeeded as we wished—here we are with at least as great trouble as in previous years—therefore, let us give up the program as a failure and stop all aid.

Second, we could say that since we have not yet achieved the security and the unity in the free world which we hoped for therefore we should double our aid—more of the same.

I do not think that either of those is the way or would give us any hope of improvement. The first would abandon the rest of the free world to the Reds; the second would only complicate the confusions and irritations that are developing. Either of them, in my opinion, would worsen our situation.

The third course is to improve our aid. We should take a good look at it and determine what parts are succeeding, are hitting the target; what portions are not succeeding, are not hitting the target; and then readjust the whole effort accordingly.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced and I think our study mission from the Committee on Foreign Affairs was convinced during its trip last fall through 25 countries and colonies from the Dardanelles to Japan and Korea, that the key thing in making the program more successful today is not the amount of our aid, but the manner in which it is given.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], who accompanied us, used to say, it is not so much how much we give as how we give it.

What we must have is not necessarily a bigger program but a better one.

The first question almost everyone asked when we returned was: How much do you think we should appropriate for foreign aid this year? But that is not the essential or the most important question. It is not the size of the program, but the intelligence of it, the quality of it, that will determine its success or failure.

How can we make it a better program—one that gets down to the grassroots better than it has done heretofore? The answer to that question will not be found in recriminations or regretting the past or bemoaning those projects which were ill-conceived or badly managed and therefore quite properly failed.

Rather, the answer is to be found in hard-headedly restudying the whole enterprise. In the beginning we were pretty much venturing into a new field without blueprint or even compass. Now we have been at it for 8 years; we have accumulated a great deal of data based on experience. We need to do a lot of homework on what that experience can teach us. We must make a long overdue reappraisal, not to assess blame for the past, but in order to win the future.

May I make about five main suggestions:

First, we must ask ouselves, what is our primary target? What are we trying to accomplish? I believe our primary target is, or should be, not just to make people fatter or healthier or stronger or richer or more productive; rather it is to win their hearts and minds, their confidence, both in the countries being helped and behind the Iron Curtain.

This is where the Communists generally have left us far behind. They have spent much less money; they have done far less to improve the economic condition of other peoples; but somehow they have been more skillful in their approach to those peoples.

We have done a better job with the tangibles; most countries we have helped are better off economically and stronger militarily. The Communists have done a better job with the intangibles; they have often given the impression of being more interested than we in the welfare of the people rather than in the power of their military establishments.

Surely the greatest paradox of our time is that we who believe and are constantly saying that our remarkable material achievements are the result of spiritual causes, have somehow got ourselves before the world as trusting primarily in material things—food, guns, and dollars. Whereas the Communists, who proclaim themselves materialists and even deny the existence of spiritual forces or values, have nevertheless managed to get themselves before much of the world as idealists, challenging men to forego material things, at least for the present, in order to work for things of the spirit—equality, comradeship, "democracy", "peace", "relaxation of tension", and so forth.

Sometimes I wish our mutual security agencies had in them more men who had run for office. For the first task of the personnel of our International Cooperation Administration is the same as that of the office-seeker, namely, to win voters—to win the confidence, the loyalty, the support of people. Whatever other qualities the candidate may or may not have, he succeeds only if he is able to win the confidence and support of a majority of the voters in his city or district. That is the job of those who work in ICA all around the world. The material improvements we bring are good in them-

selves, but their objective is also to win people's confidence so that they will want to stand together with us for freedom and security and prosperity for all.

Only as our programs win the hearts and minds, the confidence of people, and strengthen their will to defend their freedom, are we justified in spending all this money to increase their capacity to defend that freedom—their economic well-being and their military strength. To increase their capacity without winning their confidence is, in my judgment, an act of self-deception on our part.

Second, having determined our target—the winning of people's hearts and minds—we have to streamline the program to the essentials. Whatever hits that target, strengthen it, give it greater emphasis. Whatever fails to hit that target, or even worse, alienates people, drop it, or modify it.

In many countries we are doing too many things. And we are trying to do them too fast. We are like a teacher who would try to advance a pupil from the 2d grade to the 12th grade in 2 years. We have to be a little more patient and not expect spectacular results overnight. We are dealing with people with long histories, strong traditions, deep suspicions. To crowd them too much is to defeat our own efforts.

We have to learn more about them; and be willing to learn from them. After all, they know quite a bit about their own country and have some ideas as to what to do about their problems. Our ignorance, and the resulting arrogance, lead us into a subtle form of imperialism, unrecognized because we know our purposes are benevolent.

There is also such a thing as an imperialism of efficiency. In our enthusiasm to help, we almost take them over. A man in Burma told us in 1953, "You Americans are so aggressively friendly."

An efficient American arrives, looks around, and promptly starts in, "This is what you ought to do about your agriculture, your railroads, your schools, hospitals, and housing." Our very zeal produces an irritation that in some countries is approaching resentment. That is, we lose rather than win confidence.

These peoples have fought up to 300 years to get freedom from one alien control, that of Europe; they react violently against what sometimes seems to them almost another alien control—this time by us. They want first of all their full independence, no matter how much they need our material aid, our technical skills.

In Vietnam, we found our representatives working hard and selflessly—at 89 different projects. When we suggested that might be spreading ourselves a little thin, one said, "But it's much better than it was. We did have 240."

Now, Vietnam is a country that has survived thus far only by a near miracle; it is hanging on by a thread. Some 10 or 15 main projects may well determine whether it pulls through or goes down. Why not simplify the program to those life-or-death essentials? If the country makes it for 5 years, then we can go ahead with the frills, with more elaborate developments. The immediate need is the basic programs; too much beyond them only scatters our efforts, complicates our operations, and confuses the people of Vietnam.

Third, we have to have a long-range program. Why? Because we have a long-range problem. One does not solve a long-range problem with a short-range program.

But a long-range program is not the same as long-range commitments or contracts for specific projects.

What did we do after Pearl Harbor? Did we say, "Let us declare war for 1 year; and then we will stop and debate for 2 months whether or not to fight Japan a second year"? No; we declared war to fight until we won. We committed ourselves to a long-range struggle.

But we did not commit ourselves to specific operations or strategies. We did not lose flexibility in the conduct of the war. We did not decide right then that we would put greatest emphasis for the whole war on landpower or on airpower or on naval strength. We retained control of the operation. But the world knew, both our allies and our enemies, that we had declared war to the finish. The world could count on us and so had confidence in us.

That is the intent of the amendment prepared by our chairman, the new statement of purpose and policy in the bill before us. It says to people who may be uncertain about us that as long as the threat to our common freedom exists, we are in it to win.

The program must have both continuity and flexibility—as the President's mutual-security message to us pointed out. The two are not in conflict. Continuity is necessary to keep flexibility on the track; flexibility to give success to continuity.

The most important thing said in this whole cold war period, in my opinion, was said by General MacArthur in this Chamber, "Once you get into a war, there is no substitute for victory." Victory requires long-range purposes and policies.

If we are going to identify ourselves with Korea, then Korea has to pull through.

If we are going to put ourselves on the side of Turkey, then Turkey has to make it.

If we are going to ally ourselves with West Germany, then West Germany has to win.

The world must see that it pays to be an ally of the United States; that we have not only the power, we have the will to stand by our friends; that they can count on us to the extent that they, in turn, are willing to do their utmost.

We have not made that clear to all countries yet. We have got to have long-range purposes, policies, and programs.

Fourth, we have to have better personnel.

They need to be better selected. It is not enough to be good technicians or engineers. They need to be broader gage. Their job is not just to build dams or dynamos or fertilizer plants; it is to win the respect and good will of people. The way some of our men, although highly competent technically, tend to throw their weight around, or deal with the local people with a patronizing, condescending attitude, is thoroughly insulting.

They also need to be better trained and prepared. You do not send out a military man to head a big operation with only a year or so of training. He has gone through West Point or Annapolis. The Communists do not send people into these countries with a few weeks' briefing. They have been trained for months, sometimes years, until they know their jobs. They are all-around professionals.

My dad used to say to me when I was in a big hurry to get something done, "You never lose by taking time to sharpen your tools. You will have more done at the end of the day."

We have been at this program now for 8 years, most of the time on a crash basis. We have not taken the time to sharpen our tools. We would do better and have more accomplished at the end of a year if we devoted more time and effort to training our personnel so that they know more about the people and the language and the history and the overall needs of the country to which they are going.

They need to stay longer. Most go for 2 years, Well, almost anyone is willing to sign up for 2 years to go halfway around the world and have the experience of a lifetime. But by the time he gets adjusted and on top of his job, it is time to go home. Fortunately, more and more are signing up for a second tour when their usefulness will be much greater.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that in general we should not recruit for less than 3 years. Those who are not willing to stay 3 years would select themselves out. In most cases that would be a good thing. More can be done with half as many—if they are the right kind and better prepared.

And then they need to identify themselves more closely with the people. The president of a country that is one of our best friends said, "Your people work long and hard at desks in the capital cities, but our country is made up largely of farmers. They can't come in to see you during office hours; they are out in the fields. Besides they would be reluctant to come into your spick-and-span offices in their bare feet. Why don't you have office hours in the tearooms in the villages one evening or two a week? That is where the Communists are. You work with your papers and blueprints and programs; the Communists work with the people."

Our representatives also need to conduct themselves less ostentatiously than some of them do. Their success will depend not so much on how much they do for, as on how well they work with, the people among whom they are to live. To win the confidence of those people, we must identify ourselves with them.

Once we have determined more clearly our target, streamlined the program to its essentials, set ourselves to the long-range task, and secured better personnel, then, fifth, we need to decentralize much of the controls now held too tightly in Washington. Too often, operations get bogged down in redtape. In our proper concern to avoid mistakes or waste, almost everything has to come

back to Washington for decision or approval. But that takes too long. The fiscal year is half over before the year's program gets started. More decisions need to be made in the field. If we have more first-class men there who are better trained and know their job, they can be given greater authority, and can make more decisions on the ground.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, about three main facts stand out as we evaluate the years of effort in scores of countries. One fact is that some of the projects unquestionably have failed. Some of our personnel have produced more antagonism than goodwill.

A second fact is that, despite the failures, most of the world is still free—and it would not have been free without this mutual-security program. Therefore, it has succeeded remarkably well in its overall objective.

The third fact is that the program has saved us money, net. Without it, we would have had to spend more, not less, because we would have had to expand greatly our own Armed Forces. If MSA were to be cut off, we would not have more money for schools, hospitals, highways, old age assistance, or tax or debt reduction here at home, as many assume; we would have less.

The question, therefore, is not whether to continue the program; but how. How can we improve it so that it will do a better job in the future than in the past?

This whole problem is not a test of our strength, as a nation, or of our resources; it is a test of our character.

It is a test of our maturity, our decisiveness, our steadfastness.

Our relations with some of the nations still on the fence, even with some of our closest allies, have not been going too well. It is a time of testing of them, yes, but equally of ourselves. We must make it clear to all that those who stand by us will never be let down.

One thing that tends to pull some toward the Communist side is the fact that the Communists do not hesitate to speak right up for those who lean in their direction—witness today in the Middle East and South Asia. For us to appear indecisive, unable to differentiate between our real friends and our enemies, will lose us the friends and not win over the enemies.

Mr. Chairman, our difficulties are largely because we have not quite identified our basic problem. We have measured it too much in terms of supplying food, guns, and dollars. That we have done and can do. But men do not live by bread alone—or guns or dollars. We have not paid enough attention to the things of the spirit.

Men want to be apart; but they also want to be together. They want to be free; but they also want to belong, to be important, to be needed, to be appreciated. The Communists have understood that better than we have.

We have been able to succeed with the individual problems which we understood and set our hands to. Once we identify as our greater problem this task of winning the confidence of men, their minds and hearts, and set ourselves to accomplish that, I have no slightest doubt that we can and will succeed with it too.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to bring to the attention of my colleagues a problem which goes to the very heart of congressional consideration of the mutual-security legislation which we have before us today. It is a problem which I believe requires not only serious consideration, but also positive action in the form of an amendment to this legislation.

This bill authorizes the expenditure of nearly $4 billion for the mutual-security program for the coming fiscal year. This is a huge sum of money from any standpoint. However, not alone the huge sum of money involved, but larger questions of the role of the various programs covered under this bill in furthering our national security place grave responsibilities on each of us as we conduct this debate and as we ultimately cast our votes.

How well we fulfill our responsibilities will depend in large measure on how well we are informed about the purposes of this bill, the activities to be carried out under it, the results which have been obtained in the past, and the results that may be expected in the future.

Let me pose this question for you: How much do most of us really know about the foreign-aid program? We are told by the executive branch about its importance. Of that few of us can have any doubt. But we have been told by the executive branch a number of other things about this program. We have been told, according to the information presented to the Foreign Affairs Committee and published by them, of various activities undertaken in the past and of the successes which have accompanied those operations. How complete and accurate is that information? Is it in sufficient detail to give each of us, or even the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, a reliable picture of what has been done in the immediate past? I have reason to think not. As chairman of the International Operations Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, I, with my colleagues on that committee, have had occasion to examine some of these programs in detail. We have found a number of instances in which the information supplied to the Congress and to the House Foreign Affairs Committee is far from the full picture which Congress needs to make informed judgment about these programs. Let me cite you an instance:

We studied the conduct of our technical-assistance programs in Latin America last year, and we issued a detailed report on March 29 last. On April 13 of this year representatives of the Department of State and of the International Cooperation Administration appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee and reported on their work in Latin America in technical assistance. They reported to the committee that there were in operation 56 joint bureaus, known as servicios, in Latin America, and that 19 of these bureaus had been terminated since the program began down there in 1942. The termination of these bureaus is one measure of the completion of some of the programs carried on in technical assistance. These figures were submitted to the Foreign Affairs Committee, and they were accepted by the committee and appear in their report—on page 21, House Report No. 2213. But the report omits reference to certain details which, in my opinion, are very important and significant. Did the committee ever find out whether some of these supposedly successful programs were terminated because they failed? Did the committee ever learn that nearly half of those reported as terminated have been reactivated so that the figures are meaningless? There is nothing in either the record or the committee report which indicates that the executive branch made this clear.

Let me mention another point: The same presentation—hearings, page 298—and the same report—page 21—mention the number of projects undertaken—something more than 3,000—and refer to 1,853 completed and transferred to the host government. It does not indicate that some of these are not completed projects at all, but are merely bookkeeping transfers, and a number of others represent actual counting of projects which were closed out almost before they began.

Even the record of host-country cash contributions does not indicate that the computation was made at inflated exchange rates, which tend to exaggerate the contributions of the host countries. Let me show you how this works out. The committee's report on page 21 mentions that Latin American host-country contributions in the form of cash were about $21.8 million. But the report does not state that these figures are based on assigning International Monetary Fund par value to the host-country currencies. If you return to page 330 of the hearings on the subject, you will see an interesting table. It shows that the free rate of Bolivia's currency is 4,600 bolivianos to the dollar. Yet Bolivia's contribution is computed at 190 to the dollar. Brazil's cruzeiro is rated at 18½ to the dollar, while its free rate is actually 70.5. Similarly, Chilean currency is valued at 110 to the dollar, while its free rate is 487. The most favorable of these works out to about one-fourth of the value imputed to them. If this average holds, Latin American contributions are more nearly $5 million than $22 million.

Even when the very capable members of our Foreign Affairs Committee ask for supporting information for some of the statements made by executive branch witnesses, they do not get much that is truly helpful. I point to the effort of Mr. VORYS to find out in detail what we were spending $45 million on in connection with budgetary assistance to Iran in fiscal year 1954. The executive branch witnesses promised the committee an answer. What did the committee get? It got a document which said $10 million was used to help Iranian imports, $10 million was provided to temporarily support Iranian currency, $14.5 million was made available to Iranian importers, and the rest of the information was no more

detailed than this. Each of these items needs much more detail.

The $10 million which was provided to support Iranian currency was an unusual transaction. The Iranians needed to issue local currency, but under their law they could do so only if they had an equivalent amount of foreign exchange in their vaults. The $10 million we granted was used to supply that backing. It was, however, a temporary device, and the note issue was retired in a matter of months as their financial situation improved. Nowhere have I been able to find that the Congress has been informed as to what was eventually done with that $10 million when it was no longer needed to back the Iranian currency. The evidence is that it went into the general program, but we still cannot tell what it was spent for.

Can we in the Congress make informed judgments with no more than this kind of information before us? Can even our distinguished Foreign Affairs Committee do much more than report to us the same general statements that have been given to them? I think the answer in very large measure is "no."

Why does this kind of vague and misleading information so consistently make up the record upon which we must base our judgments? I think a very real answer to it lies in the nature of mutual-security legislation and the customs which have grown up in connection with it over the years. These, I suggest, make it incumbent upon us to take corrective action in amending this law in certain respects.

I think it is generally conceded that in the interest of flexibility in the execution of mutual-security programs the Congress has relaxed many of its traditional controls. It has written broad authorizations into the legislation. It has granted a number of exceptions to time-tested controls by making it easier for the executive branch to transfer funds from one appropriation to another or from one purpose or area to another. It has, in effect, delegated to the executive branch much of its own discretionary power over the expenditure of funds. It has done so because it has recognized the need for the executive branch to be in a position to take prompt action to meet rapidly changing situations. It has accepted the statements of the Executive that in many cases programs could not be carefully and completely prepared and presented to the Congress in advance. Thus it is that in recent years we in the Congress have regularly appropriated money for mutual-security purposes based on illustrative programs. These, as we all know, make no pretense of being firm programs, but are instead statements of intent on the part of the executive branch, illustrating what it hopes to do with the money Congress gives it.

Let me make it clear that I am not at this point questioning the need for either flexibility in the legislation or the use of the illustrative program technique. I merely want to emphasize the fact that our foreign aid legislation has this unique character. And it has this unique character because the Congress has accepted the argument that the executive branch needs this latitude in order to perform its tasks under this program.

The granting by the Congress of this kind of power; indeed, the fact that it represents a delegation by the Congress of some of its own discretionary prerogatives carries with it obvious implications. Certainly, under the circumstances Congress has a special right to know in detail just how such powers and prerogatives have been exercised and to have made available to it appropriate documents, papers, communications, and other records which, taken together, give an accounting of the stewardship exercised over programs so conducted. It is to insure that such documents, papers, communications, and other records are made available that I shall offer an amendment to the bill. In the course of experience of our committee, this amendment appears to be necessary because of an inclination on the part of the executive agencies involved in the nonmilitary assistance aspects of the mutual-security program to withhold information concerning the details of operations they have undertaken. My amendment reads as follows:

On page 13, after line 12, insert the following:

"(d) After section 514, add the following new section:

"'SEC. 515. Access to records by certain legislative committees: (a) Before any funds authorized under any title of this act may be expended or obligated after the date of the enactment of this section, the President shall issue such directions to the agencies and officers involved as will ensure that all documents, papers, communications, and other records on the basis of which any action is taken or any determination is made under such title will be freely available to any committee of Congress which has the duty of studying the operation of activities under such title.

"'(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the continuing availability to appropriate committees of Congress (pursuant to directions issued under subsection (a)) of all documents, papers, communications, and records relating to operations under any title of this act shall be a condition of the exercise of any authority to expend or obligate funds under such title.

"'(c) The provisions of subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply in the case of funds authorized under chapter 1 or 2 of title I or unvouchered funds authorized by section 401, or in the case of actions taken or determinations made with respect to such funds.'"

Our committee is currently investigating the operations of United States aid activities in Iran. Although present arrangements for access to appropriate documents and records are satisfactory, we were able to work them out only with a considerable amount of effort. Moreover, we have no promise that the time consuming and somewhat difficult process involved will not have to be repeated for our next study. Since we do have, under the Legislative Reorganization Act, the duty of auditing these programs unless special recognition is given to the special circumstances created by mutual security legislation a formidable obstacle will remain in our path and in the path of the Congress in its attempt to exercise adequate control over expenditures. I do not mean by this to suggest that the application of this amendment is only to the work of our committee, but I do point out that it strikes at the very foundation of the work we must perform.

I think I should also make it clear that this amendment does not raise any question about the constitutional separation of powers. As I have mentioned earlier, the requirements of mutual-security programs have been such that Congress relinquished to the executive branch some of its constitutional powers. All that this amendment seeks to do is to assure that Congress will be frankly, fully, and accurately informed of how the executive branch has exercized the discretion which Congress has allowed it.

As Congress has recognized the special need of the executive for latitude in initiating mutual-security programs, this amendment seeks only to insure that the executive branch will likewise recognize the special needs of the Congress in reviewing such programs. Because it arises specifically in the context of our mutual-security programs, I think the amendment should form a part of this bill.

I think the amendment which is proposed and the action which is required by it will reinforce rather than weaken that constitutional separation of powers which has so long been a foundation stone of our freedom. I urge its adoption as a necessary means of assuring that the Congress can exercise its traditional powers in this very important area of our Government operations. Without this amendment we are, I am afraid, in danger of abdicating rather than delegating a fundamental power vested in this body.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the distinguished member from South Carolina, Mr. JAMES P. RICHARDS, for his diligence, his remarkable patience, and his great ability.

It has been a privilege to serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee under his leadership, and I regret very much that he has announced his retirement from Congress. He is a kind gentleman.

By disposition he is moderate and fair; by intellectual standards capable and perceptive, and when these qualities are joined with accrued knowledge based on long experience, we have all the attributes of a great legislator.

The bill which we have under consideration today is his more than that of any other member of the committee, and I am pleased to say that I will support it on the floor of this House.

But I am frank to admit that there are policy questions and questions of operation in this legislation concerning which I should like to make my own position clear on the record.

Concerning the request made by the Administration for a long-term commitment, I want the record to show that I have examined with care the testimony of the witnesses who appeared before the committee and I do not find that a good

case has been made out for a long-term commitment by Congress with respect to our foreign-assistance program.

There has been some fuzzy thinking and talking about long-term planning with respect to this program. The Executive Department can and should do the long-term planning and Congress should not be asked for a long-term commitment which it cannot and should not make.

For the life of me, I do not understand how one session of Congress can commit successive sessions of Congress to a long-term program, and no witness who appeared before our committee gave us any real help with respect to this basic and fundamental problem.

We are living in a world in which changes take place rapidly. Tito and Yugoslavia are good examples of what can happen in a year.

Neutrals of today may be our enemies of tomorrow, and, since it is constantly suggested that one of the great needs of our times is flexibility with respect to rapidly changing world situations, it seems reasonable that the Congress could be expected as a matter of flexibility to take a careful legislative look at our foreign-aid program at least every 2 years.

And lest there be those who doubt the good faith and the word of the United States with respect to projects which may cover several years, the statement of policy on this question in the bill is assuring enough for our friends and convincing enough for our enemies.

It is worth reading as follows:

> The Congress of the United States, recognizing that the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered as long as international communism and the nations it controls continue by threat of military action, use of economic pressure, internal subversion, or other means to attempt to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent and continue to deny the rights of freedom and self-government to peoples and nations once free but now subject to such domination, declares it to be the policy of the United States to continue as long as such danger to the peace of the world and to the security of the United States persists to make available to free nations and peoples upon request assistance of such nature and in such amounts as the United States is able to provide compatible with its own stability, strength, and other obligations, and as may be needed and effectively used by such free nations and peoples to help them maintain their freedom.

I particularly approve of that part of the committee report which suggests that the military portion of the mutual security program be placed in the Department of Defense budget next year.

A careful review of the testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs leads me to believe that the requested appropriation has been inflated.

Besides, the Administration itself says, and I agree, that there is a great need for reevaluation and analysis of this entire foreign assistance program.

And, it is a fact that there is available some $5 billion carried over in unexpended appropriations from former years.

Consequently, it is commonsense to say that the Administration cannot spend the amount of money it has asked for in 2 years.

More importantly, it cannot even spend the accumulated balances of some $5 billion in 2 years and under this bill, the Administration has been given considerable flexibility and freedom of movement with respect to the transferability of funds from one purpose to another.

Actually, not even 2 years is involved as a new session of Congress will open in January which is a matter of only 7 months. If in January it can be demonstrated that there is a real need for additional moneys, I am confident that Congress will make such moneys available.

The Comptroller General, an Administration appointee, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently that overoptimistic foreign aid planning had resulted in appropriation of more moneys than could be spent.

One result, he said, is that the Defense Department is holding at least $400 million in foreign aid funds in violation of the law. That money, Comptroller General Campbell said, should revert to the Treasury.

Finally, but most importantly, the tax burden upon the people of the United States is already burdensome and crushing, and surely there is a point of diminishing returns and of economic collapse even for the richest and most resourceful of nations.

It is my considered opinion that the Communists are hopeful that the United States will recklessly spend itself into bankruptcy.

Therefore, until the program has been reevaluated and carefully analyzed and while billions of unexpended funds are available, I consider it to be a part of patriotic good sense to hold this appropriation within reasonable limitations.

It is difficult for me to understand our failure to make a more substantial appropriation for Guatemala. The administration request for Guatemala was completely inadequate and although the committee by its own action raised the amount of money available for Guatemala, it appears to me that the amount authorized by the committee should be increased.

Guatemala is a country located in the Western Hemisphere, and in June of 1954 it overthrew a Communist government which was a Red beachhead in Central America. As a result the Government of Guatemala is in great need of economic assistance.

Guatemala must be made exhibit A in the contest between the free world and Communist slavery.

It is the first country to actually rid itself of Communist tyranny.

In Guatemala, we of the United States have an opportunity to prove that a nation which throws off the tyranny of communism will not be deserted and moreover, that it will be given substantial aid and assistance by the United States of America.

Guatemala should be more than exhibit A in the contest between freedom and Communist slavery. It can and should be made a showpiece, for its neighbors in Central and South America, who are constantly resisting Communist enticements and Communist pressure. Guatemala is our friendly neighbor and we should help it to recover and at the proper time in the consideration of this bill, I intend to offer an amendment to increase the money available for assistance to Guatemala, and I hope that the majority of the Members of this House will support that amendment when it is offered.

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

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I wish to associate myself with the remarks the gentleman is making with respect to Guatemala. As he knows, I offered an amendment in committee to increase the money for defense support and economic aid for Guatemala by $5 million. I still do not think that is enough, and I intend to support the amendment that the gentleman expects to offer tomorrow to increase that amount by even more.

Mr. DODD. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. DODD. I have great respect and a feeling of friendship for my friend from Iowa and, although I have not much time left, I want to give him some of my time if I can. I hope he does not detain me too long.

Mr. GROSS. First of all, I want to commend the gentleman for discussing the provisions of this bill. He is one of the few speakers on the part of the committee who this afternoon has given particular attention to the provisions of the bill itself. On pages 8 and 9 of the bill I note this language:

> In subparagraph (B) (ii), before the semicolon at the end thereof, insert "or by reason of war, revolution, or insurrection."

Does this mean that this provision of the bill will provide that American investments in foreign countries will be guaranteed against destruction or damage by reason of war, revolution, or insurrection?

Mr. DODD. I believe that it does. I have not found the place. I am sorry.

Mr. GROSS. Page 9 of the bill.

Mr. DODD. I believe that it does from what I have heard the gentleman read.

Mr. GROSS. They already guarantee to provide for indemnity against expropriation; is that not true?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Now we want to carry in this bill indemnification for war, revolution, damages or destruction resulting from war, revolution, and insurrection. "Insurrection," I think the gentleman will agree with me, is a very, very broad term.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. That language is the exact language used by the President of the United States in his message to the Congress. He recommended that that language be inserted.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I am not interested in the language used by the President of the United

States. I am interested in what we are doing here with this bill ourselves.

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

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. That is the exact language that has already been passed by the House on three occasions but eliminated in conference at the insistence of one Member of the other body. The purpose of the proposal is to save money for the American taxpayers. We are already gambling billions of dollars on the survival of these free countries. If we can get American private capital to go in, taking along its own management, with the understanding that if there should be destruction due to war, revolution, or insurrection, the Government will reimburse them for their losses, we can cut down correspondingly the amount of taxpayers' money to be put into the countries. That is, we will need to use public funds only if things go wrong. Now we spend public funds every year, and the gentleman is opposed to that. It is a possible expenditure of taxpayers' money against a certain expenditure.

Mr. DODD. That is my understanding. I think it will encourage American private capital.

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wonder who has the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut.

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

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman should tell of his own amendment put into the private enterprise section of the bill, which helps to strengthen the bill.

Mr. DODD. I thank my friend from Ohio. It is a very simple matter. I offered an amendment, which I think the committee adopted unanimously, which should make more secure the investment of American private capital because it alleviates somewhat the fear or risk of discriminatory treatment at the hands of the government of the country where the investment is made.

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

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I wanted to say to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut that he has been a very able member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and while I have not always agreed with him, I do regret the fact that he is going to leave that distinguished committee.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much, indeed.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know of any law on the statute books of this country that provides for the indemnification of an American businessman for damage or loss sustained because of war, or insurrection, or revolution, in this country?

Mr. DODD. In this country? I think our insurance companies take care of that.

Mr. GROSS. I think it is written out in every insurance policy specifically and I believe the gentleman will agree with me.

Mr. DODD. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Last year when the foreign aid program was before us, I supported the committee's recommendation that assistance be continued to Yugoslavia. I did so on the basis of the calculated risk which our military experts had urged us to take. At that time, I pointed out that I had grave doubts about the position of Yugoslavia with respect to the free world.

Recently, it appears that Tito has moved toward a reconciliation with the Soviet rulers in Moscow. The doubts which I expressed last year are compounded in view of recent events. Only on the basis of self-interest and a calculated military risk was I able to go along with the recommendations for assistance for Yugoslavia in 1955. In view of recent developments, plus the fact that Yugoslavia is a truly Communist state with all of the evils of communism including the suppression of freedom, the continued assaults on religion, and the destruction of family life, I have more than grave doubt that we should continue to appropriate funds for Yugoslavia.

The calculated risk on Yugoslavia of last year takes on the appearance of an irresponsible gamble this year.

Surely in our own interest and in the interest of the cause of freedom it is difficult to reconcile continued assistance to Yugoslavia and meager appropriations for Guatemala.

Conscience compels me to state that I am disturbed about the flagrant gap which exists in the committee report with respect to a major crisis in our foreign relations; namely, the steadily deteriorating situation in the Middle East.

Failure to express these views would be tantamount to agreeing with the evasive language contained in the report, entitled "United States Foreign Policy in the Middle East." That section of the report includes a series of quotations from the hearings and from Secretary Dulles' speech of August 26, 1955.

I am amazed that this is the extent of the committee's consideration and recommendations with respect to the explosive situation which exists between the Arab States and Israel, nor is there any consideration of how to meet the steady infiltration of the Arab States by international Communists.

Soviet and Iron Curtain arms are pouring into Egypt. Egypt has recognized Red China. Nasser flouts the United States while he embraces the Bulganin-Khrushchev-Chou En-lai axis. Nasser has announced that he will soon visit Communist China, accompanied by a military mission to Peiping.

Syria is flirting with the Communist world and, according to all reports, is about to recognize Communist China. Moreover, she is negotiating an agreement for the purchase of arms from the Communist bloc.

Yet the committee report remains silent.

The Arab States, in their avowed purpose to annihilate the State of Israel, have embarked upon a campaign, growing more successful each day, to supplement substantially their arms and ammunition by acquiring jet planes and submarines for obviously offensive purposes. "Blockade," "nonrecognition," and "annihilation"—these are the three terms uppermost in the minds of the Arabs in relation to the existence of the state of Israel.

Recently Premier Ben-Gurion of Israel has offered to meet Premier Nasser of Egypt at any time and in any place, including Cairo itself, to discuss a settlement of the problems between the two countries and achieve peaceful relations between them.

Ben-Gurion is willing to discuss the question of borders, Arab refugees, and other political, economic, and military matters. The desire of Israel for settlement and peace is clear and unequivocal.

In order to induce the Arab States likewise to understand the necessity for reaching a solution of problems through the means of a peace conference, on April 10, 1956, our colleague, Congresswoman EDNA KELLY, of New York, introduced House Joint Resolution 600, requesting the President to instruct the permanent representative of the United States to the United Nations to request the Security Council without delay to convene the Arab States and the state of Israel and other interested nations in a peace conference.

I endorse that resolution as an essential step toward peace and security. But no mention is made in the committee report of the necessity for a peace conference.

This I completely fail to comprehend. I can only construe it as an abdication of congressional responsibility of the highest order, in which I cannot join.

From the quotations referred to in the committee report, there is no indication whatsoever of what United States policy is with regard to the area.

It is not enough to say that our policy is peace and security.

It is not enough to say that our policy is to maintain impartial friendship to both sides.

It is not enough to say that the behavior of the Soviet Union in the Middle East is "not so good."

It is not enough to say that this is an area "which is of great importance to the United States."

It is not enough to say, "The United States is trying to continue its foreign relations in a responsible manner."

It is not enough to say that "We want to maintain friendship with all the peoples of the Middle East."

By policy, we mean the plans and programs, if any, which the United States has in mind to carry out its objectives. Putting it another way, what steps are we preparing to take that will induce the Arab States to sit down with Israel, a state which has demonstrated that it is

essential to the well-being and security of the entire area and of the Arabs themselves. The committee report gives no guidance whatsoever on these questions except for the statement contained in it: "the committee has been reassured both on and off the record that the program does not include any money or plans for military aid to Israel or to the Arab States bordering on Israel." This did not reassure me, nor can it reassure Israel, whose preservation our Government has promised to maintain.

It is because of this gap in the committee report that I have felt compelled to state these views and to refer to the findings and recommendations which were made on this vital problem by a special study mission of the Foreign Affairs Committee last fall.

I was a member of that study mission which went to Israel and made its report. In that report we said:

> The study mission is convinced that the United States should and will continue to give full support to Israel. Under present conditions the United States must also feel the gravest concern over Communist infiltration of the Arab States. We, of the study mission, believe that the United States should make it possible for Israel to obtain the defensive weapons which Israel has requested. These she must have to protect herself against the offensive weapons being sold at ridiculously low prices to Egypt and offered to the other Arab States by the U. S. S. R. We object to an arms race in this area. Our objective is a peaceful solution to the problems of all the nations in the area. This must be accomplished by diplomatic negotiations at a peace conference where all the issues of the Middle East can and must be solved. The Tripartite Pact of 1950 should be reaffirmed with emphasis on the security for this area.
>
> The policy of the United States in the Middle East must be reviewed to effect a settlement of the problems existing there. Continued unrest and hostility among these nations and the recent campaign of the U. S. S. R. to penetrate economically and diplomatically into the affairs of the Middle East could spark a worldwide conflict. It is no secret to observers that the U. S. S. R. will use any nation as a pawn to suit its purpose of world domination.

I do not believe in a policy of assisting those who openly defy us and align themselves with the Communist bloc while we leave an avowed friend naked and alone. Such a policy could end in disaster. We know that every member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and every Member of the Congress, and every American wants to avoid such a disaster in the Middle East. The avoidance of such a disaster, however, will require firm, courageous, honest, aboveboard action by our Government and adherence to the moral principle of fair play which has made us such a great Nation and a respected people.

Mr. Chairman, thus far I have attempted to discuss some of the controversial factors involved in this legislation. But it seems to me that differences of opinion with respect to long-term planning, the adequacy of appropriations, the size and type of assistance, and the selection of particular areas for help, while of great importance, all fail to reach the root problem of our foreign assistance program.

And until we solve this problem our foreign aid program will not be fully successful.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. LAWRENCE SMITH, quoted, I believe, this afternoon on the floor of this House from the writings of the distinguished British authoress, Miss Barbara Ward, who has suggested in a recent article that the complete absence of any political or philosophical basis is the greatest weakness in our foreign aid program. I believe this is a just criticism and that it strikes at what I have described as the root problem.

Our foreign-aid program should not be based solely on expediency, self-interest, Communist competition or the cold war, but rather upon conviction and principle.

We have discovered in the last century one key to a shared sense of moral solidarity in the principle of the general welfare. This is the principle upon which our entire foreign-aid program should properly rest, for involved in it is the idea of universal brotherhood of men.

Over and over again we have heard it said that the problem of coping with communism is primarily an ideological or a spiritual one. And this is why we must found our foreign-aid program on a great moral principle.

If the basic cause of communism and its threat to our society is on a spiritual and ideological plane, the missing element in our policy of coping with it must be spiritual and ideological.

We can find this missing element in our foreign policy by rediscovering why we hold our democracy so dear and why we should endeavor to share its underlying principles and beliefs and blessings with our fellow men. Democracy is based on a Judaic-Christian ethic concerning the nature of man, his essential worth and dignity, and his inherent God-given rights and freedoms. Man is a valuable being.

Here is where we find the real reason for a foreign-aid program. Thus, we understand that we are engaged in this tremendous project not only because we must resist communism, not only because we must make ourselves secure, not only because we must have strong defenses, but more importantly, because it is the right thing to do.

This is what actually motivates us in the conduct of our affairs at home.

This is why we will not discriminate on the basis of race, creed, or national origin in our immigration laws.

We will oppose segregation in all its forms as a violation of the basic rudiments of Christian charity and another form of Hitlerlike racism.

We will support measures to eradicate slums from our large urban centers which to our friends abroad are incomprehensible in the light of our high standards of living.

If God has blessed us with fertile land and a population with a high degree of technical skills and initiative, we shall recognize our responsibility to find ways and means of sharing our surpluses and skills with other peoples of the world who are less fortunate.

Thus, in our foreign aid programs, we should be prepared, when asked, to tell our foreign neighbors who need assistance why we want to help them—that one of our principal motives is to help them establish and maintain a free society. We should be able to tell them why we attach such importance to freedom, and why we are interested in sharing it with them; that it is the nature of man which is at issue.

We should discuss these matters in our churches and civic groups, in our schools and universities.

We should call for volunteers and, like the Communists, develop cadres of young people to dedicate their lives in whole or in part, to serve these ends, both here and abroad. We have never lacked for volunteers when wars, in the traditional sense, have broken out.

But this is a new kind of war—the cold war—but a war nonetheless. And it is a war to the finish between freedom and tyranny.

The American people should realize that these problems are not to be confined to Government action only; we all have a stake in the outcome and we all have a role to play.

Those who recognize these things, have a responsibility to act and to give leadership to others.

We need bold and imaginative leadership to infuse and permeate our foreign policy with this vitalizing element. The people of the United States are ready for it. For this is not a suggestion to introduce an element not already existing on the American scene. It is rather a suggestion to recognize it, and to draw more heavily from our spiritual ideals in the shaping of our foreign policies and our objectives, in the conduct of our foreign-aid programs, and in the content of our propaganda. Let us not be ashamed to explain our ideals publicly, and, above all, let us act as though we really believed in them.

If such a dynamic or positive element were infused into our national thinking on foreign policy it would tend to emphasize the quality rather than the quantity of our assistance programs.

The magnitude of aid would not be so much the measure which is often based on immediate threats of loss to the Communists.

The measure would rather be the economic and social needs of the country or area and our own ability to help on a long-term and consistent basis.

The people who receive our cooperation would not be made to feel that they are simply pawns in an international power struggle between the East and the West.

They should feel that we are doing these things because it is the right thing to do.

And I suggest that the American people and their Representatives in Congress would be more willing to appropriate the necessary funds for these programs if they had sufficient confidence that those in charge of our foreign policy had clear objectives and knew what they were doing.

What these people need above and beyond all the technical skills we can give them is to find a way of life which will have some meaning and idealism in it.

They need to discover the essential worth and dignity of the human person, to develop a sense of self-respect as well as earn and receive the respect of others.

The personnel which we send abroad either under Government programs or through private organizations should be carefully selected on the basis of their suitability and capability to express and demonstrate these ideals to the people in the underdeveloped countries.

If we continue to flounder and drift in the conduct of our foreign affairs, we shall ultimately lose all the respect which our present position of leadership requires.

Should this happen, the cause of freedom and justice in the world will be lost.

I earnestly and devoutly believe that we of the United States have the greatest responsibility in this struggle. We are on the right road, and the legislation which is before the House will assist us in reaching our proper objective.

That objective is a world at peace under law. A world in which free men use and enjoy the blessings of creation and live in harmony with God and each other.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO].

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, ever since I have had the privilege of serving on the House Foreign Affairs Committee I have been especially interested in Latin American affairs. During the present Congress I have been serving as a member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. I have always considered this assignment a tremendous challenge and an opportunity.

From the point of view of its moral values, strategic importance and tremendous potentials, Latin America is a vital and essential link in the whole fabric of free world unity. While general statements along this line are made from time to time both in the Congress and in the executive branch, I feel compelled to say that we have not always shown by action that we believe what we say.

The programs for Latin America contained in the mutual security bill now before this House fall short of what I would consider adequate. They constitute what I consider only a very small demonstration on the part of the United States that we recognize the fundamental importance of Latin America not only to the security of the Western Hemisphere but also to the security of the whole world.

The 20 Latin American Republics have a combined area approximately 2½ times larger than that of the United States. Latin America is second only to Western Europe in its imports from the United States and it is the principal source of imports into the United States. The Organization of American States made up of each of the Latin American Republics and the United States is the oldest regional organization devoted to securing the integrity and maintaining the defense of an important free world area. In 1950 the population of Latin America for the first time since the colonial period exceeded the population of the United States. The present rate of growth of 2.5 percent per year exceeds that of any major region of the world. The population is increasing at a rapid rate. These are facts we would do well to remember.

No one can dispute the fact that strategically, morally, and economically it is essential to keep on the side of the free world a strong and dynamic Latin America. It is essential that we maintain a strong and prosperous Latin America if the 20 Republics and the United States are to gain any mutual advantage in two-way cultural, moral, and trade relations between them and us. And it is vital to the free world defense against Communist tyranny.

As recently as 1954 we witnessed the successful overthrow of the Communist supported Arbenz government in Guatemala. This was a government under the domination of international communism, not in the Far East but in our very backyard in Central America. We should all pause and give thanks to President Castillo Armas of Guatemala for having succeeded in overthrowing the Communist regime and for his efforts to restore that country to a position of stability and growth. This is all the more commendable when we remember that at the time President Castillo Armas took office he found the treasury looted, a huge public debt, and widespread unemployment; in fact, chaos was facing the country. Guatemala is the only country the world has ever seen which has been able to overthrow a Communist regime. I shudder at the thought of what might have happened if the Communist regime had continued in power. I shudder at the thought of what might have happened in other countries in Central America which form a connecting link between us and South America. Certainly, the present government in Guatemala deserves the full support which they are entitled to expect from us. We can do no less.

While I favor the other programs in this mutual security bill, I feel it is my duty to call attention to the relatively small amount which we are making available to our neighbors in Latin America. The total nonmilitary assistance authorized in this bill for all the countries of Latin America is only $65,850,000. That is for defense support, technical cooperation and the Organization of American States. The amount requested by the executive branch for military assistance for this area was $35,546,000, which amount may well be cut because of the overall cut of $1 billion in military funds for the entire military assistance program. When we compare these figures for Latin America with the total authorization in this bill of $3,563,475,000 it is clear that not enough emphasis is being given in the planning and execution of programs for Latin America.

Mr. Chairman, our friends in Latin America follow very carefully the course of congressional consideration of the mutual security program. To them, and I think there is much justice for this view, our lack of apparent attention to this hemisphere is something which they cannot comprehend. This they do not understand, not only from the point of view of their own best interests, but from the point of view of the best interest of the United States itself.

I feel that many of the shortcomings in our policy arise because of the cross-current of information which our various ambassadors to Latin America send back to Washington. This is no criticism of them, for I feel that in the main they constitute a body of extremely able and dedicated diplomats. However, I think it is essential that we consider United States policy and programs in a particular country of Latin America not in a vacuum but as part of our overall policy with respect to all of Latin America. It is for this reason that I am today urging that the President appoint a special representative to Latin America with the rank and status of ambassador, whose function it will be to consider United States-Latin American relations in the broad context of the best interests of the hemisphere. It would be his function to circulate among the countries of Latin America as special circumstances might warrant. It would be his job to explain clearly and quickly the policy of our country should that policy be open to serious question or misunderstanding or should it need special emphasis. He would not, of course, replace our ambassador to a particular Latin American country but would rather speak for all our ambassadors to Latin America, in a sense, on matters affecting all of Latin America. Appointment of such a special representative would strengthen and buttress the action of a United States Ambassador in a particular Latin American country through affording additional support at the highest level. It would give clarity to United States foreign policy in the area and would remove the confusion which frequently results from conflicting statements from time to time by various United States representatives on particular United States policies. Furthermore, such an appointment would give greater impetus to United States fulfillment of mutually desirable objectives sought by hemispheric conferences and meetings and would strengthen the position of the United States representative to the Organization of American States.

This post would require an experienced, imaginative, humane, astute, and understanding diplomat. I suggest to the President and Secretary of State Dulles that our present Ambassador to Italy, Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, would be an ideal choice.

No ambassador in our history faced the difficulties which confronted Mrs. Luce upon assuming her post as ambassador to Italy. Within a year's time, prejudices against her sex had not only vanished, but she had become one of the most loved and respected ambassadors we have ever sent to any country. Her brilliant record of achievement has been acclaimed by all. Her successful efforts to combat the spread of communism and to perpetuate democratic government, her job of weaning a floundering people from Communist arms into the western orbit, her just and laudable part in the settlement of the thorny Trieste problem, stand as impregnable testimony to a job well done.

Clare Boothe Luce has earned the reputation as one of America's frontline diplomatic representatives. Latin Americans would welcome her with pride.

While I do not know the future plans of Mrs. Luce, aside from the fact that she intends to return to her post in Italy as soon as she has taken the rest so justly deserved, I do know that she would be ever willing to serve her country in any capacity requested by the President.

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

Mr. MORANO. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I am happy to hear the gentleman pay this fine tribute to our former colleague, Mrs. Luce. I want to join him in all that he has said regarding the truly extraordinary job she has done for our country in a very difficult situation in Italy. But we who knew her in the House were not surprised because we had come to recognize and admire her qualities and capabilities and had learned to expect that kind of superlative performance from the able and charming and distinguished lady.

Mr. MORANO. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MORANO. I know that the President is cognizant of the tremendous importance of Latin America to future hemispheric peace and security. It is for that reason that the President plans to attend the Special Sessions in Honor of the Presidents which will be held by the Council of the Organization of American States in Panama City, Panama, June 25 and June 26, 1956. The announcement that the President will attend this important meeting has given new hope to the Latin American Republics. The appointment of a roving ambassador such as I have suggested will do much to fulfill this hope.

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

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM].

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I stand before you, my colleagues, after 8 years as a member of this most important Foreign Affairs Committee. I only regret that I am severing my membership with this committee and with this House, but I must say this retirement is not of my own choosing. During these long, tedious, and important deliberations I was in the district in North Carolina most of the time campaigning; but I tried to keep up with the hearings and have spent many hours during the last 10 days in reviewing the testimony, the deliberations, and the report.

I think I can speak with some intelligence on these affairs because after beating around the world during a great part of my life, and after several years in the Navy in World Wars I and II, I have very definite conclusions about our place in this world of ours, our responsibilities as leaders of the free world, and our obligations to our people of the United States of America.

The cutting of these amounts requested in this bill does not mean that this money will be saved. If we keep the same level of defense, it may cost us from 2 to 3 times the amount by which the bill is cut. Planes, tanks, ships, guns, uniforms, and other items cost a great deal more here than from our allies.

This country came out of two world wars infinitely stronger, materially and physically, than we went in. Statistics show that we would have lost 16 million men killed in World Wars I and II if we had lost the same percentage as did Britain and France. We lost more men killed in the War Between the States than in both World Wars. Our allies are bankrupt in men—the best young men get killed first.

The question of international peace is completely tied in with the questions of domestic peace and prosperity, because if we are to continue to stand off the forces of evil now abroad in the world, and at the moment being confessed in such an astonishing manner by the leadership of the Kremlin, we have got to follow a course that is charted for us by our President, our State Department, and the Department of Defense, using the checks and balances we hold in this and the other body based on our experience and commonsense. There are so many angles involved that it would be impossible to name them all; but these angles include domestic peace between labor and management, between the farmer and the consumer, between all racial groups, and a united front and the endeavor to follow the long-range plan that is best for the United States of America.

God has so blessed us that we are prone to hide our heads and say to each other that all is well and that we should forget other nations and look to our own knitting. Today, by chance, is the anniversary of the landings on the Normandy Beaches, and there was an example of cooperation by the allies that should set a mark for us to aim at during a time of so-called peace, but during a time when we have never lived more dangerously.

Under the leadership of General Eisenhower, who was given a free hand to organize this supreme effort to invade the continent of Europe, we achieved victory; and under his leadership today I hope, and pray with you, that we are traveling toward an ultimate victory of universal peace.

The example of victorious nations at the end of World War II will be noted in history as a turning point in world affairs, because instead of trampling the conquered, as has been done in the past, we loaned them a hand of sympathy and help and encouragement and brought about a strength and feeling of goodwill that has not been known before.

General Eisenhower is now our President Eisenhower, and he is my President and your President; and in a bipartisan manner I am proud to try to follow the course he and his peacetime staff have charted as the best American course toward peace. I have not always agreed with him and his advisers, but I have agreed that he is honestly and sincerely working, at great peril to himself, to make us realize that we have world responsibilities and that we must face them as we should face our personal responsibilities, down to each individual.

I have been amazed at the caliber of the men of this body generally. I compliment my colleagues on your hard work and intelligence, but I say to you in all frankness that what we do on this Mutual Security Act of 1956 may well mean our survival in a storm of unknown proportions. It is no time for loose talk or political partisanship or vindictiveness or personal preference, but rather a time for a prayerful request for guidance in behalf of our country.

The men who have testified before our committee have been picked for their experience, patriotism, character, and standing in this country of ours; and whether in the civilian components of the Department of State or Defense or in the military components of the Department of Defense, I give them credit for as much sincerity and as much patriotism as any of us. For some reason we have arrived at a situation where the general talk gets around to the topic of sincerity in these requests and to statements that "They always ask for more than they expect." How much better it would be if we took these gentlemen as a group at their word, as you would the managers of any business or organization of individuals united for a common purpose, and said to them in effect, "We take what you have said to us as facts, and we hope and expect that you will spend these moneys in the most competent and sensible way possible. And if there is any left over, you will come to the Congress and say to us, 'Here it is. We were able to do the job with less than we asked for'." That has happened many times in the moneys that have been allocated to the Foreign Affairs Committee and other committees, for expenses, and I am proud once again to be a member of a committee that has turned back moneys that could have been spent.

It has always embarrassed me to have outstanding leaders appear before a committee of Congress and questioned in a manner that would indicate their lack of sincerity. Men who have risked their lives in war and men who have made enormous sacrifices in peace are not usually at the top of various departments of the Government unless they have proved their ability as well as their patriotism. I do not believe our President would say to a group from both sides of this House, as this morning's papers reported after the meeting at the White House last night, that a cut such as proposed by the committee could endanger the security of our country unless he meant it. I take him at his word.

I give every man the right to his own opinion, but I have always said to my constituents when they have criticized me that at the same time I expect some constructive suggestions. We have had long experience in working with our allies; and it has been my conclusion, and is my conclusion today, that we need them far more than they need us. In Europe, in the Near and Middle East, in Asia, we have firm friends; and we have stuck to a policy of mutual security between friends and have upheld the United Nations as the best avenue of

peace; therefore, I cannot blame our allies for doubting our intentions when loose talk and rash statements come out of Washington that seem to belie our own sincerity.

I think few of you will disagree with me that our enemies respect strength, and what man does not respect strength. Individually we like to follow strong leadership. Individually we like strong and firm friends to lean on, and in our personal life we doubt the sincerity of those who talk about us in order to gain personal importance. As a Government we have had enough experience now in world affairs to believe that we as a Nation are young in diplomacy, and in the ways of the world, and we must realize that in our population, made up of so many strains and root stocks, we have various and diverse currents that run athwart our charted course.

Would not it be different if we had as many citizens of French or Spanish descent in our country as those of English descent? Would not it be different if we had as many of Arab descent as those of Jewish descent? Would not it be different if we had as many of Slavic descent as Italian descent?

Take the question of Yugoslavia. I have sat with 1 or 2 of my colleagues here with Marshal Tito in Belgrade and heard him say that in case of aggression he would fulfill his obligations to the United Nations. Is he not the only so-called satellite leader that has been called a traitor, a murderer, a deserter, and given unspeakable insults, to stand up and fight the Soviet leadership and by a show of strength win out to the point where he is fawned upon in Moscow and regarded as one who personifies strength and cannot be defeated by such talk. The papers reported yesterday that he said in Moscow that his people had fought so hard for democracy that through this experience he believed the United Nations was the final answer to peace. Then why should we try to throw overboard a country who has felt the disasters of world war acutely and has come out of it strong and with the respect of both the world of light and the world of darkness.

I remember a famous Marine colonel in World War II, Col. John W. Thomasson, Jr., of Texas. We were having a big argument down in the Navy Department in early 1942 about the situation in Argentina. I was outspoken in condemning the leaders down in Argentina for not coming in with us. After all our opinions were finished, Col. John Thomasson said:

> I'll tell you what is the matter with those Argentinians—they are pro-Argentine.

I think Tito is pro-Yugoslavia, and I want us to be pro-America; and I want us to attract and hold every ally we can get in our camp. The stronger they are, the better off we will be.

My mature belief is, as I stated, that we need our allies in the free world more than they need us. What do you think would happen to our country if certain of our strongest allies would announce, as Hitler did in 1939, that they had signed an alliance of nonaggression with the people of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I imagine the same foreboding wave would surge over our land as surged over Western Europe when Hitler made his announcement. I respect the right of every one to state his own opinion, but I do not respect those voices that are abroad in our land that chant a constant theme of "give-away" and "pouring money down a rat hole" and such similar statements.

Weapons are changing and being modified at a faster pace than ever in history. Aside from our need for fighting men and equipment, such as ships, planes, guns, tanks, and various war materials, we most desperately need brains—the brains of research and development from every point of the compass.

I want to call to your attention something that I have known since the end of World War II when I was associated with one of the greatest men of our times—the late James Forrestal. It was brought out at the end of both wars by our own miliary, and frequently discussed that we, the United States, had not originated any of the main weapons that won war. I think it will be interesting to you to have an incomplete list of these weapons because many of you who served in that war will identify them, and many of you who served at home will be familiar with them and their importance. Here are a number of offensive and defensive weapons originated outside the United States and which were of the utmost importance in bringing us victory. They were, in fact, the main tools of victory which were later developed by American ingenuity and know-how and used with such intelligence by soldiers, sailors, and airmen:

First. Atomic bomb—British.
Second. Jet plane—British.
Third. Radar—British.
Fourth. Tanks—British.
Fifth. Electric torpedo—British.
Sixth. Forty-millimeter Bofors—Swedish.
Seventh. Twenty-millimeter Oerlikon—Swiss.
Eighth. Acoustic torpedo—German.
Ninth. Magnetic mine—German.
Tenth. Degaussing—British.
Eleventh. Torpes—British.
Twelfth. Sonar—British.
Thirteenth. Depth charges—British.
Fourteenth. Hedgehog—British.
Fifteenth. Jeep carriers—British.
Sixteenth. Motor torpedo boats—Italian.

I am not belittling our research, and am praising our development and our productive capacity, which has been made possible through our system of free enterprise; but I do not want you to ever believe that we have a patent on ingenuity and ideas.

I am going to support the President's request for the full amount of foreign aid. If we are going to keep a certain level of defense and cut this amount materially, it will cost the people of the United States from 2 to 4 times the amounts of the cuts to attain this level of defense. I am going to place my confidence in our leadership, who are working as patriotically as we, and harder than most of us, to bring our diplomatic and military organizations to the highest points attainable. I want to plow under any soil banks we may have of hypocrisy and demagoguery and build up the most important soil bank of all—that of the strength of these United States, based on cooperation, hard work, and a spirit of sacrifice, if necessary, to maintain our position of leadership among nations. I ask you to purge your minds and hearts and make your decisions based on what is good for our country and good for our children and generations yet to come. The Bible says, "When a strong man, armed, keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace." I interpret that to mean moral as well as physical strength; and I am willing to go down fighting for any cause that I believe just.

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

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TUMULTY. Do I understand from the gentleman's speech that he endorses Marshal Tito's rule over Yugoslavia?

Mr. CHATHAM. I endorse Marshal Tito's stand against the Kremlin.

Mr. TUMULTY. Does the gentleman endorse Tito after he shot down our fliers?

Mr. CHATHAM. I take no part in that argument. I stated that I endorse his stand against the Kremlin and they are giving way to him.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, some of us here have filed minority views with respect to this bill. This has been, in our opinion, necessary in the past, and we regret we found it again to be so. These were filed not with any sense of pleasure that we thought it appropriate to do so. We did it, rather, with a sense of sadness that, in our opinion, the program had not been successful and, therefore, it was our obligation as members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and as Members of the House of Representatives to point out at least some of those things in which we thought the legislation had been deficient.

Obviously, it is impossible in a few minutes even to suggest all of the things in which we think this legislation has failed to achieve its announced goals. However, there are some points which I think are of so much importance that ought to bring them to the attention of this body. Accordingly, in the first place, let us ask ourselves in which direction this program has been moving.

Mr. Chairman, we have moved—and I think this is important—constantly in recent years in the direction of greater concentration of power in the executive department. And, notice I did not say in the hands of the President but in the executive department. We have tended to lump together money, areas, and programs to such an extent that it is difficult, if not impossible, for many people to understand what is proposed by the legislation here before us at this time. I am sure that there are Members of this House who have read the proposals which are here before us and have tried, in their own minds, to understand what they mean. They must have found

that it was difficult to tie them in with existing legislation and it was at the same time difficult, if not impossible, on the basis of information available to say "Well, this much is going to such a country and this much to another country and so much to another," and so on down the line. In other words, how is this House going to legislate intelligently with respect to this proposed legislation if there is not the detail before it upon which it can operate? Not only that, but there is a constantly increasing tendency to place more power, more very broad powers, in the hands of the executive.

Let me point that out by only two quotations. In the legislation as it now exists, and I am reading from section 418, which has to do with the President's fund for economic development, these words are found:

> The President is authorized to utilize the appropriations made available for the fund to accomplish in the free Asian area the policies and purposes declared in this act and to disburse on such terms and conditions, including transfer of funds, as he may specify to any person, corporation, or other body of persons however designated, or to any friendly foreign government, agency, or organization or group of friendly governments or agencies as may be appropriate.

In other words, under existing law the President has the power, under that section to give these funds to any person, corporation, et cetera, that he may deem appropriate. It does not say public corporation. It could be a private corporation. It could also be a private person. When that question was raised in the committee, the committee took steps; I may say, however, that the committee, in my opinion, took steps in the wrong direction because the language which is now proposed does not impose even that degree of limitation.

As proposed by section 201 it is simply this:

> The President is authorized to utilize the funds hereafter made available for purposes of this title to accomplish in these areas policies and purposes declared in this act, and to disburse them on such terms and conditions, including transfer of funds, as he may specify.

In other words, in the existing law we have said that he can give the funds to persons, corporations, et cetera. In the proposed law we do not put any such limitation on it at all. The funds made available under section 201, $243 million, can be used in any way the Executive may see fit within the terms of that section. Heretofore we have spoken about the so-called blank-check authority, the authority which exists in the Executive to use funds and authority with little or no limitation. Certainly we are carrying that authority in this legislation far beyond anything that up to now has existed. What I am saying to the Members of this House is that in this proposed legislation we are finding further evidence of the fact that there is an increased loss in the Presidency as well as in the legislative branch to control these funds and the policies of the program.

The previous speakers this afternoon have pointed out that heretofore errors have been found in this program. It is not at all difficult to understand why that is true when we have legislation written in such broad and sweeping terms as this.

A thing which you will find strongly urged in the minority views is that there is need for a restudy and reappraisal of this whole program. That was proposed, as I think all of us are aware, by the President himself when he suggested to the committee that it might be appropriate for us to authorize the appointment of a body to restudy this program. That authority is not given in this bill. But certainly I am one of those—and there must be many of us here—who feel that if we are going to have this program with all of the shortcomings which many of us find in it, certainly it should be subject to the most careful and objective study and reappraisal. If there is a program, which, as many of us believe, has not been successful in the past, then let us at least ask ourselves what we can do to make it more successful in the future if we are going to have the program.

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

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

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I offered an amendment to set up a commission to study this program; it was reconsidered and taken out of the bill.

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is certainly correct. He did offer an amendment which would have provided such a commission. The committee finally decided not to include it in the bill.

Our eloquent friend, the gentleman from Minnesota—and we have the greatest admiration for him; I know of no one who is more diligent, loyal, and patriotic than he—many times has used the illustration, and a telling one it is, of the patient who has been kept alive by certain medicine, although he is very ill. He points out that that may be the situation with respect to the world today. Here is a sick patient—the world—and, as the gentleman says, here is a medicine—foreign aid—which has kept him alive. I should like to take that a little further and say that it is not enough simply to keep a patient alive. We must call a consultation of physicians. We must call people in and see if we cannot get the patient well. We must change the medicine. If one kind of medicine has for a number of years done nothing more than keep the patient alive, let us see if we cannot find a new medicine, one which will provide a cure.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Is it something different from the blood transfusions that have been taken from the American taxpayers?

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

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is the gentleman in favor of continuing the medicine during the consultation, or does he want to stop the medicine entirely?

Mr. ADAIR. No, I want to review the whole situation and then try to find a medicine which will be successful.

Mr. JUDD. What are you going to do during the review process, stop the program?

Mr. ADAIR. Not at all. As the gentleman so well knows, there is enough medicine on the bedside table right now to last 2 years or thereabouts. We do not need for an instant to stop the program. It can go along.

As has been repeatedly pointed out, it is not so much the money which these nations throughout the world—and many of them are true and loyal friends and allies—most need, because many times the mere giving of dollars takes away self-respect from nations as it does from individuals. We need something beyond that. We need, and it is my hope that we may be able to achieve, the importing to these nations of the American philosophy of self-reliance and liberty—of the American belief in the freedom and the rights of the individual. That is what we must do, not rely on dollars alone, but to strive for better understanding among persons and peoples throughout the world and, above all, to rely, as did our forefathers, upon a philosophy and a faith.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. I would like to see him count them again.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum is not present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 58]

Arends	Forand	McDowell
Baker	Frazier	Machrowicz
Barden	George	Mack, Wash.
Barrett	Gubser	Magnuson
Bates	Gwinn	Mason
Belcher, Okla.	Hagen	Miller, Calif.
Bell	Hale	Miller, Nebr.
Berry	Halleck	Miller, N. Y.
Bolling	Harden	Moulder
Bolton, Oliver P.	Harvey	O'Hara, Minn.
Boykin	Hays, Ohio	Patman
Brooks, La.	Hayworth	Perkins
Brooks, Tex.	Herlong	Philbin
Brownson	Hillings	Phillips
Budge	Hinshaw	Pillion
Burdick	Hoffman, Ill.	Polk
Cannon	Holifield	Powell
Carnahan	Holt	Prouty
Celler	Hope	Reed, N. Y.
Chase	Horan	Seely-Brown
Christopher	Jackson	Shelly
Clevenger	Jarman	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Johansen,	Sikes
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Ala.	Simpson, Pa.
Dawson, Ill.	Jones, Mo.	Taber
Deane	Kearney	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	Kelley, Pa.	Thomas, Tex.
Dolliver	Kilburn	Thompson, Tex.
Dondero	Kluczynski	Thornberry
Donovan	Krueger	Utt
Dowdy	Lane	Vinson
Doyle	Lankford	Watts
Eberharter	LeCompte	Wharton
Engle	Lipscomb	Wilson, Calif.
Fallon	McCarthy	Wilson, Ind.
	McConnell	Withrow

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair,

Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11356) and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 313 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not here to defend the bill before the Committee. The next time I speak to you on the foreign-aid program, it will be with relation to the money bill from the Committee on Appropriations. At this time I am expressing my own views and my own convictions; I am not speaking for the members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling the money part of this legislation.

I should like to pay my respects to the very able chairman handling this bill; he is not only a great chairman, but a splendid gentleman, the Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS, of South Carolina. It is my understanding that this is the last year our distinguished colleague will handle this legislation. I am convinced he reported out what he believed to be a good bill. It is not unusual for us to disagree, but in so doing we are not disagreeable.

I must state that I am very disappointed in the large amount requested in the bill before you.

The bill calls for $3,563,475,000, and notwithstanding the fact that the committee made a reduction of $1,109,000,000 below the request, the proposed authorizing legislation is still $860 million above the amount appropriated by the Congress last year.

In my opinion, there is even more confusion in the several departments handling this program this year than in previous years. If the Members will take time to read the hearings, not only of the Committee on Foreign Affairs but of the Appropriations Subcommittee, my statements will be borne out to them, notwithstanding the many tears being shed by some of the participants from the top echelon down.

Time will not permit me to go too far into many of the obvious irregularities and inconsistencies of the program, but confusion is still prevalent in most phases of the program.

Department heads are overemphasizing the importance of the loan provisions of the program. The report of the committee, based upon testimony made before the Foreign Affairs Committee, may leave you under the impression that there has been a very large amount of money repaid on these loans. I observe one figure indicating for this year that $15,126,000 has been paid on loans made made under this program. The testimony is erroneous; the departments are including a lot of bona fide loans made years prior to this program. There has been only $568,000 paid back on the principal on loans under the present program. The largest appropriation for foreign aid is for the military. Under the military there are no loans, and none of the money is to be repaid.

The same thing is true under the technical aid program. Any loans would be under the economic aid section. Let me quote verbatim from a statement of Mr. John B. Hollister, the Director of International Cooperation Administration:

> Our efforts this year to increase the volume of loans made under the program have had somewhat disappointing results. We have found that the use of a loan rather than a grant is frequently, for either political or economic reasons, inconsistent with the attainment of our objectives, unless the loans are so soft, that is, their terms are so liberal, that they constitute partial grants.

The amount of money being paid back on the loans made under this program would not, in fact, finance the overall program for 12 hours. So let us be realistic about this matter.

Last year, when the Congress reduced the foreign-aid appropriation by $500 million, many were lamenting that the program had been ruined. What happened? This year every witness in the top echelon who has appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee has testified, in effect, that the reduction last year did not handicap the program.

Last year, after hearings by the Foreign Affairs Committee and by the Appropriations Committee and while the bill was in conference, we discovered the Air Force had a check in the amount of $302 million belonging to the foreign-aid program. The FOA Administrator did not know what to do with the check. Inasmuch as he did not know this money was due until hearings were completed and the bill passed.

This year is no different than last year. Confusion is the order of the day. Last year we had a beautiful letter from the Defense Department which obviously was purposely written to confuse members of the committee. It meant one thing at one time and another thing at another time. It was written to be interpreted two ways. Do you remember that incident of planned confusion?

Let me say this: Of the total amount available for fiscal 1955, 22 percent of the entire annual appropriation was obligated on the last day of the fiscal year. To be more specific, 22 percent of the entire annual appropriation was obligated during the last hour of the last day of the fiscal year. Confusion? I would say so. But they hollered just as loud last year as they are hollering now.

Let me quote from an editorial that ran in many of the newspapers throughout the Nation only recently:

> Now the General Accounting Office, which keeps track of how the money is ultimately used, reports that the foreign-aid program suffers from poor planning, lack of accountability, poor coordination, overestimating capabilities of recipient countries, and overambitious programs.
>
> These critical remarks could be multiplied many times to prove that the present American-aid program is in dire need of reexamination and revision.

Another quotation is as follows:

> Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito, who is next on the list of Kremlin red-carpet visitors, suggested on the eve of his departure for Moscow that American aid henceforth should be in the form of long-term loans rather than outright grants.

Are we going to force Yugoslavia's Tito to accept free grant aid after his statement?

May I quote very briefly from a United Press release from Moscow:

> President Tito of Yugoslavia said today he is sure there will never again be a split among Communist countries such as occurred when he broke with the Kremlin in 1948. The spirit of Lenin's principles of collective leadership are such that I am sure there will never again be misunderstanding among the nations of the socialist camp, he declared in a speech broadcast from Kievsky station in Russia.

This bill actually includes money for Yugoslavia. When the chips are down, where will Tito be?

I believe there is sufficient evidence to justify additional cuts below the committee recommendation. When I heard today that there was a lot of lamenting the reduction proposed and pleading to increase the amount recommended by the committee, I could hardly believe the story.

The distinguished chairman of this committee knows that I am going to vote against this bill. That is why I said at the beginning of my statement that the next time I speak to you I will be representing the Committee on Appropriations and not necessarily expressing my own views.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman for the statement that he is making. I wonder if in the brief time that he has he would address himself to the testimony of the Comptroller General of the United States before the Foreign Relations Committee of the other body concerning the $400 million the Department of Defense has illegally held of mutual assistance funds since 1954.

Mr. PASSMAN. I should not like to do that, but I should like to say that you have all the proof you need that this program is just as confused this year as it was last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that no one will get the idea from the remarks that I am about to make that I am an isolationist or that I am unsympathetic to the economic and social problems facing the world today. Nor do I want anyone to think that I am unmindful of the magnificent contributions made by our allies during World War II and the part these nations have played since that time to uphold the principles of freedom.

Nothing could be further from the truth. I sincerely appreciate the great sacrifice made by our allies during World War II to secure the peace, and

I am fully aware of the economic pressures confronting them in their struggle to hold back atheistic communism. I am also aware of and have a sympathetic understanding of the economic and social problems facing certain nations today who were not associated with us in the great war, but who are either neutral or allied with us in our effort to halt the spread of communism.

Mr. Chairman, no one can say that we have not been generous in sharing our wealth with these nations. Believing that we shared a common objective, namely the establishmjent of a free world, the United States has poured out its wealth in a never ending stream. Since 1940, this Nation has given allied and neutral countries over $100 billion in economic and military aid. Year after year we have seen bills come before the Congress to appropriate this huge sum of money and the Congress has always responded.

Roughly breaking down the money we have spent for military and economic aid, we find that we spent some $50 billion during World War II, some $26 billion for postwar relief and approximately $26 billion has been spent since the beginning of the Korean war. Since World War II we have actually spent more for military and economic aid than we spent for such purposes during the war. These billions of dollars have gone to pay for everything from tanks for France to plows for Iran.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the time has now come for this country to reevaluate the whole field of our foreign-aid spending. I believe the time has come when we should make an honest effort to ascertain if the huge spending programs we are approving year after year are actually accomplishing their purpose, namely, halting the spread of international communism, or if they are falling short of their objectives. And while we are examining foreign-aid spending, we might take a sober look at what it is doing to the financial condition of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons advanced by the proponents of foreign aid is that it cements friendship for the United States and the ideals for which it stands. However, experience in a number of countries has taught us that this argument is not sound. The bitter truth is that American prestige in many of the countries we have been so generous with is lower now than at any time since World War II. Our dollars have not made us popular in India, Iceland, Burma, Greece, France, and Ceylon, to name a few countries.

The United States News and World Report recently had an article which vividly illustrates this point in connection with India. The article pointed out that since 1950 the United States has given India $64.3 million for iron and steel, $42.6 million for irrigation and power, $38.9 million for railroads, $24.5 million for grain, $20.9 million for fertilizers, $16 million for cotton, $15.8 million for technical services, $15.1 million for malaria control, $12.8 million for village development, $12.2 million for schools and training, $4.9 million for sanitation, $2.3 million for airports and $21 million for other projects. This makes a total in gifts to India of $291 million. In addition to this huge amount, we have loaned India since 1950 $190 million to buy wheat and $40 million in connection with a world bank loan. The grand total of aid to India since 1950 amounts to the staggering figure of $521 million. At this point, I would like to say that $521 million far exceeds the amount of money it took to run the State of North Carolina in all its departments during the year 1955. This huge sum is far more than the $380 million it took to construct the Panama Canal and would build two Hoover Dams at $172 million each, with millions to spare.

Now how much friendship and popularity has the expenditure of this $521 million bought for the American people in India? Well, let us examine the record. India opposes practically every objective we have in the Far East. She trades with Communist countries and during the first 6 months of 1955 her trade with Red China alone more than doubled. India champions the seating of Red China in the United Nations and is in favor of giving her Formosa. She has welcomed with open arms Soviet technicians to work in her 5-year plan of internal development. She seeks arms from Russia while at the same time she opposes our arming of Pakistan, a stanch friend of the United States and freedom in the Far East. Indian newspapers praise Russia and hail her as a benefactor while seldom mentioning the tremendous aid the United States has been giving India. Now, what has Russia done for India to merit all the praise and expressions of warm friendship she is receiving in that country? Again let us look at the record. Since 1950 Russia has given India $500,000 for electrical equipment and $200,000 for disaster relief. In addition Russia has loaned India $100 million to purchase a steel mill as yet unbuilt. Total Soviet aid to India amounts to $100.7 million in contrast to the $521 million we have put up. Though United States aid to India has been five times greater than that of the Soviet Union, still the Russians get the praise while all we merit is criticism and obstruction in the Far East.

Now let us examine what has been our experience in another country in our attempt to help that country combat communism and regain economic strength. Let us take a look at Greece. During the past 12 years we have poured over $1.8 billion of economic assistance into that country. This amounts to approximately $214 for every man, woman, and child in Greece and is the highest per capita amount of aid we have given to any country on the European Continent.

Mr. Henry Gemmill, writing in the Wall Street Journal for January 26, 1956, states that this huge sum of money has put Greece back on her economic feet—no doubt about that—but as far as winning friends and influencing people the high investment must be rated a dubious success. Mr. Gemmill says that today the sentiment of the Greek people toward the United States ranges from mild exasperation to violent opposition. And in recent months this feeling has been intensified through our neutralist stand with respect to the island of Cyprus.

In Ceylon we have spent American taxpayers' money and in that country the West is having trouble. Recent elections in Ceylon have resulted in a neutralist landslide.

In Iceland there is a mounting feeling among the people for the removal of American soldiers. We are continually being blamed by that country for her economic ills. I have no doubt in my mind that the criticism is well founded. It would be impossible to pour the money we have into Iceland without disrupting the economy of her 160,000 people.

There are other examples where the United States is coming out second best in her policy of spending money to influence people, but I will not burden the House with a discussion of them at the present time. Sufficient is it to say that dollars will not buy friendship in the family of nations any more than it will in the private relationship between individuals.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been said that the tremendous sums we have been spending overseas are necessary to halt the onward march of communism. Has our spending, then, been successful in this objective? Apparently not, for at the beginning of 1945 there were less than 200 million people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. Now, 11 years later, over 900 million people are Communist ruled. In addition, countries representing over 500 million people have elected to follow a neutralist course rather than to join in collective security. Many of these countries now behind the Iron Curtain were recipients of generous American aid in the past. At the present time we are giving or lending money to every one of the so-called neutralist nations.

The proponents of foreign aid also advance the argument that it is our duty to raise the economies of foreign countries because poverty among the working class of people breeds communism. But this line of reasoning is also subject to questioning. In France over one-fourth of the voters cast Communist ballots this year. The past 4 years have seen rising wages and prosperity in that country. Yet, where do we find the French Communists? Not among the poor class of workers. The greatest Communist strength is among the highest paid French workers. The same thing holds true in Italy. Communism is strongest in the high-wage industrial cities of northern Italy and lowest in the poverty-stricken southern portion of the country. The billions we have poured into France and Italy have given those countries their greatest level of prosperity, but the money has failed to halt the growth of internal communism. Communism will be halted in these countries, as in any other country, when the will of the people is strong enough to resist it and not before.

Mr. Chairman, I now turn to what I consider to be the most important factor in any discussion of our foreign-aid spending, or, for that matter, in any domestic financial undertaking this Gov-

ernment enters into. And that is the relation of continued Government spending to the financial health and economic stability of the United States. As much as we desire to spend here at home, we must never do so to the extent that the financial security of the United States is undermined. The well-being of this generation of Americans as well as the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity rests upon the continued solvency of the United States. Strike down or in any way impair this Government's financial integrity and you will open the United States to Communist enslavement as sure as if the struggle had been lost on the field of battle. And all too well do we realize that if this Nation weakens and falls, Christian civilization with all its blessings of liberty and justice, with all its promise of the future, will perish from the earth and not be known again in our time.

It behooves us, therefore, to adopt and steadfastly maintain as our first consideration, and under all circumstances, the continued economic health and well-being of the United States. So long as the United States maintains her economic health, there will be hope for the rest of the world, whether free or enslaved.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the total debt of the United States now stands at the tremendous figure of $276 billion. This is more than the combined national debts of the nations of the free world. Our debt amounts to approximately $1,600 for every man, woman, and child in the country. It hangs over our heads like a giant threatening cloud and casts a shadow far into the future. If we should work a miracle and balance the budget at this session of the Congress and start paying off our national debt at the rate of $1 billion a year, it would take us 276 years to retire it. This statement takes on added significance when we realize that the United States is only 181 years old. If we could be fortunate enough to retire our national debt at the rate of $2 billion a year, it would take us 138 years. It gives us something to contemplate when we realize that in 1913 the total cost of all activities of the Federal Government was only $1 billion whereas today the interest alone on the national debt exceeds $6 billion.

Mr. Chairman, if we cannot make a start toward the reduction of our national debt and at the same time lessen the load of our tremendous annual interest charge during this period of great prosperity, then when will we ever be able to do so. I am afraid that those who come before us and advocate continued long-range foreign aid spending have no concern over the national debt. I am afraid they follow the easy path and abandon the burden of debt to future generations of Americans as yet unborn.

Foreign aid spending for the past several years has been costing every American family, from the richest to the poorest, approximately $105 per year. Every billion dollars we appropriate adds another $24 to the family burden. When we pause to consider that the average median income for the American family is $3,400 a year, a yearly foreign aid contribution of $105 or $130 is hard to realize. But, of course, not every American family pays its foreign aid contribution every year. However, it pays its share and the rest is made up from those with higher incomes and the balance is tagged onto the national debt.

Mr. Chairman, we hear so much about tax relief for the American people. Well, if we want to give them tax relief all we have to do is scale down or better still, eliminate unnecessary foreign aid spending. To do so would lighten the tax burden for the American people to the extent that millions of small income Americans could forget about paying Federal income taxes.

I cannot vote for any program that reaches down in the pockets of the textile workers and farmers of my congressional district and takes dollars to subsidize Communist-sympathizing India or Communist-dominated Yugoslavia under Tito. I cannot support any program, foreign or domestic, which continues to pile debt upon debt and thereby undermine the financial foundation of this Republic.

Mr. Chairman, the people of my congressional district are 100 percent opposed to communism. They stand ready, within reason, to help those who have the will and the national pride to help themselves. My people feel that they have not been ungenerous with the oppressed peoples of the world. Rather they feel that they have been, in many instances, generous to a fault and that the time has now come for a cold, realistic reexamination of our foreign-aid spending. The people of the Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina are willing to assist less fortunate people of the world in their quest for freedom and a higher standard of living but they are not willing to destroy the United States in the attempt.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, should like to join those who have spoken before me paying tribute to our distinguished chairman whom we are losing this year, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. I think almost everything has been said that could be said about him, but I want to say, speaking personally, like my colleagues, we will miss him very much in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, for the first time since coming to Congress, I rise in support of mutual security legislation and, more specifically, in support of H. R. 11356, the bill now before us.

This bill reminds me somewhat of the agricultural legislation recently passed by the House. As was stated at that time, this is not the best piece of legislation which we could devise but it is the best which could pass this House. I hope to see it improved at such a time when amendments are in order but if it remains in its present form, I shall feel able to vote for it.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that all sorts of dire predictions have been made regarding the effects the committee reductions of slightly more than a billion dollars would have on our foreign-aid program. I understand that administration spokesmen have been urging the appropriate committee of the other body to restore the cuts. Now I would like to read the opinion of an outstanding Eisenhower supporter, Mr. John S. Knight, publisher of the Knight newspapers which, I am sure, are known to many of my colleagues. I quote from Mr. Knight's editorial of May 27:

> The House Foreign Affairs Committee has, by a 24 to 4 vote, approved a billion dollar cut in the administration's nearly $5 billion foreign aid bill.
>
> This slash is long overdue and should be supported by both Houses of Congress. Our foreign economic and military aid programs beg to be reappraised and revised downward.
>
> It was originally intended that military aid would help get our allies started on rearmament, just as Marshall plan economic help was supposed to be of temporary duration until Europe was rehabilitated.
>
> Both now appear, under one form or another, to have become a permanent part of our foreign policy, with the time-worn rationalization that these programs bolster the free world against communism.
>
> If Europe cannot now, with its present prosperity, support a military defense establishment, what kind of allies do we have? Many of France's American-financed divisions have been sent to quell the North Africa revolt.
>
> Germany is years behind her commitments to the European defense plan.

Mr. Chairman, since John Knight is not only not an isolationist but has, on occasion, even been criticized for being too much of an internationalist, I felt his words were particularly appropriate at this time.

Now if this is to be a permanent program, a permanent part of our foreign policy and one designed to outlast even the cold war, I believe its primary purpose should be designed to advance American interests in the world, the welfare and security of our own people.

I think our foreign-aid program would be better understood and respected abroad if it gave more priority to what was strictly in the best interests of the United States. Such a course of action might not always gain us friends but the realistic pursuit of our own interests would be a policy which anyone could understand. As the Saturday Evening Post said in a recent editorial:

> What we do in this field will be more effective in all respects, including the cooperation of the recipients, if we lay it on the line that our generosity is at least as closely related to our self-interest as the willingness of others to accept it is to their self-interest. Once that were made clear, we should soon find ourselves less frequently accused of using foreign aid to further some dark and devious imperialistic scheme.

It is very simple, Mr. Chairman. The average native in a middle or far eastern country is unable to understand our foreign-aid program as conducted on its present basis. With his hidden fears of colonialism, he is suspicious of whatever he does not understand and immediately suspects and looks for an ulterior motive. Finding none, he increases his suspicion, both of the giver and the motive of the gift. This is due to the fact that we have failed to show, by our words and deeds, that our investments are expected to return something of benefit to the United States.

Now let me return to the question of the billion dollar cut in military aid. I noticed that recently the director of the International Cooperation Administration declared that this cut, if retained, would be unfortunate because it would upset administration planning. But it was my understanding that administration policy in this matter was now at the crossroads. How else can one reconcile the intention of the Executive to appoint a commission for the purpose of reviewing and reappraising this entire subject? Frankly, Mr. Chairman, this is nothing but an interim policy which we are considering today. It is a form of marking time while important policy decisions are being considered and prepared for the future. But I cannot reconcile a $4.6 billion authorization request with marking time.

This was a reduction in military aid. Now the administration has indicated a belief that the Soviets have altered their own policy, from one of force to the so-called competitive coexistence. The administration is apparently willing to go along with this presumed switch to a certain extent as shown by the decision to let General Twining visit Moscow, a decision, which, incidentally, I thoroughly deplore. But if it is now believed that the Soviets represent no military threat at present, why was it thought necessary nearly to double the request for the military part of the program?

Many will say that we must not trust the Soviets and that we must keep our guard up. I thoroughly agree with such statements. And I would be very happy, Mr. Chairman, to take this billion dollars which the committee has cut and vote to increase our own defense budget by such an amount. I would much rather see that money, if it is needed for defense, be spent for American weapons than to put it into the hands of other peoples who are perfectly capable of protecting themselves. If the British want to kill Cypriots or the French to shoot down Algerians, they may have a perfectly valid reason for being compelled to do so. But I cannot believe that our financing such accomplishments adds thereby to our own national security.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the President has been quoted as saying that the committee's billion-dollar cut "would be dangerous to national security." Now I would like to make my position perfectly clear. Although I have been known as an opponent of foreign aid in the past, I have never attacked the program as a whole but only what I considered its undesirable features which, to me, have included its size.

My own congressional polls of my district have, in the past, shown a majority of my constituents to be opposed to foreign aid. This year, for the first time, a majority indicated acceptance of the program at present levels, that is, the levels of the past year or slightly under $3 billion. My missionary work has, apparently, done some good. But, after convincing my people that a program of that size is needed for some time to come, I am not going to turn around and vote for a program of nearly $5 billion in the absence of more justification than I have hitherto received. It is going to be difficult enough to vote for a $3 billion authorization as it is.

I certainly concur with the minority views that a stern, realistic reappraisal of the program is needed. I hope that the administration's announced intention to make such a reappraisal will soon be forthcoming. During the interim period, I can support an interim program of the size which we have approved in the past. But I do not regard an interim program as one which includes a more than $2 billion increase over last year in spite of a 2 years' normal supply in the pipeline. I, frankly, see no reason to add to the pipeline at this time when we have no assurance that, following the administration's reappraisal, the pipeline may not be diverted or indeed stopped altogether.

Mr. Chairman, with the exception of this one issue, I will put my record in support of the administration up against that of any other member, Republican or Democrat. But I could not in good conscience justify voting for the original program any more than I can justify voting money for the Communist Tito or the Fellow Traveler Nehru.

This whole program, Mr. Chairman, badly needs a long-overdue improvement. We are not going to get that improvement as long as we take the unsupported statements of those whose jobs depend upon keeping the program going at higher and even higher levels. I very much fear that improvement, if it does come, will arrive only where drastic congressional action forces a so-caled "new look." I believe that our committee action this year has been drastic enough to shock certain people and to impel reconsideration of the overall program. If the House maintains this attitude and supports the action of its committee, I think we may begin to get some real improvement in the program. It is on that basis, and only for that reason, that I will vote for this program this year.

I offered the original amendment in committee for the billion dollar reduction which was at that time defeated. Upon reconsideration, I was unable to offer it again through a technicality. However, its adoption by a narrow vote was one of the reasons that I am going to vote for this bill in its present form. Other reasons are set forth in the supplemental views to the committee report which were signed by myself and the gentleman from Alabama.

As we said in those views, Mr. Chairman, we believe that this program could be reduced further without crippling it. We further deplore the continued inclusion in the program of so-called neutrals such as India and Yugoslavia. We reserve the right to initiate or to support amendments which, in our opinion, will further strengthen or improve the program. But, if the program remains in its present form, we will feel able to vote for it since it represents so great an improvement over what has gone before.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the mutual-security bill which we have before us represents an investment in freedom. Few reponsible persons would doubt the urgency, in the complex situation confronting us now, of continuing this program of assistance and aid to friends and allies. Though we may have wistful moments of wanting to go back to the simpler past when we could wholeheartedly devote ourselves to our own development and to exploration and expansion of our own frontiers; to the time when the fates of other nations were not irrevocably bound up with our own, we cannot regress. History has chosen us for world leadership. We cannot escape the responsibilities that have fallen to us, no matter how burdensome or perplexing they may be. This is the age when America must display the courage and wisdom of maturity.

The bill we have before us represents congressional recognition of this fact. It does not represent a great new departure in American foreign policy, since foreign-policy decisions are not initiated in the Congress. It is a vehicle by which the American people, through their elected representatives, have studied the existing mutual-security program and recommendations of the administration for the continuation of that program.

While the administration has indicated its deep awareness of the intense fluctuations in the world scene and has also suggested a searching study of the aid program and its effectiveness, it has not specifically proposed any essentially new ideas. The Congress might well have expected a new approach to the program, in the light of the change of Soviet tactics from military belligerence to economic, psychological, and political penetration and subversion. Indeed, some in the Congress may think a new approach is overdue, since the so-called New Look in Soviet tactics is in reality not very new. There is evidence that it began to appear as early as 1952, before the death of Stalin and the end of the Korean conflict. But while we hear that a reappraisal of the techniques and direction of our foreign policy has been taking place within our executive branch, no major new concepts have yet been proposed.

The administration did request a firm commitment by the Congress to a long-term aid program. While some felt that the Congress could not commit its successors to a program, this year's mutual-security bill does include a statement of policy, which arises out of an amendment proposed by Chairman RICHARDS, of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The statement "declares it to be the policy of the United States to continue as long as danger to the peace of the world and to the security of the United States persists to make available to free nations and peoples upon request assistance of such nature and in such amounts as the United States is able to provide compatible with its own stability, strength, and other obligations, and as may be needed and effectively used by such free nations and peoples to help them maintain their freedom."

Though the United States has been engaged in aid and assistance programs for several years, there has never before been included in the mutual-security legislation a statement of policy like the present one. This statement is a significant addition. For some years it has been obvious that the competition between tyranny and freedom is not a momentary phenomenon but will be the condition of international life for years to come. Many of us are well aware that we cannot dodge the necessity of a continuing, full mobilization of our physical and mental energies in this competition. We are not engaged in a crash program. As the statement of policy indicates, we recognize our commitment to continue the ongoing struggle for freedom—for as long as is necessary. It states clearly that we are in the struggle for freedom to stay and to win.

I believe that approval of the statement by this Congress will be a landmark in modern history. It will show the world that we fully accept the unrelenting duties of the leadership that has come to us. Our friends and allies will be heartened by this definitive evidence of our absolute determination to help them in their continuing efforts to work out their problems and destinies within the framework of freedom.

The statement is also a basic step in appraising realistically what our course in today's world should be for it makes evident that we must begin by accepting some enormous and even terrifying facts. This is a world in which weapons of incredible new dimensions are available. It is a world in which ancient patterns are not only changing but exploding.

And from Iceland to Japan, the seemingly benevolent tactics of the so-called new look on the part of the Soviets have been melting the periphery of the cold war. The great alinement of free world allies and friends is slipping and sliding, cracking and splintering like an ice field moving into warmer waters. In the Middle East, the Soviets have made inroads of inestimable importance. From this bridgehead, which they have long coveted, they can extend their operations into North Africa and south Asia where many new nations are in the first throes of independence. The Soviet entrance into this area is probably the most momentous event since the Korean conflict, and may ultimately prove crucial in the struggle between tyranny and freedom. The possibility of all-out conflict between Israel and her Arab neighbors may be our most immediate concern in that area, but it must not be our only concern. If it were, we would be dangerously underestimating the significance of the Soviets' penetration and influence in a part of the world where they have not been a factor before. It is a part of the world that is strategically vital and where domestic conditions may provide particularly fertile ground for Communist infiltration.

In Algeria, huge numbers of French troops diverted from the NATO forces are engaged in continuing hostilities over the Algerian claim for independence. Cypriots, Greeks, Turks, and British are spilling blood in the struggle over the Cyprus claim for union with Greece—and again, NATO suffers through the weakening of its southern anchor and enmity between its members.

Iceland's Parliament, the Athling, favors withdrawal of NATO forces from that country, which would mean the closing down of American bases in a strategically vital area. In Germany, Chancellor Adenauer's strength has declined, and many voices are calling for negotiations with the Russians for unification. The forces of economics in heavily-populated Japan are exerting tremendous pressure on the government to trade with Japan's nearest great market, Communist China.

These facts are complex and discouraging. How can we meet them? How can we reverse or offset our growing sense of having lost irretrievable ground to the Soviets?

Leaders everywhere are calling for answers to these questions. President Gronchi, of Italy; Chancellor Adenauer, of Germany; Premier Mollet, of France; Canadian Prime Minister Pearson, and Secretary-General Hammersjkold, of the United Nations, are only a few of those who have emphasized the critical need for constructive new answers. Every leading newspaper in the West publishes articles and editorials suggesting new plans, pleading for new approaches. In line with the thinking of many who fear the complete deterioration of NATO, I have introduced a resolution calling for the strengthening of the nonmilitary functions of NATO. This resolution suggests development of a jointly financed program for economic and technical assistance to non-Atlantic areas, for the more effective utilization and combination of scientific and technological resources of the Atlantic nations, for a jointly operated information effort and for educational and cultural exchanges.

The resolutions I've introduced along with suggestions that are coming from concerned people all over the world, arises from one of history's fundamental lessons—that an alliance whose original stimulus was a military threat tends to disintegrate when that threat recedes. This is what we see happening to NATO today. Yet we cannot afford to let the NATO apparatus crumble into disuse. Through it many nations have developed the techniques of cooperation, techniques which could now be directed toward extending to the underdeveloped nations the kind of help which has been so successful in reviving Europe.

My proposal also arises out of my belief that it could be a vehicle for transmitting skills and convictions to that great uncommitted area of the world where the demands for self-determination and the desire for independence are now multiplying. Through our participation and leadership in such a program as I suggest we could revitalize those moral and ethical convictions which led to the birth of our Nation. We are splendidly equipped for this leadership, as our mutual security program has already demonstrated, because America is the proof that the struggle for self-betterment and fulfillment of innate talents is not in vain. Throughout our nationhood we have been devoted to the cause of freedom and individual opportunity. The American Revolution, after all, is the great revolution that did not end in a new corruption, tyranny or moral bankruptcy. It is the revolution that did not produce an Emperor Napoleon, a Lenin, a Stalin. Instead, it produced a democracy with a daring belief in the ability to conquer any odds and to find a practical solution to any problem. This democracy is the idea that has revolutionized the modern world. We see other nations modeling their constitutions on ours, comparing their productivity with ours, measuring their liberties by ours, gauging their standards of living by ours .

The great giant that is America has also learned well how to gird its industrial sinews for battle. Now it must once again make use of its brilliant genius and resourcefulness in the production of ideas which alone can win the current fight for freedom.

The crises of a decade ago led to the very program we are considering today. World War II left Europe devastated and destitute, with its industrial equipment shattered and its cities in rubble. Shortly after the end of the war, the Russians began attempts at penetration of Iran, Turkey, and Greece. The Berlin blockade was a Soviet effort at strangling off the allied hold in that part of Germany. Pessimism and defeatism pervaded the atmosphere of Europe and gave the Communists fertile ground for attempting to capture control of the Governments of France and Italy. The Marshall plan, Greek-Turkish aid, NATO, the Berlin airlift—all these vital efforts, which within only a few years reinvigorated the West, were responses to Soviet initiatives.

The Soviet strategy has been changing again, and so must ours. We cannot be guilty of "too little and too late," for the fate of humanity is at stake. If we will but recognize it, the challenge which has been thrown down by the so-called Soviet "new look" is an opportunity to demonstrate again that democracy has the flexibility and creativeness to move speedily and produce lasting solutions to the world's problems.

We cannot win this titanic contest by being self-righteous or displaying a feeling of superiority. Great nations, like great men, accomplish most when their self-esteem is leavened by humility and the realization that no matter what they have done it is only a scratch on the infinite surface of human capabilities.

As we again give our consideration to our mutual-security program, we might reexamine the motives that led us to undertake this program. Did we intend it to be a dole to impoverished allies who might be expected to flatter our national ego with displays of gratitude? Did we mean it to be a pure philanthropy? Did we hope that the countries we helped would fall into the habit of thinking unanimously or simply echoing our thinking?

No. The program is based on none of these things. The program represents that special blend of practicality and idealism which is particularly American. It recognizes that a poor and hopeless

nation can lose pride, vigor, and the ability or desire to defend itself. It recognizes that freedom flourishes in an atmosphere with a rising horizon. It recognizes, too, that no industrial nation, including our own, can be self-sufficient. Rubber, copper, tin, manganese, industrial diamonds, and a multitude of other products without which our industry cannot function must be imported. The high-level skills in other countries are invaluable to us as we explore the growing realms of technical and scientific advances. The Russians may claim that they have independently invented everything from alphabet soup to sulfa drugs, but we know that international exchange of technical, scientific, and cultural ideas is indispensable.

The program we are considering includes an awareness that in this day of atomic weapons and jet travel, our ocean borders are no longer inviolate and that the combination of readiness by other countries' forces and bases for our own forces in those countries constitutes a first line of American defense.

Most of all the program is, as I have said, an investment in freedom, that priceless quantity without which the most splendid endowment of resources and talents would be worthless. The fact is that since the inauguration of such efforts as the Marshall plan and NATO, no European nation has fallen to communism, and the revival of Europe has given us allies, not satellites. In nations like India and Indonesia, our technical and economic assistance has been important in helping new governments meet internal problems while at the same time keeping the strength of domestic Communists minimal. Our aid has been essential to our Central American neighbor, Guatemala, which so courageously expelled the Communists who had taken over its government.

Now, I know that there are individuals in the United States who pronounce the words "foreign aid" in acid tones. In their misunderstanding of our mutual-security program, they call it a bottomless drain on the American taxpayer. I believe that these are the people who would like to have the United States run away from its role of world leadership and return to a state of mind suitable to a frontier and provincial nation.

I am glad to say that the congressional district which I represent is one of those in which the main body of public sentiment strongly favors continuance of the mutual security program. In a questionnaire which I sent out earlier this year, some 70 percent favored continuation of economic and technical assistance. It seems to me that this attitude arises from an awareness of the importance of our relations with friends and allies in part of our country where world trade makes a recognizable impact on almost every life. I believe, too, that the high level of understanding which typifies my district is the result not only of increased education but of political knowledgeability and a concern for world peace which is natural to an area which could well be a target of enemy attack.

One of my regrets regarding the bill we are considering is that it does not include an authorization for United States participation in the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development, an institution which has not yet come into being.

SUNFED would be the instrument for multilateral action on economic development projects. These projects are not of the type that would or could be undertaken by private capital. Roads, railways, canals, port installations and sources of power, clearing, irrigation, housing, schools, hospitals, etc.—these are not profitmaking enterprises, but they are the necessary preconditions for the establishment of sound economies, stable governments, and social progress. Expert information shows that the gaps between the economically advanced countries and the underdeveloped countries are widening, not narrowing. This is because the rate of development is faster in already developed countries.

The multilateral approach has the advantages of greater flexibility and greater acceptability. Also, in the speedily changing situation in which we now find ourselves, it is becoming increasingly obvious that we must have new ideas, new means to help the underdeveloped countries reach the point where they can help themselves. As is pointed out in the famous report which was done by Belgian banker Raymond Scheyven for the 1954 session of the U. N.'s General Assembly:

> It is * * * necessary to introduce structural reforms, while maintaining full respect for the sovereignty of the underdeveloped countries. It might be easier to carry out such structural reforms through an international organization, which is in a better position to spare national susceptibilities. The intervention of any one country in reforms of this nature would be a very difficult matter, as is illustrated by the reactions which have been aroused whenever lending countries have sought to make their investments conditional upon stipulations which the borrowing countries regarded as infringements of their sovereignty.

As our Ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, has said:

> Multilateral aid offers a way to prevent the so-called auction which some are trying to promote between the United States and the U. S. S. R., as to which will spend the most in an underdeveloped country.

Mr. Lodge continued:

> One advantage is that a sound multilateral program would provide no cover for engaging in political penetration which is what the Communists do and which we are unjustly suspected of wanting to do.

SUNFED, like the implementation of the economic, scientific and information functions of NATO which I have proposed in House Concurrent Resolution 216, would provide the kind of new impetus which we so desperately need today. The H-bomb stalemate between the United States and Russia has diverted Communist efforts to economic penetration. I believe that international economic cooperation therefore assumes the greatest urgency, and I had hoped that it would be included in the administration's recommendations to the Congress. I believe delay in making the necessary contribution to participate is expensive in the long run.

The legislation does include provision for our continuing support of a number of important international activities, such as the United Nations Refugee Fund, whose major objective is to make refugees useful and productive members of society in the countries in which they now reside; the United Nations Children's Fund, which currently devotes its resources to assisting less advanced countries in development of child health and welfare services and in the control and eradication of diseases. The ceiling has been increased on our annual contribution to the Food and Agriculture Organization, in which none of the members of the Soviet bloc participate.

The atoms-for-peace program is included in three different parts of the mutual security bill. The Asian nuclear center is financed from funds authorized for Asian economic development; training of individuals in various aspects of the peaceful uses of atomic energy is financed from funds for the technical cooperation and technical exchange programs; and the proposal to offer research reactors to friends and allies.

The bill also continues the United States escapee program, which provides care, maintenance, and resettlement assistance to recent anti-Communist escapees in Europe and to selected escapees in the Far East and other areas bordering the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

In concluding I want to reiterate my conviction that if the contest between tyranny and freedom is to be conducted on the economic and political levels, we have a powerful advantage. Clearly, our devotion to individual liberty and integrity is shared by the vast majority of the people of the world. But this advantage is ours only if we make dynamic use of it. Much more can and must be done to take advantage of the opportunities open to us, as I have attempted to indicate. The mutual security program represents a minimum effort in continuing the sound policy which has developed over the past decade. Those who oppose this measure provide only the Fortress American concept as an alternative. That concept in mid-twentieth century is not only impossible to maintain but would constitute an unequivocal repudiation of our traditional belief in freedom and democracy for all. As Thomas Jefferson said early in our history:

> The preservation of the holy fire is confided to us by the world, and the sparks which will emanate from it will ever serve to rekindle it in other quarters of the globe.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I have consistently supported the mutual security program ever since the enactment of the Mutual Security Act of 1951. While improvements in a program so widespread and so global are always possible I nevertheless feel that it has been a major factor in achieving the foreign policy objectives of the United States and of the free world. The bill authorizes an appropriation of $3,563,475,000 to enable the executive branch to continue with the program. Last year there

was appropriated $2,765,875,000, including a carryover of $62,533,250. Thus, the authorization in this bill is some $800 million more than the appropriation last year. I feel that the amounts authorized should be more than adequate to enable the executive branch to accomplish the purposes of mutual security and to continue its effectiveness in deterring Soviet aggression. But this will require sound fiscal practices, the prudent use of appropriated funds, wise programing, and cooperation with the Congress.

I supported in committee the cut of $1 billion in military funds which leaves an authorization of $1,925,000,000 for military assistance. The bill limits new military funds for all of Europe to $450 million, of which $48 million is specifically earmarked for Spain. However, it should be pointed out that the bill at the same time specifically repeals the existing area ceilings on military funds previously made available. This has the effect of giving greater overall flexibility with respect to the use of the unexpended military funds, which amount to approximately $5 billion.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I fully support the action taken by the committee in increasing the economic development assistance request for Latin America from $27 million to $32 million. While I regret that this sum is $6 million less than that appropriated for the comparable purpose last year, I am glad that we have given recognition to the gallant fight being waged by Guatemala to rid itself of the evil effects left behind by the previous Communist regime. The $5 million increase in funds for Guatemala over the executive branch request should help the Government continue its great task of restoring the economy of the country and giving the people a stable government.

The action of the committee in transferring the classification of this assistance from "development assistance" to "defense support" is a forward step in the recognition of the flexible nature of defense support in the light of particular area requirements. In Latin America all of the 20 republics have joined with us in common hemispheric defense by ratifying the inter-American treaty of reciprocal assistance. Nineteen of the twenty Latin American Republics have adhered to the resolution of 1954 entitled "Declaration of Solidarity for the Preservation of the Political Integrity of the American States Against the Intervention of International Communism." Thus the economic assistance made available to Latin America, largely to Bolivia and Guatemala, should help immeasurably in enabling the governments of these two countries to lend strength to the reciprocal assistance treaty and the declaration of solidarity. The report makes clear congressional intent that the defense support funds in this area may be used for the purposes originally planned under the category of development assistance. I believe that an area in which our foreign policy must show imagination, vision, and more effectiveness is in our relations with our Latin American neighbors. I hope that the executive branch will give this aspect of our foreign policy particular attention and care which will be reflected in the program submitted to the Congress next year.

My own view of the solid friendship which Latin America demonstrates to the United States was confirmed in a report issued by two colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Hon. BROOKS HAYS and Hon. CHESTER E. MERROW, on their experience as delegates to the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations in New York last fall. Referring to the support given by Latin America to the United States position at the General Assembly, my colleagues stated:

> Things did not come easy for the United States and its position of leadership. Support for the United States on major problems could never be taken for granted. This is no criticism of our friends in the United Nations. The United States does not want satellites. On the contrary, we expect our friends to question our position, to discuss it with us, and then arrive at a judgment based on their own mature consideration. It was interesting to note in this connection how steadfastly our Latin American neighbors stood with us in the 10th Assembly. This support was extremely important when it is remembered that it represented, with its membership of 20 states, one-third of the then 60 members of the United Nations.

While I feel it is essential that we consider carefully United States relations with peoples in other areas of the world, it is essential that we not do so at the risk of forgetting our own neighbors to the south.

The authorizations in the bill for the United Nations Refugee Fund, the United States escapee program, and the United Nations Children's Fund surely are highly justified in any program of mutual security.

In this bill the committee has substantially broadened the private-enterprise provisions of the mutual-security program. This is a clear recognition that United States private enterprise has a definite place in the foreign policy of the United States, a place which must be strengthened, for in the long run it can reduce the necessity for huge grants-in-aid and thus reduce the drain on the American taxpayer. The committee has increased the total guaranties which can be given on American private investment abroad from $200 million to $500 million without requiring appropriation of funds. The risks covered have been expanded to include the risks of war, revolution, or insurrection. Many segments of American private enterprise have emphasized that such a broadening of guaranteed risks will do much to stimulate a marked increase in American private investor participation abroad.

A companion program, the informational media guaranty program, has also been expanded by providing new means for financing it. The Director of the United States Information Agency, who administers the information media program, is authorized to take over $28 million of the $200 million of notes previously issued for guaranties and to use them as the basis for financing the program. He is further authorized to finance guaranty payments out of a special revolving fund to be set up with the proceeds of the sale to the Treasury of the notes originally executed by the ECA Administrator and now assumed by the director. The informational media guaranty program provides a market for informational materials from the United States in areas overseas which, because of the shortage of dollar exchange, would not be available to United States publishers and exporters. Thus, books, magazines, films and newspapers, telling the history of the American way of life find their way overseas and constitute an important source of informatien about America.

I feel that the various elements in this mutual security bill are well devised, amply provided for by the Congress, and sufficiently flexible to permit the executive branch to carry forward the program of mutual security. Provisions of law by themselves are meaningless. In the final analysis they can only serve as a framework of action and guideposts for the executive branch in conducting our foreign affairs. Let us hope that those charged with these heavy responsibilities act resolutely and in the best interests of our people.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOSCH].

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Chairman, on several previous occasions, I have expressed my concern over the further large-scale foreign aid, commonly referred to as mutual security, handed out to virtually all comers. Over the past few years, in questionnaires sent to the constituents of my congressional district, it has become evident that many of our people are wary of the success which can be or has been derived from this program.

A look at the record is necessary to properly analyze the present request for an additional $4.9 billions which our respected and diligent Committee on Foreign Affairs has reduced by $1.09 billions. The foreign aid funds paid out during the postwar period from July 1, 1945 to June 30, 1955 and foreign aid funds available from July 1, 1955 to date total close to $65.2 billion, more than 25 percent of our total national debt. We have been told this help was essential to withstand the threat of communism. The record fails to disclose that this high hope has been realized.

Now, specifically, the following is just an indication of what has happened in some of the places wherein these funds were expended in an endeavor to buy friendship:

First. Most recent and most glaring: Tito, the Yugoslav dictator who has already received $1 billion in aid, is blustering to the leaders in the Kremlin of his faithful adherance to the Communist cause and that said friendship shall never again be wedged or broken. Let us also not forget that within the last year he refused to let us even see what he does with the military goods we keep sending him, spouting that he does not need our help.

Second. This same Tito is today charged by the United Nations Commissioner of Refugees of planning to surrender to Red slavery those who sought refuge in Yugoslavia from anti-Titoist purges at home.

Third. Great Britain has most recently permitted its Malayan and Singapore Governments to lower the bars on the sale of rubber and other strategic materiel to Red China. Yes, this makes it easier and cheaper for the Peiping regime—they now get their materiel direct.

Fourth. Since the end of World War II, France has received over $10 billion in economic and military aid. The unstable actions of the French Government, to wit, the withdrawal of troops from NATO, its large Communistic vote makes one wonder what help she will give if, God forbid, the half million American boys stationed in Europe are attacked by the Soviets to the East. Speaking frankly, it would appear our aid has been for nought.

Fifth. Since 1950 we have given India over one-half billion dollars and what is her attitude today? Turn Formosa over to Communist China, admit Red China into the United Nations and a policy of increased trade with the Soviet world—that is her attitude, that is what she is doing and advocates.

Sixth. In the report recently submitted by the General Accounting Office it said that foreign aid was plagued by unrealistic planning, by conflicting policy decisions and by Egyptian reluctance to cooperate. Yet, we are currying day in and day out to try to outbid the supposed offer of aid and assistance by Communist Russia.

It is also interesting, from a strictly financial stable program, to remember that there are in unexpended balances for foreign aid from prior years, which will be available for expenditure after June 30, 1956, the sum of $6.8 billion.

It has been argued that we cannot relent in this program for, if we do, Communist Russia will take up the slack, but nowhere, at no time, have we endeavored to put Communist Russia to the test of a program of assistance such as we have undertaken and carried on for the past 10 years. I do not believe that Communist Russia could in any manner fulfill an obligation such as this program entails.

The bitter experience of the past, which clearly demonstrates we cannot buy friends, prompts us to consider whether the time isn't at hand to pay more attention to our economy at home. Without this program we could make substantial strides in reducing taxes, which now take one-third of all income, as well as reducing the national debt. We can be assured of the preservation of freedom in this world only so long as we remain economically strong and we cannot hope to maintain a stable government if we continue to scatter our resources all over the globe.

In view of all the foregoing and in good conscience, having in mind the welfare of our American Nation and its peoples, I am compelled to vote against this foreign aid legislation.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

PEACE, PEACE, EVERYWHERE (IN REPUBLICAN PARTY PROPAGANDA) BUT NOT A PEACEFUL MOMENT ANYWHERE

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, may I take a moment to pay a sincere tribute of appreciation and gratitude to the very distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the learned and able gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. His keen intellect and his fine sense of humor will be missed in future Congresses. We wish him well in whatever he undertakes and to him and his gracious wife, a long, happy, and healthy future.

This mutual security bill we are considering today is most important. The members of the Foreign Affairs Committee have labored long, hard, and diligently on it. Whether we agree with part, all, or none of the bill, they are entitled to our heartfelt thanks for a most difficult task accomplished in the true American spirit of trying to accomplish the greatest good for the greatest number. They did their arduous work in and out of session.

I met many of them during the recess last year in various parts of the world, seeking to obtain first-hand knowledge of facts that would help them enact good legislation. They were worn, tired, and haggard, not from play but from hard work and uncomfortable travel. Even illness did not deter them from pursuing their tasks.

Only one who has traveled into out-of-the-way places, backward, and underdeveloped, rich in nothing but misery, can truly understand the magnitude of their devotion to duty.

They have earned the thanks of our people.

Defeat of this bill could well initiate the end of our civilization. Its passage, however, may only postpone that destruction.

We here can only legislate. The executive department, the President, and his Secretary of State must administer.

Continued maladministration of this program will destroy us and the free world. That is why I say that passage of this bill will not, ipso facto, give us the peace and security we so much desire.

Passage of this bill is the first step. Good, decent, honorable administration is the second and most important step. Unfortunately in that respect our President has failed us and the world. He has given lipservice to the principles we have enacted, but no implementation.

I say that, because the failures of his Department of State are his failures. He may argue that there are no failures but he must concede that the responsibility is his.

His Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, has failed us and failed us miserably.

Wherever you go, in this election year, we hear Republican officeholders, campaigners, and politicians chanting the issue on which they will win in 1956, "Peace and prosperity." I will talk about the Republican prosperity of big business and the bankruptcy of small business at another time.

Today I want to destroy the Republican myth about peace.

We could have peace or at least make progress toward real peace if our Secretary of State paid more attention to the realities in this world and heeded the facts available to him.

We Democrats are Americans first. We want peace—real peace. We will cooperate fully and completely without partisanship toward that end. We do not intend to sit idly by, however, and let Republicans, in or out of office, prate about peace and give the American people nothing but talk.

Now, let us see where we have this peace or rather do not have it.

I invite your attention to the record. The record of the hearings on this very bill before the distinguished committee handling this legislation.

On May 10, 1956, pages 980 and 981 of the record, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles speaking, I quote:

> We have an armistice in Korea, but no formal peace. In Taiwan (Formosa) there are almost daily military engagements * * *. In Vietnam, there is an armistice, but no formal peace.

In his public release of his testimony and in his direct testimony he referred merely to "peace." The corrected record now refers to "formal peace."

He also referred to the Middle East situation.

What do you think this forthright Secretary of State talked about in the Middle East? He talked about everything except the daily fighting. He did not mention Cyprus, or Morocco, or Algeria, or Israel.

Is there a single person in this Chamber so foolhardy as to suggest that there is peace in the world today?

Is there peace in the Holy Land?

Is there peace in the Far East?

Is there peace between Pakistan and Kashmir?

Is there peace in Algeria and Morocco?

Is there peace in Cyprus?

If peace were in these places could freemen be at peace anywhere, while millions of our brothers are enslaved throughout the world by Communist dictators?

I say to Mr. Dulles:

"Wake up, Mr. Secretary. Stop double-talking. Stop fiddling while the world burns. Start acting. Start by cleaning out the deadwood of your Department, who find out what is happening abroad by reading the American press; then eliminate those who put oil dollars ahead of world peace; with them throw out all who try to make friends of our sworn enemies at the expense of our sworn friends; kick out those who use foreign aid money to make more jobs for American personnel abroad and with them, those who think it more important to keep warehouses filled with medicines and medical supplies rather than to use them to heal the sick.

"This is a good program. You have failed to make it work."

Mr. Chairman, this bill, no matter how improved by amendment, if it can be improved, will be just another law on our statute books, unless the President and the State Department vastly improve its administration.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the committee for the marvelous job they have done on the bill that is before us today.

It is no news to the House of Representatives that I favor construction by the Federal Government of a high Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River. But some of you may be interested to know that I will also favor giving American dollars to the Egyptian Government to build the high Aswan Dam on the Nile River, when, as, and if this Republican administration overcomes its split personality and stops insisting that what is good enough for the Egyptians in northeast Africa is too good for our citizens in Idaho and the northwestern United States.

Right now while we are considering this mutual security bill is a good time to do some straight thinking—and some straight talking. After years of study of the Hells Canyon project, subcommittees of both the House and the Senate have endorsed and recommended authorization of the high Hells Canyon Dam. The administration, and its soul mates in the power lobby, are doing their level best to stop us so they can complete one more giveaway of another great natural resource—the priceless Hells Canyon Dam site.

Yet Secretary of State John Foster Dulles has demanded that we wake up and approve the Aswan Dam as a crash program. Or else, he says, the Russians may build it, which would be bad. He may be right. However, some people are beginning to wonder if Bulganin, Khrushchev, and other touring Communists will have to come to Moscow, Idaho, for a conference before this administration will wake up to the importance of building the high Hells Canyon dam. I am confident this will not be necessary, because I am convinced Congress is going to see that the high Hells Canyon dam is built without the assistance of any visiting Russian tourists.

Aswan Dam is probably a good project—notwithstanding the fact that this administration would no doubt call it creeping socialism since it would produce public power. Aswan Dam, like Hells Canyon, provides for full potential development of water and power resources instead of partial development by inadequate low dams that waste forever our limited, God-given natural resources. However, Aswan Dam will cost about four times as much as the high Hells Canyon Dam—the actual figures are $1,300,000,000 for Aswan and approximately $308 million for Hells Canyon—and the two dams will produce about the same number of kilowatts of electric energy. In fact, Aswan Dam is just a king-size Hells Canyon Dam wrapped up in a new economy style package. Except that the American taxpayer would be making an outright gift of a good part of the Aswan Dam costs—while on the other hand funds for the high Hells Canyon Dam are in the form of a loan that would be repaid to the Federal Treasury with interest. Yet we are told we cannot afford the high Hells Canyon Dam.

I believe in first things first. I think Hells Canyon Dam should come ahead of Aswan Dam.

I think it is time for this administration to stop doubletalking and get the high Hells Canyon Dam under construction. In fact, if they really want the daily double they can make authorization of Aswan title II of the Hells Canyon bill already written and reported by two subcommittees in this Congress.

Any of you who share my sentiments and believe that what is good enough for the Nile River and Egypt is not too good for the Snake River and the United States are invited to join with me in furthering this enterprise.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I have consistently supported a continuation of foreign aid to assist friendly free countries in resisting Communist aggression.

It is my belief, however, that assistance of this character should be temporary, of an emergency nature, and should be so administered as to encourage the development of internal economic stability and strength so that friendly countries may stand on their own feet, finance their own defense, without being a continual and permanent burden on American taxpayers. For this reason and in the belief that aid has been too generous in the past, and too loosely administered, I have consistently voted for reductions in the amount of aid.

I have also believed that our greatest contribution to the assistance of friendly free countries is the encouragement of the establishment of sound and vigorous free enterprise economies and that this goal can be achieved best through the efforts of individual citizens and business firms in natural and profitable economic undertakings with the dual benefit of relieving overburdened taxpayers and the promotion in the world of our free enterprise philosophy. We should continually seek by demonstration, as contrasted with exhortation, to prove the superiority of a productive system based upon freedom and initiative of individuals over the totalitarian, state-controlled Communist system.

Mr. Chairman, my attitude on this legislation is well known to my constituents. Just about a year ago I discussed this subject in my weekly newsletter, a copy of which I insert at this point in my remarks:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 1, 1955.

DEAR FRIEND: How long should we continue to give money to friendly, free countries in resisting Communist aggression?

The Mutual Security Act of 1955, which passed the House this week 273 to 128, exemplifies how a Congressman must weigh considerations for and against a proposal and then vote although, in its final form, he does not regard the bill as satisfactory.

Since entering Congress in 1951, I have supported the continuation of foreign aid. But continually I have sought to reduce the size of the program. Our country and the rest of the free world are threatened by Communist imperialism. Under modern world conditions we cannot go it alone. Countries, particularly those adjacent to the Communist bloc, without outside help, might easily slip behind the Iron Curtain.

On the other hand, I have always regarded financial aid to such countries as a temporary stimulant to develop internal strength to enable them to stand on their own feet and resist Communist military, economic, and subversive assaults.

This year, for the first time, foreign aid is advanced as a permanent program. The bill before the House had objectionable features. It authorized $3.3 billion in new money although $8.7 billion of previous appropriations remain unspent. By authorizing transfers from one fund to another it gives the executive branch of the Government a blank check in expenditure of public funds.

I tried to insert in the legislation a provision designed to increase the investment of private capital in foreign economic undertakings, reducing the need for government-to-government grants and loans, and promoting the free competitive enterprise system in friendly foreign countries. Although many colleagues agreed with my objective, the managers of the bill opposed my amendment. It was defeated.

There must be a better way of helping friendly countries to strengthen themselves than indefinitely to dole out American dollars. Until such a method can be found, however, I believe we must continue the present aid program aimed at resisting Communist aggression, although the legislation as written is not wholly satisfactory.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

Mr. Chairman, my efforts to encourage the creation of a climate abroad favorable to the investment of private capital has been one of my major efforts since joining this body in the 82d Congress. I have repeatedly offered amendments and discussed this subject both before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and in debate on the House floor. A list of references to these efforts is incorporated at this point in my remarks:

BILLS INTRODUCED

H. R. 3798, 82d Congress.
H. R. 4199, 83d Congress.

AMENDMENTS, SPEECHES, DEBATE, INSERTIONS (IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD)

April 23, 1951: Speech introducing H. R. 3798, an affirmative American foreign policy, volume 97, part 3, pages 4209–4213.

July 3, 1951: Speech, Let's Export Independence, volume 97, part 6, pages 7606–7609.

July 10, 1951. Letter from Nelson A. Rockefeller, volume 97, part 13, pages A4246–A4247.

July 12, 1951: Correspondence with Paul H. Appleby, volume 97, part 14, pages A4318–A4319.

July 18, 1951: Correspondence with Spruille Braden, volume 97, part 14, page A4494.

July 19, 1951: Miscellaneous letters, volume 97, part 14, pages A4502–A4505.

August 13, 1951, Statement of Howard S. Piquet, volume 97, part 14, pages A5071–A5072.

August 16, 1951: Amendment to Mutual Security Act of 1951, volume 97, part 8, pages 10179–10180.

August 17, 1951: Amendment to Mutual Security Act of 1951, volume 98, part 8, pages 10289–10290.

May 21, 1952: Debate on Mutual Security Act, volume 98, part 5, pages 5670–5673.

May 23, 1952: Amendment to Mutual Security Act of 1952, volume 98, part 5, pages 5912–5913.

June 9, 1952: Letter from Mrs. H. Richard Blackwell, volume 98, part 10, page A3519.

March 26, 1953: Introduction of H. R. 4199, volume 99, part 2, pages 2339–2344.

May 5, 1953: Speech re President's recommendation for a Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, volume 99, part 4, pages 4556–4558.

July 23, 1953: Debate on Trade Agreements Extension Act, volume 99, part 7, page 9707.

May 28, 1954: Speech by H. C. McClellan, president, NAM, daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages A4014–A4016.

June 30, 1955: Amendment to Mutual Security Act of 1955, volume 101, part 7, pages 9633–9634.

March 29, 1956: Speech on Report of Subcommittee on International Operations on Technical Assistance in Latin America, pages 5862–5867.

May 22, 1956: Fortune editorial, The American Game, pages 8753–8754.

TESTIMONY

July 20, 1951: Testimony before House, Foreign Affairs Committee on mutual security program, 82d Congress, 1st session, pages 778–819.

April 28, 1952: Testimony before House Foreign Affairs Committee on mutual security program, 82d Congress, 2d session, pages 869–882.

Mr. Chairman, I regret to say that my efforts have met with only limited success. I believe that a bipartisan commission, on the order of the Hoover Commission, could best study and recommend solutions for the problem of eliminating or minimizing artificial barriers to private capital investment overseas.

In the Mutual Security Act of 1951, section 516 (c), an alternative study was ordered to be made by the Department of Commerce. That study resulted in submission of a report in two parts. The first part, a survey of factors limiting United States investments abroad, was published in 1953, and a second part, an analysis of views of American businessmen on impediments to overseas investment, was published in June 1954. Those were useful documents and I have no doubt they contributed materially to the increased flow of American capital overseas which resulted in American foreign investments being doubled in the decade following World War II.

I favor a study by a commission, because I believe any government department will be at a disadvantage in studying and possibly criticising either its own activities, or lack of them, or those of sister agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

In the extension of the Trade Agreements Act of 1953, title III created the Randall Commission to study foreign trade and overseas investments. Unfortunately the Randall Commission absorbed itself so overwhelmingly with trade that it did little to advance the attack on impediments to investment beyond the point which had been reached by similar previous studies.

Mr. Chairman, since I doubt the House of Representatives will accept a proposal I have repeatedly made to establish a bipartisan commission to encourage the increased flow of investment capital in strengthening the economies of friendly free countries, I have decided to attack this problem in the current mutual security legislation in a somewhat different manner, hoping that it will appeal to the judgment of my colleagues.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I intend to offer two amendments to H. R. 11356 which together, if adopted, should stimulate the activities of our citizens and business firms in contributing to the economic development of friendly foreign countries through their business undertakings.

The first amendment is to section 413 (a) of H. R. 11356, and reads as follows:

Page 8, after line 17, insert the following:

"(j) Amend section 413 (a), which relates to encouragement of free enterprise and private participation, by inserting '(1)' after '(a)' and by adding the following new paragraph:

"'(2) It is further declared to be the policy of the United States to ensure that the expenditure of funds under this act will effectively contribute to the achievement of the goals of United States foreign policy, and for that purpose to eliminate or minimize international barriers to investment and trade, to facilitate the creation in foreign countries of a climate favorable to the investment of private capital, to discourage the extension of socialism and nationalized industries by declining to commit United States funds to the support of Government-owned and Government-operated industrial and commercial facilities, and in general to avoid the expenditure of funds in support of erroneous policies and practices of foreign governments which, without our financial support, would eventually have to be corrected or eliminated by the force of circumstances'."

And redesignate succeeding subsections accordingly.

This amendment would clearly, and beyond any question of doubt, instruct the administrators of aid programs to eliminate or minimize international barriers to investment and trade, to encourage the creation of climates favorable to the investment of private capital and to discourage socialism and Government-owned commercial and economic enterprises and thus to contribute to the achievement of goals of United States foreign policy. At the same time, this amendment would instruct our officials not to use aid funds to underwrite unsound policies and practices of foreign governments which, without our financial support, would eventually have to be corrected or eliminated by the force of circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, the second amendment would also amend section 413 by adding a requirement that the Commerce Department shall again conduct a study of impediments to private investment abroad and make recommendations of means whereby those impediments may be removed or decreased. The text of that amendment reads as follows:

Page 11, after line 5, insert the following:

"(l) Amend section 413 by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) The Department of Commerce shall, in full cooperation with private business groups and governmental agenices (including the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development), conduct a thorough study of the legal and other impediments, foreign and local, to private investment abroad, and the methods and means whereby those impediments can be removed or decreased, and shall make recommendations thereon to the Director of the International Cooperation Administration.'"

And redesignate succeeding subsections accordingly.

On May 22, 1956, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—pages 8753 and 8754—an editorial from Fortune magazine which I think is very significant, because Fortune's editorial emphasized the role that private capital and free enterprise can play in the development of stable and strong economies in friendly foreign countries. Let me just quote three sentences from that editorial. It states:

The fact is, however, that Government aid, while having a place in the American response to Moscow, is a sideshow, not the main show. The real source of America's strength lies in its own flexible and dynamic system of private enterprise, and in the projection of that system abroad. What is needed is not another Government plan, by which the Soviets set so much store, but rather a foreign economic policy that will enlist the support of the American people and capitalize on American assets.

Many of you have noticed in the appendix to the minority views on H. R. 11356 tabulations prepared by the Legislative Reference Service showing foreign aid grants and loans since 1940, that is, since World War II and the postwar years, to be in excess of $111 billion. Frankly, I think that figure is somewhat low, because it does not take into account the surpluses overseas which we practically donated to many foreign governments.

But during that same period the investment of American private capital overseas has increased by only $15 or $16 billion.

I say we have the cart before the horse. The increase in investments of private capital should have been far greater and the expenditure of Government funds—not capital but grants and loans—should have been far less. To reverse that emphasis is the purpose of my amendments. What fault can you find with it?

We in America believe that economic and political stability are achieved through a flourishing free-enterprise system depending on private capital rather than socialistic governmental operation and control of economic activities. That has been officially announced as United States Government policy in Latin America by the Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, Mr. Henry Holland, in the following words:

What are our convictions as to the role of Government in the economic field? What kinds of programs and policies do we believe will produce strong economies? The answers are probably apparent. The people of the United States believe in the private enterprise system. We are convinced that we ourselves can do more than any government can to make business enterprises grow, to create new ones, to create more employment at acceptable wages, and to raise the standards of living of our people. We believe that our Government helps the national economy most when it creates those conditions which give us, the working men and women, the farmers, the businessmen of the country, the greatest opportunity to carry on all those processes of private enterprise which have brought us to the point where we now are.

This means that there are certain things that we expect our Government to do and some that we expect it not to do. We rely on our Government leaders to follow sound fiscal and taxing policies, policies that will maintain a stable currency, policies that will combat the evil disease of inflation, policies that will assure to investors a fair chance to make a reasonable profit if they risk their capital in industry or commerce. We expect

our Government to supply those public facilities and services which are needed in a free-enterprise system, but which are not in themselves attractive to private investors. These include such things as roads, schools, hospitals for the poor, irrigation systems, port works, and things of that nature.

GOVERNMENT VERSUS BUSINESS

Of equal importance are the things that we expect our Government not to do. We strongly believe that except in special situations our Government should stay out of the field of business. When government enters a particular industry or commercial activity, private enterprise generally withdraws. This is because onerous regulations are usually imposed on the private enterprise in order to insure the survival of the less well organized and operated Government enterprises which cannot compete without special advantages. Our experience has convinced us that as a rule Government-run enterprises are not as strong and do not make as great a contribution to the national economy as do their counterparts operated by private citizens. Therefore, we feel that governments should invade the field of industry and commerce only where essential and then, if possible, only on a temporary basis.

Our Government's chief emphasis will be on those kinds of economic cooperation that contribute to the creative efforts of private individuals, particularly nationals of the other countries. We believe they are the greatest hope for progress in the other American Republics. The most effective contribution that our country could make to the economic development of Latin America would be to help private enterprise throughout the hemisphere. It is responsible for our inter-American trade which each year provides our neighbors with about $3½ billion in cash and credits. Our own private investors have supplied some $6½ billion of capital for the economic development of the area. In addition they are also providing technical knowledge, equipment, and marketing opportunities for Latin America's growing industries.

From that general statement of United States policy certain broad principles can be enumerated to serve as guides to all American officials stationed throughout the world.

Any activities and related expenditure of United States tax funds should have clear and specific relationship to the achievement of the goals of foreign policy as above stated. Efforts of our diplomatic representatives, our information poeple and our technical assistance officials should seek constantly to promote development and investment of private capital in economic undertakings; to eliminate or minimize barriers to investment and trade and to facilitate creation of a climate favorable to the investment of private capital. On the other hand, by all appropriate diplomatic means they should seek to discourage the extension of socialism and nationalized industries and should decline to commit United States funds to the support of Government-owned and Government-operated industrial and commercial facilities. They should likewise avoid expenditure of our funds to support erroneous policies and practices of foreign governments which, without our financial support, would sooner or later have to be corrected or eliminated by the force of circumstances.

The foregoing is not intended to advocate or condone meddling in internal affairs of other countries. Obviously all of our activities should be carried out with full regard for the sovereignty of friendly nations and by methods and actions calculated not to offend. Yet there should be no hesitation on the part of our officials from top to bottom under the guidance of the President's representative in each country—the Ambassador—to let it be known that United States funds are trust funds exacted through taxes from the American people; that they must be devoted to ends calculated to promote the common defense and general welfare of the American people; that they were appropriated by the Congress, not for the purpose of pure philanthropy but for the security and interests of the United States, in the belief that the threats of Communist imperialism and subversion can best be met by promoting the stability of free peoples so that they may be able to defend themselves against aggression and subversion.

Aside from our commitment to the philosophy of free economic and political institutions and our economic interest in trade and commerce with free peoples as contrasted to totalitarian-controlled economies, we are convinced that economic and political stability are promoted by free enterprise institutions and are weakened by socialist institutions.

Just last week on May 31, 1956, Mr. Robert Murphy, Deputy Under Secretary of State, appeared before the Hardy committee in hearings on American aid to Iran, which totaled some $200 million in technical assistance, so called, in a 4-year period. I asked Mr. Murphy to repeat a passage of his prepared statement announcing that it was American foreign policy to encourage the creation of a climate attractive to private capital. This is what he said:

Mr. MURPHY. This is a task, Mr. Chairman, which, under our system, we would normally expect private capital to do. Indeed, much private capital today does flow into the less developed countries, but only in cases where the economic and political risks make it attractive. In many parts of the world, the risks are such that private capital is not ready to take them, but we, as a nation, still have a strong security interest in those areas.

Then I asked Mr. Murphy this:

Mr. MEADER. I do not recall your saying it specifically, but I wonder if you could state it is our policy in conducting these programs and normal diplomatic activities and information activities to encourage the creation of circumstances that would favor the time when this will come under private capital.

Mr. MURPHY. Oh, I would like to emphasize that is our policy. We have tried to favor the use of private enterprise wherever we can.

Mr. MEADER. And, with whatever tools and bargaining powers are available in the aid program or to our diplomatic missions and Information people, they are clearly instructed, are they, to encourage the creation of a climate favorable to private capital?

Mr. MURPHY. I can say that our State Department representatives abroad are clearly advised about instructions to that effect, but I could not tell you offhand about the Information people. I know it applies to the ICA and, I believe, to the Information, but I do not know. I touched lightly upon that when I said "We must seek the expansion of trade and investment throughout the free world." We are talking about private trade and its investment there.

Mr. MEADER. And would it follow as a necessary corollary, in your opinion, that it would be our policy to discourage the extension of nationalized industries and governments operating in the economic and industrial fields?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes. Well, we have clearly indicated our lack of sympathy for those. However, we do operate in areas where there is that, shall I say, political philosophy. I think our views on that subject are known pretty well in every nook and corner.

Mr. Chairman, why should anyone oppose an amendment which seeks to announce that it is American foreign policy to encourage our traditional way of conducting economic and commercial operations. Who is going to say they oppose it? Are we favoring socialism or fighting communism with these aid funds? Why should it not be written into the act so that there is no misunderstanding of the policy of Congress, so that no Administrator can refuse to follow and obey statements of policy such as those made by top officials, which I have just quoted.

Now, let me say something. I have heard it said by people close to ICA, and I think from my own experience with the Hardy committee and otherwise, that it is substantiated, that the ICA is being run today by three ghosts: Hoffman, Harriman, and Stassen. They saddled that organization with their own people. Many of them are do-gooders and visionaries. They are still running the organization today, and many of them are not in sympathy with the philosophy I have just expressed. They need instructions, clear instructions from the Congress of the United States, to carry out the American free enterprise philosophy in their dealings abroad. I think it should be written right into the law so that there can be no question.

I have just received information that I hope I can substantiate this evening and present to the House tomorrow that some of the ICA people abroad have been encouraging the extension of socialism and nationalized industries and the commercial operations of governments, through their administration of American aid funds.

I hope the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, especially the chairman and ranking minority member, will give careful consideration to this proposal and accept my amendments when they are offered tomorrow.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, a highly respected and great American statesman not so many years ago declared that politics should stop at the water's edge. It was his belief that the American people should speak with a united voice to the world so as to have maximum effectiveness against the enemy who would like to divide and conquer them. This is an occasion, Mr. Chairman, when the solidarity of the American Nation should be particularly firm. When the very freedom and independence of this Nation are at stake I can find no justification for those who would seek partisan advantage in opposing a policy for the

protection of our homes, our liberty, and our traditions. Party politics should not intrude in matters as crucial as foreign aid, and that is why I am going to give my full support to the President's request for the foreign assistance program and will introduce the amendments necessary to restore the $1.1 billion slash made by the Foreign Affairs Committee. I shall give my wholehearted backing to the entire $4.9 billion the President has requested and will do so even if I am the only man that does.

In backing the President in this matter, however, I wish to make clear that I am giving no blanket endorsement to the administration's policies in foreign relations, nor do I maintain that the slogans of bipartisan foreign policy should be used to muffle intelligent debate in the formulation of policy. But the decision to extend military and economic assistance to other nations, in the ultimate interest of contributing to the security and welfare of our own country, has now become a settled policy of our Government. Those who would constantly like to "reexamine" or "rediscuss" this policy do so in many cases, I strongly suspect, because they would like to discuss it to death.

As the Members of this House so well recall, the birth of United States foreign aid as a consistent, coordinated program took place 8 years ago when the European recovery program was enacted by a far-sighted Congress controlled by one party and acting in concert with an administration controlled by another. Now that the Marshall plan has become history, the United States Congress has no regrets for having supported it, for it has proved to be one of the most magnificent strokes of government policy and at the same time of humanitarian generosity in the annals of American democracy. United States assistance to Europe has been an astounding success and a major contribution to world peace. Since 1948, the year the Marshall plan began, industrial production in the recipient Western European countries has just about doubled, whereas the quantity of aid, which ran to an appropriation of about $4 billion in the first year, has this year dwindled to only a very minute percentage of this sum. Not a single Western European member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is scheduled during the forthcoming fiscal year to receive any economic-type aid, except for minor technical exchanges. This fact plus the recent disclosure that nine United States aid offices in Europe were closed during the current fiscal year is concrete proof that American assistance can be brought to a successful conclusion and that it is not interminable.

The inauguration of the Marshall plan was soon followed by another program which furnished another instance of the ingenious statesmanship of our people—the so-called point 4 program of technical assistance. This "bold, new program" was sweeping and courageous in concept and, in view of the tack which the cold war now seems to be taking, may yet prove to be one of the most far-sighted policies adopted by the United States in our time.

With the sudden, shocking outbreak of the Korean conflict in June 1950 American aid underwent a radical change in character. The shift in emphasis went to the military phase of foreign aid in order to shore up shaky defenses of independent nations around the globe that were, or might be, menaced by the Soviet Union. With the termination of the Korean conflict and the increasing build-up of the armed defenses of our allies military aid could be reduced, and it was. But for reasons which I do not condone but which I will not dwell upon at this time, during the past couple of years it was reduced more than it should have been, thus creating what might be called the problem of the pipeline.

Because the amount of new foreign-aid money appropriated for this current year, $2.7 billion, is considerably less than the current rate of expenditure, about $4.5 billion a year. The pipeline of goods that is flowing to the countries we are assisting is in danger of being depleted unless an increased appropriation is made for the next fiscal year.

In order to maintain the proper backlog to keep the pipeline going at the desired rate, the President has requested $4.9 billion—no lesser amount will do the job. Four billion five hundred million dollars will not do it, nor will $4 billion. And certainly the $3.8 billion provided by the committee will not do it. The $1.1 billion pared off the foreign-aid bill by the committee will jeopardize the pipeline and, what is more pertinent, will weaken the defenses of many economically enfeebled nations the preservation of whose independence is essential to our own.

The responsibility, Mr. Chairman, is a grave one, and it seems to me it has already been treated too irresponsibly by those who have in the past not properly tended the pipeline and allowed it to fall into its present peril. However, this is no time for recriminations. I, for one, do not intend to pile irresponsibility on irresponsibility and imitate those who have already endangered our aid program. If the stream of aid has been hampered by the delinquency of those in whose charge it is, then it seems to me that the duty incumbent upon Congress is to correct the delinquency and not perpetuate it.

But why do we have to keep the pipeline flowing at such a rate, some might inquire, is not there a new look behind the Iron Curtain? Has not Stalin disappeared from the scene and have not his heirs repudiated his legacy and set a new course of peaceful coexistence for the Soviet Union? The answer is clear. There is no evidence that behind the Communist rulers' new preachments of harmony and light there has been any genuine alteration of their ultimate aims. But there is plenty of evidence that the old purposes of communism are just as strong, just as deadly, and just as enduring as they have ever been. After the Geneva Conference at the summit last year Khrushchev told the East Germans that the Communists were in favor of a relaxation of tension, "but if anybody thinks," he asserted, "that for this reason we shall forget about Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he is mistaken. This will happen when shrimps learn to whistle." I personally have not yet heard of anybody who has recently come across any whistling shrimp. Certainly there were none whistling at the sessions of the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party early this year when the Red leaders mapped out procedures for subverting democratic governments through popular fronts and by capturing democratic parliaments and transforming them into genuine instruments of the peoples' will. Mikoyan openly boasted of how the Communists had subverted free governments in Czechoslovakia and other Eastern European countries now bent under the Red yoke. The announced intent of the Communists to continue to pursue the same tactics in the future does not strike me as evidence of any change.

The Muscovite chieftains proclaim that they can win their goals without war, and that communism can emerge triumphant in an era of peaceful coexistence. But the so-called peaceful gestures they have made have cost them little or nothing, and when put under scrutiny are obviously false and hollow. The withdrawal of their military forces from Austria and from Porkkala in Finland were highly dramatized, but they had no business being there in the first place and these outposts had lost their usefulness. Let them withdraw from Poland or 1 or 2 other captive countries and permit genuine free elections, and I might begin to put some credence in a real change. Likewise the recently highly propagandized cutback in Red army manpower is hardly a sign of pacific intent when Soviet science and industry are pushing ahead so energetically and alarmingly in long-range bombers, guided missiles, and nuclear explosives. The Soviet Union, despite the manpower reductions, is still the most powerful country militarily in the Eastern Hemisphere.

The de-Stalinization campaign, Mr. Chairman, proves essentially nothing, except that victims of a tyrant of the blackest hue can safely turn on him once he is dead. Stalin always was "de-Stalinized" in my book, and I can see no particular merit in partially recognizing him for the villain he was. I do not think that the dispelling of the pack of lies we call the Stalin myth is the bright dawn of a new day. Nor do I consider the release of many political prisoners as the sudden advent of Russian democracy. Obviously there have been changes in the Soviet Union since the demise of the man of steel. It would have been astounding if there had not been. We cannot propel ourselves on the wings of wishful thinking to believe from a few shreds of evidence or from a few superficial corrections of the rankest injustice that the confirmed totalitarian has reformed or that "shrimps can now whistle."

From all indications, therefore, the Soviet "new look" is nothing but old-fashioned expediency designed to break down the defenses of free peoples and lull them into a complacency where they can be easily destroyed, like a snake hypnotizes a chicken before gulping it down. The prime target of Soviet tac-

tics is NATO and the other military coalitions lined up against the Communist threat. As a corollary, one of their fondest hopes is to cripple the mainstay of these alliances, this aid bill we are now debating. I know that all of us are foes of communism and I know we are all imbued with the sincerest and most patriotic of motives, but there is nothing the Soviet leaders want more than for us to do than blow large holes into this measure. It would be a sharp rebuff to the Soviet rulers and help tremendously to thwart their "new look" foreign-policy tactics if this aid program were approved in its full and undiminished version. The world would then be on notice that we do not intend to falter in those purposes of international security, tranquillity, and justice that we have so often proclaimed.

The theory that the Soviet Union's recent gambits in the economic aid field in Asia and Africa and its greater stress upon political penetration into these areas indicate that the Communist strategists are placing less emphasis upon the military, is not based on solid evidence. If its surge forward in hydrogen weapons and if its spectacular gains in intercontinental bombers and guided missiles add up to less emphasis upon the military, then I fail to see it. The U. S. S. R. today is militarily stronger than it ever was, and I can see no logical reason for stemming the flow of tanks and guns to our allies. Saber rattling is not in my line, and I think the United States should always shrink from actions savoring of warmongering. But to cut back our military assistance at a time when Soviet capabilities have not diminished but increased, would be to gamble on the lives of the American people and to put liberty on the wagering board.

When the defense appropriation was discussed on this floor a few weeks ago I pointed out the sad plight into which our Armed Forces were getting. They are rapidly becoming the second best defense forces in the world. The trouble is there is not any prize for second best in a war. Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of our present defense position is our slippage in long-range strategic bombers. To correct this I proposed a $1 billion increase in the B–52 program. The argument was then made that the increase was unnecessary because of the military assistance being furnished through the foreign-aid bill. It would be the acme of inconsistency now to reduce military aid, when we have not taken the steps necessary to assure our defense superiority. To cut military assistance now, after refusing to give our own Defense Establishment the sinew it needs, would be to compound obstinacy and multiply blindness. I cannot understand pennypinching when the security of the country is at stake.

From my attitude on the military segment of this program please do not conclude that I believe we can put our faith solely in arms and soldiers and bombing planes. Hungry bellies often have a way of spreading Communist influence even more than the threat of force or the promise of subversion, for the man in desperate straits sometimes thinks a radical solution is his best out when the methods of reason and democracy appear discouragingly slow. Food, shelter, and clothing are the foundation stones of freedom and orderly society—today as they have always been. Unfortunately many millions in the vast continents of Asia, Africa, and even in Latin America do not enjoy minimum standards in these essentials of life. Consequently, it is understandable how the example of Soviet Russia can have superficial appeal to many peoples in underdeveloped lands. The Russians point out that only a relatively few years ago they had a backward economy, too, and that they have built it up to its present level in only three decades, and this despite the handicap of a devastating war. The "miracle" of communism can do the same, they say, for the people of other countries, and the latter, often poorly informed on democracy and the American brand of capitalism, find an attraction in this propaganda.

A major purpose of our economic aid is to give these people an alternative, to convince them that communism is not the way out, to demonstrate that freedom is more bounteous than slavery, and that the only gift Moscow can give is a new and more terrible colonialism. Tractors, cement and technical skills have become weapons in the cold war, and we cannot be niggardly with them any more than we can with the military hardware we are sending to our allies.

We need both an economic and a military assistance program and we need it in sensitive areas all around the globe. I am no special pleader for Asia, or for Europe, or for Latin America. Those who try to pare back aid for one area in order to concentrate it in another that happens to be their momentary favorite can easily end up, when you add up their efforts together, by mangling the entire bill and wrecking the aid program. We cannot afford to quibble over this area or that area. With the Soviet Union on the loose the whole world is in danger. If we appropriate the full amount the President requests, then there will be an adequate sum for every area and there will be no need to worry whether this or that one is getting enough.

Moreover, we can afford it. How many of us sit down and carefully ponder the implications of the fact that with only 7 percent of the world's population we have nearly 50 percent of its wealth. Our gross national product is now running about $400 billion a year, which is about 8 times the GNP of the United Kingdom and 100 or 200 times that of some countries in Southeastern Asia. Moreover, our productivity is increasing by leaps and bounds—our GNP has almost doubled since the end of the war. We are on the threshold of the atomic age, an era of virtually unlimited power, where the only limit to the American economy will be that imposed by the horizons of science. Not only can we afford this program, but we can't afford not to have it. If we thought the cost of the last war was high, it will be nothing compared to the next. The price we will pay the next time will be the national heritage of our people, perhaps the very structure of civilization itself.

These are all very practical considerations. As a member of the Appropriations Committee I have long been aware of problems of Government finance, and the virtues of a balanced budget have long since made a vivid impression upon me. But at the same time I also know the futility of a government which balances its budget and goes down to defeat. Frankly I am more interested in the balance of power than I am in a balanced budget, and in seeing that the American Nation does not end up as a has-been in the merciless scrolls of history.

There is also the timeworn line that the Reds are trying to break our economic back, that they are trying to get us to spend ourselves into destruction. I have heard this rationalization of economy-minded gentlemen time and again, and know it inside out. The surprising thing is that the Soviet line can also be interpreted to be just the opposite of what the opponents of aid would like. On the basis of statements by Communist spokesmen at the recent 20th Congress, one could also say that they are trying to get us to curtail our defense and foreign assistance expenditures, because it is these expenditures that are sustaining our economy. Personally, I hold no brief for either line, no matter how you interpret it. The economy of this country is too big, is too virile, and I have more confidence in it than to believe that the magnitudes with which we are here dealing in this bill will shake or break our financial stability.

Mr. Chairman, please do not permit what I have said to convey the impression that I do not think defense is costing the American taxpayers a lot. But we are a business-minded people, we know that you cannot get something for nothing and we know the value of making prudent investments in enterprises that pay off. Actually, this foreign aid measure is an expensive premium on a very vital and worthwhile insurance policy. It will pay off in the highest return we can get—the protection and security of our people.

That is the only payoff we need or want. We are not looking for fame or glory or for gratitude. To hear some critics rail at the assistance we are giving to other countries you would think that we were in some sort of popularity contest and that aid money was a sort of bribe to the judges. You cannot purchase friends any more than you can buy the love of a woman. In fact, it is grossly insulting to suggest, by attitude or otherwise, that a man's gratitude or loyalty can be bought, and insofar as we may make such an inference we are thwarting the purposes of our assistance measures. The rewards we are primarily seeking in our foreign aid are not ephemeral things like popularity and gratitude. Our foreign policy is conducted on a more serious level than that. Our goal is that other nations should be democratic, independent, and strong, and able to live out their lives in security, peace, and freedom. If I thought that by so doing we could guarantee these results from our aid, I would be willing to extend it anonymously—for after all these are the

results that will most redound to our welfare and safety. I do not decry the value of good public relations, and naturally I would much rather have other peoples like us than dislike us. And please, Mr. Chairman, do not overlook the fact that hundreds of millions of people around the globe do like and admire us. But if at the same time we are criticized and maligned to an extent we never were before, I fail to understand the logic that attributes this to foreign aid. It seems to me it arises more from the central position of leadership that events have thrust upon us than from the presence or absence of an aid program.

Whether we like it or not the old comfortable days when we could fade unobtrusively into the wallpaper are gone. The standard of leadership is now in our hand and we cannot lay it aside without grave peril to ourselves and to our children. We are committed to all the sacrifices, the headaches, the anxieties, and attacks that have since the beginning of time beset those in positions of high responsibility. This program has made steady progress during the past 8 years toward its goal of enduring peace with justice. As the President said in his message to the Congress we cannot now falter in our quest for peace. The need is urgent because the enemy is still rampant, and more crafty and guileful than he ever was before. We should thank Heaven that our great people have been endowed so richly with the stamina, the resolution and the skill to carry on the struggle. For carry on we must. The alternative before us is simple, we can either lead or we can quit. And Mr. Speaker, Americans have never been quitters.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Mutual Security Act of 1956."

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT] having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY HONORS HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on next Sunday, June 10, our able and respected majority leader, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, will receive the honorary degree of doctor of laws at commencement exercises of the Catholic University of America. This is, indeed, a remarkable tribute, for no person holding public office other than a President of the United States has ever before received an honorary degree from Catholic University.

We who know our majority leader so well can easily understand why the university selected him for such honors. We recognize that the tribute being accorded him is one which is richly deserved and fully merited. JOHN MCCORMACK'S entire public life, including his years in the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and his 28th consecutive year here in the United States House of Representatives, has been exemplified by an unsurpassed devotion to duty coupled with a strict observance of the highest Christian principles.

Other honors and awards have come to Congressman MCCORMACK over the years. He has been awarded the peace medal of the Third Order of St. Francis. He is a member of the Order of Malta First Class. Honorary degrees have been received by him from the following:

Boston University, Boston, Mass.
Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass.
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass.
Villanova College, Villanova, Pa.
Tufts College, Medford, Mass.
Providence College, Providence, R. I.
Stonehill College, North Easton, Mass.
Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.
Staley College, Brookline, Mass.

That he is now to be so signally honored by Catholic University pleases me personally, as I am sure it does every Member of this House. Perhaps our thinking is best described by the following editorial which recently appeared in a Boston newspaper:

A DESERVING HONOR

When the Catholic University of America confers an honorary degree on Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK on June 10 this eminent institution of higher learning will recognize officially the life and accomplishments of one of the greatest Americans of our time. As the holder of the most important offices in the National House of Representatives, Mr. MCCORMACK has endeavored with conspicuous success to be a spokesman for all Americans, and his influence has invariably extended far beyond the boundaries of his own party. It has been said that this outstanding son of Massachusetts could have had all of the major appointive positions in the land, including that of Supreme Court Justice. But he always chose, even against the wishes of two Presidents, to continue as a Member of Congress and as an active participant in the enaction of humane and progressive legislation. "The Catholic University has never honored a more deserving statesman."

OIL IMPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in a letter made public recently, Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, asked oil importers to lower their planned imports of crude oil in the current quarter in order to maintain the ratio to domestic production recommended by the Presidential Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources last year.

At the same time, Mr. Flemming announced that the Committee formula which pegs oil imports at the same ratio they bore to domestic production in 1954 will be reviewed by September 1 in the light of changing economic and national defense requirements. If the Committee finds as a result of this review that import programs are threatening to impair the national security, the Office of Defense Mobilization proposes to hold a public hearing under the national security section of the Trade Agreements Act. This provides that the President adjust imports when he finds that they are threatening to impair the national security. It is Dr. Flemming's responsibility to advise the President when he believes such a condition may exist.

The control of oil imports through a perversion of powers of the Defense Production Administration and the national security section of the Trade Agreements Act is obvious. The President's Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources is nothing more than the legalization of a domestic petroleum cartel to the advantage of the domestic producers who already have received more lush inducements than any other industry—by way of the 27½-percent income-tax depletion allowance and quick amortization certificates.

How can national security be enhanced by restricting the importation of crude oil? Today, this country's petroleum reserves have been lagging critically behind the increased demand. The shortage of domestic oil is properly the concern of every American—known reserves can take care of current needs for less than 12 years. As a matter of fact, domestic production is inadequate to take care of current needs in industrialized America by 278 million barrels per year. The alarming fact is that during the past 10 years oil consumption has increased 80 percent while domestic oil production has increased only 40 percent. Demand has increased twice as much as production.

The only argument that can be sustained to control imports is that America's security depends on the development of a sufficient domestic industry. But the oil searchers are already stimulated by protected prices and the tax benefits which they uniquely enjoy. After being located and determined, the best place for American oil is in American earth, located but preserved. If our imports should be cut off by reason of critical world conditions, we will be able to sustain our oil-hungry economy and perhaps survive with oil we have providently saved for that day. It is in the interests of the national security that

American oil be saved for that contingency.

Import oil is abundantly available at one-third less the domestic price. The domestic oil producers' cartel, operating through the President's Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources, is seeking to restrict oil imports in order to fix higher prices and profits for domestic oil. How much more gouging can the American oil consumer tolerate?

The work of the President's Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources should be more carefully scrutinized by Congress. In whose interests does the Committee really operate? There is too much government in America by committees which are private instrumentalities and which owe their primary obligation to the industry which compensates them rather than to the public trust.

PRESIDENT PLANS ACTION AGAINST UNION RACKETEERS

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

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased to note an article by Mr. A. H. Raskin which appeared on the front page of this morning's New York Times. I should like to call it to the attention of my colleagues. According to this account, President Eisenhower is planning to take special action aimed at racketeers inside certain labor unions. I should like to insert the full text of Mr. Raskin's article at this point in my remarks:

EISENHOWER PLANS ACTION AGAINST UNION RACKETEERS—SPURRED BY BLINDING OF RIESEL, PRESIDENT ASKS FOR LABOR CONFERENCE—MEANY WELCOMES CONSTRUCTIVE INQUIRY

(By A. H. Raskin)

President Eisenhower plans White House action against underworld infiltration into unions, authoritative labor sources reported last night.

The President was said to have informed George Meany of his intention in a private conversation at the dedication of the new $4 million headquarters of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations in Washington on Monday.

Mr. Meany, who heads the united labor movement, told the President that labor would support any constructive investigation of racket inroads into union ranks.

The specific spur for the President's expression of determination to act, it was reported, was the blinding of Victor Riesel, crusading labor columnist, by an acid-hurling assailant in midtown Manhattan 2 months ago.

The conversation between the President and Mr. Meany was summarized by one source, as follows:

The President said he had watched Mr. Riesel on the Meet the Press television program Sunday night, and had been much impressed by his demands for Federal action against union racketeers. The President declared that he wanted to do something about the problem. He expressed a desire to meet with Mr. Meany soon to discuss the subject in greater detail.

The AFL–CIO head replied that he welcomed the President's interest and would be glad to meet with him. Mr. Meany said labor's sole concern was that any investigation be directed at ridding unions of corrupt elements and not at weakening unions.

In the television interview that aroused the President's interest, Mr. Riesel made a dramatic, fist-clinched appeal for establishment of a permanent congressional committee to root out union crooks.

He praised Mr. Meany and other top officials of the merged labor organization as men dedicated to clean unionism, but he said they lacked power to do an adequate job without Government help.

No indication was given by the President of what action he might take. However, one possibility discussed in labor circles was the appointment of an impartial committee of distinguished citizens to hold hearings in major industrial cities.

Such a committee could be armed with power to subpena witnesses and to initiate contempt proceedings against those who refused to cooperate. It might function along the lines of the State crime commission, which conducted the waterfront investigation here in 1952. Its findings led to the enactment of the New York-New Jersey compact against waterfront crime and to the expulsion of the International Longshoremen's Association from the old AFL.

The AFL–CIO has an ethical practices committee of its own to keep its ranks free of racketeering. Mr. Meany is expected to recommend specific measures for increasing the effectiveness of this self-policing machinery at the meeting of the AFL–CIO executive council in Washington this week.

However, the merged labor group has repeatedly expressed its willingness to back Government action designed to provide additional safeguards in areas outside direct union control. Mr. Meany recently endorsed the basic provisions of legislation recommended by a Senate labor subcommittee to curb abuses in union-management welfare funds. The subcommittee was headed by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois.

It is not clear just what steps the President may recommend. Mr. Raskin's article suggests the possibility of establishing an impartial committee of distinguished citizens to hold hearings on this matter. In line with this approach, I am today introducing a joint resolution to establish a special, nonpartisan, Hoover-type commission to investigate labor racketeering.

I have already introduced several resolutions authorizing Congress to undertake such an investigation. As a Member of Congress, I personally think it would be appropriate for Congress to take action on this important problem. On May 24 I introduced House Resolution 512, which would authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to take action. On May 31 I introduced House Resolution 518, authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to make inquiry as to whether the blinding of Victor Riesel was an infringement of the freedom of the press. Yesterday I proposed, in House Joint Resolution 634, that a special joint committee of Congress undertake an investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it matters greatly who undertakes this investigation. These various proposals will provide a variety of choices as to the best course to take. In my own opinion, Congress has a responsibility and might well take some action. Any inquiry, if it is to be undertaken, should be thorough, constructive and objective. I have no particular preference as to whether the investigation should be handled in or out of Congress. The important thing is that it be undertaken. It is also important that any investigation be aimed at racketeering inside some labor unions—and not at labor itself.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that Mr. Raskin states that Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, would welcome a constructive inquiry into labor unions. A number of us have expressed similar expectations here on the floor. It is encouraging to be furnished this additional evidence of Mr. Meany's statesmanship.

Mr. Speaker, it is extremely heartening to read of the President's interest in this subject. Under the circumstances perhaps action can be taken in the near future.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FIRST SECTION OF MUTUAL SECURITY BILL CONSIDERED AS READ

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first section of the mutual-security bill on which we have had general debate today be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

FOUR YEARS OF WORK AND ACCOMPLISHMENT IN CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, during my first two terms as United States Representative, I feel that I have exerted every effort in the development of proper representation of the people of the Seventh District of Louisiana. I have received every kind consideration from the membership of this body and, with what I hope to be pardonable pride, through my efforts and the assistance of others, we have accomplished those things that were necessary to be done.

I have been honored by being selected to serve on two major committees—the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries—on which committees I now hold positions of seniority. I am also a member of three subcommittees and chairman of one special committee of the Congress. As my seniority grows on these committees, I feel that I can be of

ever-increasing value to my district. Certainly, my service on these committees adds to the number of hours I must spend each day, and even during times of adjournment of the Congress, at my work. However, I feel that my activities in these connections will redound to the benefit of my district and State.

Of course, there are many problems still facing us. Some of them are local in nature, yet of national importance, and there are the greater problems affecting our very existence as a Nation of free men which some day, with the help of God, we hope to solve.

The things that are particularly pressing at this time, Mr. Speaker, insofar as my people are concerned and things on which I shall continue to work, are the lowering of the great tax burden which is now higher even than the taxes on many of the peoples that we are assisting through our foreign aid programs. We must help our farmers in order that they may take their proper place in our overall economy, as without a prosperous farmer, we cannot long expect a prosperous America. We must continue our work to see that both labor and management are able to receive returns commensurate with their efforts. Especially must we protect that great segment of our economy which is "small business." We must continue to conserve and develop our natural resources to the ends that we will make the best use of these God-given bounties. We must develop more and better institutions of learning to see that every child receives the maximum of education to prepare himself for the day when he will assume our responsibilities. And yet, Mr. Speaker, we must be very careful to preserve the rights of the individual States in the development and operation of their own institutions.

Also, we must not continue to steal from other nations their ambitions and pride by the giving of ever-flowing grants to them as an incentive not to develop. We must one day help them to assume responsibilities which are theirs.

My service in Washington as Representative of the people of my district has not been without accomplishment. I take great pride in the fact that I was reelected to my second term by an overwhelming majority because of the efforts I had put forth in behalf of my constituents. Because I have been asked by many to make available my record of accomplishments, I feel that there is no better way to impart to all the people of the District the efforts I have made in their behalf than to make available to them some of the representations that have been made to me by letter and telegram.

Now, in the case of my activities concerning the problems of our farmers, I think it is generally known that I have waged a continuous battle for our cotton, rice, sweetpotato, and truck farmers, and for the great cattle industry which is developing in Louisiana. I led the fight in the House and was successful in getting an additional 39,000 acres for our rice farmers last year and 9,300 additional acres this year, and was able to have legislation passed at this session guaranteeing 475,094 acres for rice plantings in 1957 and 1958. We were also able to get an additional 4,835 acres for our cotton farmers this year and to have the cotton acreage frozen so that the farmers will know their acreage will not be further cut. I personally believe that a rigid price support of 90 percent of parity on basic commodities is the best approach that has been suggested yet to the farm problem. After all, parity is defined as meaning what a farmer should receive as compared to what he must pay out, and 90 percent means even less than everyone agrees he should get.

I refer you to letters I have received in regard to my efforts for the farmers, which I think will indicate the general feeling of the people in my areas who are interested in the farmers and their welfare:

ACADIA PACKING CORP.,
Church Point, La., October 16, 1953.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: We wish to take this opportunity to thank you for the splendid manner in which you handled our request for help pertaining to the sweetpotato inspector. You did a magnificent job.

Cordially,

A. F. DAVID.

CHURCH POINT WHOLESALE GROCERY CO., INC.,
Church Point, La., January 22, 1954.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I note that Congress has just completed action on the cotton-acreage bill, which is now ready for the President's signature. This will immensely benefit our cotton farmers and especially the small tenant cotton farmers.

Please accept my heartfelt thanks for your fine efforts in furthering this needed legislation and I know that all of our cotton farmers will thank you and remember your efforts in their behalf at a time when they really needed a good Representative in Washington.

Sincerely,

P. ROY HORECKY.

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *April 28, 1955.*
Congressman T. A. THOMPSON,
Washington, D. C.:

The rice producers gratefully acknowledge your outstanding leadership in the correction of acreage inequities and its impact on rice farmer economy is so great that its monetary value cannot be estimated.

AMERICAN RICE GROWERS CO-OP ASSOCIATION,
D. B. WINTERMAN, *President.*
H. G. CHALKLEY, *Vice President.*
GEORGE BLAIR,
Secretary-Treasurer.

JENNINGS PRODUCTION CREDIT ASSOCIATION,
Jennings, La., September 28, 1954.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: The board of directors of this association, at their regular meeting last Friday, requested that I write you expressing their appreciation for the great service you have rendered to the rice industry in having the takeover date for rice moved up to February 28. I, too, would like to add my personal thanks to you for your cooperation in bringing this matter to a satisfactory conclusion.

Very truly yours,

L. P. THERIOT, Jr.,
Secretary-Treasurer.

KELLY, WEBER & CO., INC.,
Lake Charles, La., August 7, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I received your telegram and am giving all publicity possible to this very important meeting to be held at the courthouse in Crowley, La., Wednesday, 10 a. m., August 11.

The farmers need help right now and I am sure all of them appreciate the interest you have shown in their behalf.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR L. GAYLE,
President.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, April 28, 1955.

DEAR MR. CHALKLEY: Thank you for your telegram of this date with reference to the adoption of a 1955 rice acreage allotment increased by the House.

I much preferred the House version as written by the House subcommittee on rice, but the lateness and the problem of getting any increase lead me to the 2 percent increase rather than the original 5 percent.

It was a pleasure to work with Representative T. A. THOMPSON, who has been in the forefront of the studies and determinations on this matter. Certainly Representative THOMPSON did a most valiant service to the rice growers.

With cordial good wishes, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

E. C. GATHINGS,
Democrat of Arkansas.

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *April 28, 1955.*
Congressman T. A. THOMPSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Your outstanding leadership in the writing and handling of the rice acreage legislation is one of the most striking examples of dynamic action we have seen in the legislative branch of the Government. The rice producers are most grateful for your help.

LOUISIANA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
H. O. CHALKLEY,
Chairman, Rice Committee.

CHURCH POINT, LA., *October 28, 1955.*
Hon. T. A. THOMPSON:

The board of directors of Farmers Bank and Trust Co., Church Point, have requested me to thank you for your efforts in securing approval of Department of Agriculture to purchase surplus sweet potatoes. I and other leaders join the bank in expressing appreciation. We all feel it will help thousands of small distressed farmers in sweetpotato area.

M. W. SCANLAN.

JENNINGS ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Jennings, La., May 3, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: On behalf of the Jennings Association of Commerce, I want to congratulate you and thank you for your successful effort to secure an increase in the rice acreage quota.

Your constituents here are very appreciative of the fine job you have done.

Sincerely yours,

L. E. BLOCH,
Secretary-Manager.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY AND AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE,
Baton Rouge, La., March 27, 1956.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I was glad to receive your letter of March 23 and to note the fine piece of advertising you are giving to Louisiana products. Certainly, your interest in these crops will mean a lot to the growers in your area.

I am taking the liberty of sending you under separate cover a copy of our annual report on our sweetpotato research.

It has been a pleasure to meet and talk with you on occasions and particularly at the Yambilee.

Anytime I can be of help to you, please let me know, and with personal regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

JULIAN C. MILLER,
Head, Horticultural Research.

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION,
Baton Rouge, La., April 3, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: This will acknowledge receipt of yours of March 23 written on your new stationery. I think this was a wonderful idea and will be very beneficial. I wish that each one of our officials up there would do the same thing.

Thanks so much for your efforts in getting the proper officials to purchase the yams from us. You did a wonderful job.

You are doing a good job and I certainly hope no one will run against you this time. If they do, you can count on me and I will do everything I can to help you and I won't be ashamed to say so.

Sincerely yours,

DAVE L. PEARCE, *Commissioner.*

EVANGELINE PARISH POLICE JURY,
Ville Platte, La., August 27, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In behalf of the Evangeline Parish Police Jury, Ville Platte, La., I wish to extend by this letter our sincere appreciation and gratitude for the support of the agricultural research and extension bill which has been passed by the United States Congress.

Our local county agent office has advised us that an additional assistant county agent has been approved for Evangeline Parish and we are deeply grateful for your work on this bill.

Sincerely yours,

TANZAY VEILLON,
Secretary and Treasurer.

CAMERON, LA., *August 25, 1954.*

Congressman T. A. THOMPSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: It has long been felt that one man is needed to look after 4–H club work and another to do the adult work. Through your cooperation this is being realized here in Cameron Parish. The extra appropriation which Congress voted for an expanded extension program has enabled us to obtain another man who will be principally responsible for 4–H club work. Cameron Parish has had only one man agent up to this time.

Please be assured that your support for increased funds for agriculture extension work is appreciated and will be used to a good advantage.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

CONWAY LE BLEU,
Chairman, Cameron Parish Agriculture Extension Advisory Committee.

SOWELA VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOL,
Lake Charles, La., April 13, 1954.

DEAR MR. MITCHELL: Our friend and Congressman, T. A. THOMPSON, fired the opening shot in our fight for vocational funds in the United States Congress on March 22, 1954. He did not wait until the subcommittee met but registered his intention on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I am sure you will join me in thanking T. A. for the stand he had taken and encourage him to continue his fight. He needs our backing in order to make an effective fight for us.

We should be proud of the fact that our Congressman was the first to go on record in favor of continued Federal support for vocational education.

Very truly yours,

REX H. SMELSER, *Director.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Baton Rouge, La., September 15, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I wish to express my appreciation to you for having made the addition of agricultural extension work personnel possible by your support of the move for additional funds for agricultural extension work.

I personally supported this move and it was unanimously approved by the police jury.

Very truly yours,

ALVIN DYSON,
State Representative.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Ville Platte, La., August 25, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We have noticed your work in the United States Congress in regard to agriculture. We want to commend you for helping to pass the bill which gave additional funds to Agricultural Research and Extension Service.

With the passage of this bill, you have helped to better equip and staff our experiment stations and have added extra extension personnel to bring to the people on the farm necessary information.

Evangeline Parish farmers are grateful for your fine work toward the passage of this bill.

Yours very truly,

A. V. GUILLORY,
Chairman, ASC Committee of Evangeline Parish.

LIONS CLUB,
Cameron, La., August 16, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: On behalf of the Cameron Lions Club I wish to express our sincere appreciation for having supported the bill which dedicates more funds to agriculture extension, research, and marketing.

Cameron Parish is getting another man to help with adult and 4–H Club work. Up to this time Cameron was the only parish with only one man extension agent in the southwest district. We feel that with the added personnel, the county agent's office will be in a much better position to give to the farm people the service they need and want.

Thanking you again for your cooperation, I am,

Sincerely yours,

L. B. WELCH, *Secretary.*

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION,
Baton Rouge, La., September 2, 1954.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: In behalf of the Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Immigration please accept my thanks and appreciation for your assistance concerning the 1955 Federal budget for the plant pest control and plant quarantine branches of the Agricultural Research Service.

Your interest in this appropriation has resulted in the continuation of this vital and important work.

With kind regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

S. J. MCCRORY, *State Entomologist.*

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
AND AGRICULTURAL AND
MECHANICAL COLLEGE,
Baton Rouge, La., March 27, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: In reference to your letter of March 22, I wish to congratulate you on your novel idea regarding the promotion of Louisiana rice and yams. This continual reminder to people throughout the Nation will be a good way to expand our promotion efforts for these two commodities.

If possible, I would like to receive about 25 sample copies of your stationery with this stamp to use in suggesting a similar approach to certain process houses and public offices in the Louisiana rice and sugar areas.

Sincerely yours,

J. N. EFFERSON, *Director.*

DEZAUCHE & SON, INC.,
Opelousas, La., May 11, 1956.

FRIEND THOMPSON: I had intended writing you first part of April when I received your letter—carrying the "new look" on your stationery.

Thought it was a mighty good idea and certainly will serve to attract attention to Louisiana rice and yams.

It's a "yam" good idea.

Sincerely,

J. F. DEZAUCHE.

TRI-PARISH BANK & TRUST CO.,
Eunice, La., March 26, 1956.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I have your letter of March 22, 1956, calling my attention to your "new look"—bring rice and yams before the public on your stationery. I think it is a splendid thought and would like to copy your idea if you have no objection. Please have the firm who prepared or made your art work write me direct and quote price on duplicating your art work if it meets your approval.

You are to be complimented on this original idea and more people in our district should carry on such fine work.

Regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

M. J. FRUGE,
Executive Vice President.

EDMUNDSON-DUHE RICE MILL,
Rayne, La., March 26, 1956.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Thank you for your letter of March 22.

Congratulations on your "new look" in stationery. Your slogan adds to the attractiveness of your stationery, besides being good publicity and advertisement for two industries, rice and yams, that are in great need of increased domestic consumption. Your efforts are appreciated by both industries.

Kind regards.

Very truly yours,

J. OTTO BROUSSARD.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *March 27, 1956.*

DEAR T. A.: Thank you for your letter of March 23 with reference to your new look in stationery. You are certainly to be complimented for such wise vision which is a definite expression of your interest in Louisiana's agriculture.

I am looking forward to working with you during the next 4 years and assuring you my full and wholehearted support.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY J. MCCRORY,
Commissioner-Elect of Agriculture.

THE RICE MILLERS' ASSOCIATION,
New Orleans, La., March 30, 1956.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: You are to be commended for your thoughtfulness and action in promoting Louisiana products, rice and yams. Every bit of publicity helps, and if your new look in stationery will tend to develop some new consumers for Louisiana rice and yams you will have rendered a distinct service to the people of your district and State.

On behalf of the segment of the industry which we represent, please accept our thanks for this splendid cooperation.

With all good wishes.

Cordially yours,

W. M. REID, *President.*

JENNINGS ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Jennings, La., April 2, 1956.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I know your efforts to advertise rice and yams by use of the cut on your stationery will be sincerely appreciated by your constituents in this area.

Perhaps it will be of interest to you that the agriculture committee of this organization recently addressed letters to both the major oil companies as well as independents,

suggesting that they give consideration to the use of rice as a premium instead of sugar in connection with service station openings. I am glad to say that the response thus far has been favorable.

With best personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

L. E. BLOCH, *Manager.*

KELLY, WEBER & COMPANY, INC.,
Lake Charles, La., March 29, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am glad to have your letter with reference to the "New Look" on your stationery, and want to congratulate you on this. This letterhead is the last word. It certainly is an idea to advertise the products of your district, and as suggested by you, it will reach a lot of people without any cost to the taxpayers.

Last night's American Press carried a very nice article about this.

With best wishes for continued success, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

ARTHUR L. GAYLE,
President and General Manager.

LOUISIANA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, INC.,
Baton Rouge, La., April 3, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I congratulate you on the "new look" stationery with Yams and Rice printed on the envelope. You are a good Louisiana booster.

Yours very truly,

MALCOLM S. DOUGHERTY, *President.*

MERMENTAU RICE MILL COMPANY, INC.,
Mermentau, La., March 26, 1956.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Your "new look" stationery is not only artistic and complimentary, but it should give favorable advertising to both yams and rice.

It is a unique idea and these two Louisiana industries, I am sure, appreciate the thought and the efforts you are giving them through this medium.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Yours very truly,

B. C. DELAHOUSSAYE.

ABDALLA'S, INC.,
Opelousas, La., March 27, 1956.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of March 23 and have indeed noted your "new look" in stationery.

I am very pleased with the appearance and wish to commend you for this fine job you are doing. I do hope that this effort on your part will be well rewarded and that our problems regarding the development of greater domestic consumption of rice and yams will be minimized as a result of your action.

Sincerely yours,

ANTHONY ABDALLA.

TWENTY-SEVENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA,
Opelousas, La., March 26, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am in receipt of your letter with the "new look."

As a producer of sweetpotatoes, I wish to express my appreciation for your interest in the yam and to congratulate you on the excellent and novel idea. I am sure that we are going to benefit from this added publicity feature.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

LESSLEY P. GARDINER, *Judge.*

"PRONTO" LIQUID FERTILIZER CORP.,
Eunice, La., March 27, 1956.

DEAR T. A.: I am in receipt of your letter of March 22 and was very happy to hear from you.

I have read the contents of your letter and believe that the idea is very good and is another step forward in promoting sales of our Louisiana rice and yams. You just can't do too much in this direction to help our farmers and thereby reduce our vast surplus in these commodities, whereby the farmers may be able to get back in their old and accustomed manner of raising all that their soil will produce, without any strings tied to them.

You are to be highly commended for the fine work and efforts put forth by you in this great and worthy cause.

We are ready and willing to cooperate in any way that we can and we don't want you to hesitate one bit to call on us if you need us for anything.

With kindest regards and best wishes from Phil and me, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ED UZZO.

COMMITTEE FOR RICE SALES PROTECTION,
St. Martinsville, La., April 7, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I want to thank you for your kind letter showing and telling me of your "new look" in stationery. Throughout the Rice Belt I have heard many complimentary remarks about your stationery. I wholeheartedly concur with you in that full advantage should be taken of every opportunity to call attention to our fine foods here in Louisiana and compliment you on the time, effort, and expense you have put into the promotion of our Louisiana rice and yams.

I definitely agree with you that this "new look" stationery and all of your other efforts will positively assist in the development of greater domestic consumption of rice and yams.

Thanking you for your interest and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

ALLAN DURAND,
Executive Secretary.

LOUISIANA SWEET POTATO ADVERTISING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION,
Opelousas, La., March 27, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Your effort to further popularize Louisiana yams and rice through a message on your stationery is certainly of interest to us. We thank you for your interest and active support.

We also want to thank you, Congressman WILLIS and Senators ELLENDER and LONG for the assistance that you rendered the sweet potato industry in getting the Government to initiate a surplus purchase program for our product.

If available send us a newspaper mat or photograph of the "rice and yam message" and we will be glad to use it in an early issue of our Yamgram.

Sincerely yours,

J. J. ARCENEAUX, *Director.*

VILLE PLATTE, LA., *May 28, 1956.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I want to thank you for your efforts in getting the 9,300 additional acres for the rice farmers for this year. We were mighty proud of you last year for your efforts in getting us additional acreage and this year's increase in acreage will keep many small rice farmers from going broke. You are really a friend of the farmer. Keep up the fine work you are doing for the district.

Sincerely,

KERELL VIDRINE.

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION,
Baton Rouge, La., April 6, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Knowing your interest in our fine State, I have asked Mr. Gasquet to develop some pictures for you to hang in your office which I hope you will be pleased with. I have found that a picture is worth a lot of words.

I want you to know that I personally appreciate the cooperation you are giving our department, and also I appreciate the fine work you are doing for our State.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DAVE L. PEARCE, *Commissioner.*

MERMENTAU RICE MILL CO., INC.,
Mermentau, La., June 4, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Please accept my appreciation for your telegram of the second from Ville Platte advising that the distribution of the additional State acreage is now in the hands of our State committee for distribution.

I appreciate very much the personal attention you have given this matter and I think that the rice farmers of southwest Louisiana should be very grateful to you for your efforts to help them on every and all occasions.

With kindest regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

B. C. DELAHOUSSAYE.

Our State of Louisiana is blessed with lots of fresh water and many navigable streams. While these are a blessing to us and add to our wealth, they also present problems in the matter of flood control. I have worked untiringly for the better development of ports and waterways and have been successful in the acomplishment of long-needed flood control and drainage projects. I firmly believe that through my continued efforts, many of our smaller streams can be charged with greater quantities of water from our larger rivers, enabling the entire district at some future date to have available to it navigable streams that will induce industrial development and assist our farmers in their irrigation problems.

The following communications which I have received should indicate to this body and to my people the reaction of some to my efforts:

OPELOUSAS ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Opelousas, La., January 22, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Let me congratulate you on the splendid work you have done in the interest of flood control for this area. We are very pleased with the Cocodrie-Courtableau-Teche projects included in the budget.

Sincerely,

BILLY M. SMITH, *Manager.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1955.

DEAR ASHTON: Now that I've had a chance to get my breath since our fight in regard to civil functions, I want to express my appreciation for the fine work that you did in this fight.

Cordially,

FRANK E. SMITH,
Member of Congress,
Democrat, of Mississippi.

COURT ST. FRANCIS, NO. 1519,
CATHOLIC DAUGHTERS OF AMERICA,
Iota, La., June 8, 1953.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You and other Congressmen of Louisiana have done a wonderful job to help the flooded area of Louisiana. We thank you a million.

Wishing you good health and success in your undertakings, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ANNA BOURGEOIS,
Legislative Committee Chairman.

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY FLOOD CONTROL ASSOCIATION,
Memphis, Tenn., July 8, 1955.

DEAR PAULIN: I have just heard the good news that you are the new president of the Courtableau Association.

As you perhaps know, we were in great jeopardy of losing a substantial part of our appropriation in the House last month. The two House Members involved, Congressman WILLIS and Congressman THOMPSON, were among the leaders in the successful fight to restore the funds. They did a magnificent job, which if left undone would have seriously delayed your project. Now the Courtableau project can be a reality!

With warmest regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

BRUCE TUCKER,
Executive Vice President.

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY FLOOD CONTROL ASSOCIATION,
Memphis, Tenn., June 27, 1955.

DEAR CLIFF: Since your board has jurisdiction in St. Landry Parish, the people there should know how hard Congressman T. A. THOMPSON worked to restore our appropriations cut. He was energetic and enthusiastic and contributed materially to the success of our effort.

With warmest regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

BRUCE TUCKER,
Executive Vice President.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, August 1, 1953.

DEAR T. A.: I was very pleased to cooperate with you and the other members of the Louisiana delegation in securing approval by the House Public Works Committee of the resolution authorizing a study of the adequacy of the existing improvement program for flood control and drainage of the streams and structures of the Atchafalaya Floodway.

You will be interested to know that the cost of this study, while relatively small, is the highest figure approved by the committee in connection with a survey at any time this year. You and the Corps of Engineers representatives made such a compelling statement about the urgency of this study that the committee decided to ignore the unwritten rule under which it has been acting in regard to cost and to approve the res-

I certainly hope that the study will result in the development of plans which will bring about correction of the program now under way.

Cordially,

FRANK E. SMITH,
Member of Congress, Mississippi.

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 10, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Because of the great interest you displayed in connection with the development and passage of legislation authorizing the Sabine River Compact between the States of Texas and Louisiana, I am happy to present to you my gavel which was used on the occasion of the final passage of S. 3699.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes for the successful development of this natural resource, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker.

LAWES, CAVANAUGH & HICKMAN,
Lake Charles, La., June 14, 1953.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Please accept my thanks for the copy of the United States Statutes at Large covering the sessions of the Congress 1950 through 1952.

I appreciate your expression of confidence in my apopintment to the court of appeals to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Judge Dore. Judge Dore had been my friend for a long time, and his death is a great loss to the bench and bar of the State.

You have done a great service to this district in assisting the people who have lost everything they had by the recent flood. I have heard so many mention your activity and special interest in the matter.

I was sorry I did not get to see you when you were here on your last visit, but I know you had to cover the district and see the places where the people were suffering most.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

A. B. CAVANAUGH.

We all know that as long as Communist Russia is working constantly to influence the world with the ungodly philosophy they espouse, we will have to be ever alert to the problems of our own defense. I wish that the day would come when all military installations could be disbanded and closed, yet as long as we must have them, our areas should share in the distribution of these installations where many of our tax dollars can be spent and put back into circulation in our own economy.

Since I have been a Member of Congress, the Lake Charles Air Force Base has been made into a permanent Strategic Air Command installation. The money disbursed by the Government at this installation exceeds even the great industrial benefits in that area. My people all remember that Camp Polk was closed for the second time and through the joint efforts of myself and others of the Louisiana delegation, we were successful in having it reopened, not as a camp, but as a permanent base to be known as Fort Polk. It is now one of the Nation's most important training areas for our ground forces.

All of this redounds to the benefit of our entire district and State, and the following letters were received by me regarding my efforts in connection with these two installations.

REINAUER'S REAL ESTATE,
Lake Charles, La., July 22, 1954.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I am most appreciative of the telegram you sent me advising me that the Lake Charles Air Force Base has been made a permanent installation. I do appreciate your prompt attention and personally informing me by telegram.

I want to congratulate you on the good work of securing this base for Lake Charles. I feel sure it is a great step forward for the city and know it took a great deal of your personal time and attention.

With best wishes for your continued success, I remain,

Very truly yours,

JULES REINAUER.

VINCENT & WELCH, INC.,
Lake Charles, La., April 9, 1954.

DEAR T. A.: I am very sorry that I did not get to see you before you left Lake Charles. For myself and on behalf of an overwhelming majority of citizens in this community, let me express our appreciation for your untiring efforts put forth in helping us try to have the Lake Charles Air Force Base made a permanent installation.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

LEE WELCH.

OFFICE OF DISTRICT ATTORNEY,
30TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT,
Leesville, La., June 21, 1955.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of myself, my family, and all of your friends here in Vernon Parish, I want to thank you from the bottom of our hearts for the great service you have rendered us in connection with Camp Polk. The reopening of this camp on a permanent basis will be a great boon to this whole parish and to surrounding parishes. If there is anything we can do to repay you for your great work, do not hesitate to call on us.

Yours very truly,

PETER S. ANDERSON,
District Attorney.

LAKE CHARLES ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Lake Charles, La., April 9, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Your visit to Lake Charles in connection with the Air Force installation here is deeply appreciated. It was a real pleasure for me to meet you and have an opportunity to become acquainted. I am thoroughly convinced that this area is ably represented in Washington, and I hasten to assure you that it will always be my desire to cooperate with you in every instance.

We all are deeply grateful for your interest in our problem and for your assistance in our efforts to have the Lake Charles Air Force Base designated as a permanent installation.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

J. WALKER OWENS,
General Manager.

THE CALCASIEU-MARINE NATIONAL BANK,
Lake Charles, La., July 22, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Needless to say the news announcing the permanency of the Lake Charles Air Force Base was most gratifying to the entire population of the city of Lake Charles.

As a citizen of Lake Charles, may I express to you my appreciation for your untiring efforts and the time given to this worthwhile project, as I know it was through the efforts of you and our other representation in Washington that brought the permanency of the base to a final conclusion.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CECIL K. COLON,
Executive Vice President.

DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS,
New Orleans, May 15, 1956.

DEAR TOM: As I relinquish the position of adjutant general of Louisiana, a post I have held for 24 years, permit me to thank you for the fine assistance you have rendered me as a member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

With your help our military department today occupies a place second to none in the Nation. Through your generous help the great training area known as Fort Polk has been made a permanent installation of the United States Army.

For all this and more I thank you and pray God's richest blessings upon you and yours.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND H. FLEMING,
Major General, The Adjutant General.

LAKE CHARLES ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Lake Charles, La., March 9, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: We feel certain that you are apprized of the fact that the citizenship of our community overwhelmingly voted in excess of $13 million in bonds to provide drainage and donate land etc. as required by the criteria of the Air Force when our aviation committee was in Washington to make our local Air Base a permanent installation.

We, in Lake Charles and Southwest Louisiana, consider this a red-letter day in our community activity. However, we want you to know that we would not have accomplished the objectives had it not been for your counsel, advice, and assistance with ours and the police jury committee's on the various trips to Washington when the plans were made with the Air Force to make this base permanent.

In behalf of our association of commerce and the citizens of southwest Louisiana, we

want to again thank you for the splendid assistance given us in this instance, as well as the cooperation you have always extended to us.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN L. MILLER, *President.*

We of the Seventh District of Louisiana are fortunate in having unlimited resources of oil and natural gas. This, along with our navigable waterways and vast numbers of enlightened people available for work, is drawing more and more industries to Southwest Louisiana. I have been constantly alert to encroachment by the Federal Government into those things which are properly ours. I participated in the successful battle waged in regard to tidelands ownership. Our tidelands oil alone has meant more than a hundred million dollars to Louisiana already. Through our continued efforts in Washington, it is my hope that we will succeed in establishing ownership of tidelands to the 10½-mile historic boundary. These are the funds which should properly be used for the many basic necessities in Louisiana, such as public education and the program of much-needed salary increases for teachers, bus drivers, and others, and for other such worthy causes. The continued development of these tidelands will mean thousands of jobs for our people.

Below are some of the acknowledgments I received pursuant to my work in these matters to indicate the feelings of my constituency:

MID-CONTINENT OIL & GAS ASSOCIATION,
Baton Rouge, La., August 10, 1955.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: The Louisiana-Arkansas division of the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association is deeply indebted to you and your staff for the courageous stand which you took in supporting the Harris bill.

We want you to know that we deeply appreciate the fine work you did, and we realize that without your help this bill could not have been passed.

We wish you continuing success in the fine work you are doing in our Congress.

Sincerely,

L. LEE WELCH, *President.*

ST. LANDRY DRILLING CO., INC.,
Eunice, La., July 28, 1955.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: We take note here of a wonderful job you are doing in Washington, and we wish to compliment you on it.

Very truly yours,

IVAN WEST.

OIL, CHEMICAL, AND ATOMIC WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION,
Maplewood, La., June 28, 1955.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: The members of Calcasieu Parish, Local No. 4–500, Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union, CIO, meeting in regular session, June 7, 1955, have directed that this communication be sent to you, wholeheartedly thanking you for your efforts toward settling the recent Southern Bell Telephone strike.

You may feel sure that you have earned the confidence and admiration of all members of our union who champion the cause of democratic principles in our State and in our Nation.

Sincerely,

PERCY L. ROGERS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

The problems encountered by many of our veterans and families of boys in the service are great. My office has ever been open to anyone seeking assistance in the matter of what is due them from their Government. I have never failed to respond to these problems and have been successful in seeing that they all received prompt attention by the appropriate agency or department of the Government. An indication of the response given me as a result of my intervention in these cases can be seen in the following letters:

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *May 25, 1955.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: This is to express appreciation for your obtaining for me copies of my flight examinations while in the service.

Again I thank you for your persevering efforts in my behalf.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES W. WEST.

DE QUINCY, LA., *January 10, 1955.*

HON. MR. THOMPSON: We are today in receipt of a check from the Finance Department of the Army covering my wife's part of the corporal's pay earned by me while in the Army.

Many thanks for efforts made by you and your staff in securing for us the above-mentioned check.

Sincerely,

HUEY P. SHIRLEY.

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *July 20, 1955.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: We would like to express our appreciation for what you have done for us. We know that you had to take time out in writing those letters when you had more important work to do. We have found out that you are a kind and just person, and are ready to help anyone in need of something important.

Again we thank you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. GEORGE L. JONES.

RAYNE, LA., *April 12, 1954.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Having received your last two letters, I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for your trouble in helping me to get back into the Air Force.

Thanking you ever so much, with all my heart, for going to any trouble for me.

If ever you wish something and I am able to assist you, please advise me.

Sincerely yours,

RODNEY J. BARONET.

SULPHUR ELECTRIC, PIPING & PLUMBING CO.,
Sulphur, La., December 7, 1955.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: In reply to your Mrs. Harrison's letter of December 1, I want to take this opportunity to thank you on the way that you have made the claim of Jim's travel pay possible, for without your assistance, I'm convinced that the claim would have gone untouched.

I would also like to express my feeling for the hospitality and the consideration I was given by your Mrs. Harrison when I was in Washington recently.

If at any time we can be of service to you, please feel free to call on us.

Respectfully yours,

FRANK LANGLEY.

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *January 8, 1956.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I finally received my pension check, and I want to thank you kindly for getting it for me. I certainly feel that you are responsible for it. I am very sorry that I was such a bother to you. If I can ever be of any service to you in any way, please call on me or any of my family. We all want to say thank you again.

OSCAR W. HALE.

OPELOUSAS, LA., *May 18, 1953.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I wish to thank you for all you have done in behalf of my brother, Carrol Lavergne, in his attempt to get a hardship discharge from the Navy. We realize now how difficult they are to obtain. I assure you that you were right in assuming that my brother is badly needed at home as we expressed in our letters. But thanks again for your efforts and your kind interest. We really appreciate it.

Again, may I express my best wishes for your success in Washington.

Sincerely,

MRS. FRANK O. QUIRK.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Lake Charles, La., December 16, 1953.

Re Smith, Carroll E.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: This is to acknowledge the receipt of your telegram of December 14, 1953, on the above-named veteran, and to advise that we have obtained all the necessary information.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank you and your competent staff for the assistance received by this office during the past year and to wish all a Merry Christmas and Happy New Year.

Sincerely yours,

SAM P. FONTANA,
Assistant Calcasieu Parish Service Officer.

TOBERT SLACK, LANDSCAPE ENGINEER,
Lake Charles, La., August 10, 1955.

DEAR ASHTON: I received your letter of August 5 enclosing the letter dated August 4 addressed to you from The Adjutant General of the Army with reference to Capt. W. F. Martin.

Many thanks for your effective and very efficient efforts in our behalf. Really, I did not intend for you to go to so much trouble. You certainly got results in a hurry and I can assure you that both Martin and I appreciate it.

When you visit Lake Charles again, come by to see us.

Sincerely yours,

TORBERT SLACK.

CROWLEY, LA., *February 9, 1955.*

DEAR MR. THMOPSON: I received your letter and also a check for $421.67 from the Veterans' Administration in payment of my claim for education and training benefits. I appreciate your help very much and again I thank you.

Sincerely yours,

JOHNNY MAYFIELD.

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *April 23, 1953.*

Hon. T. A. THOMPSON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Received your wire April 20 expressing deep gratification to the family of M. Sgt. Walter McCullom of Lake Charles. The mother, father, relatives, and friends deeply appreciated the interest shown in their son being released as POW in Korea.

T. C. PRICE, *Mayor.*

ARNAUDVILLE, LA., *March 24, 1953.*

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the citizens of the Arnaudville and Leonville communities of St. Landry Parish, I would like to express our sincere thanks for your efforts in having our only resident physician, Dr. Robert L. Morrow, deferred from military service. Our people will forever be grateful to you for your interest and help.

Trusting that some day we can be of value to you, I beg to remain

Sincerely yours,

MURRAY L. RABALAIS,
President, Citizens Committee.

PLAUCHE & STOCKWELL,
Lake Charles, La., September 8, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: We acknowledge with thanks receipt of your letter of September 2 and the attached letter from the Comptroller General of the United States relative to the case of Dr. William Smith.

Dr. Smith and I wish to express our sincere appreciation for the courtesy and help extended by you to us in this matter, and we are happy to know that if the need arises, we may call upon you in the future.

Yours very truly,

FRED H. SIEVERT, Jr.

OPELOUSAS, LA., *May 13, 1956.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: With reference to your letter of May 8, I have received my combat pay. I thank you very much for your interest and your help in this matter.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH W. ROBIN.

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *August 19, 1953.*

DEAR SIR: This is to express my sincere appreciation for your assistance in making application for a uniform allowance that was due me.

Recently I received a check in settlement for my claim. This was much speedier action than I would have received otherwise, I am sure.

Thank you very much.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT F. JONES.

OPELOUSAS, LA., *March 11, 1953.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I have received my military pay records and all necessary information. Thank you for the excellent service.

Sincerely yours,

TERRY BERTRAND.

PARKS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.,
September 3, 1953.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I want to thank you for your kindness and appreciation of my problem and also your prompt reply to my request. By your reply and from later developments, I have been able to make a decision which I hope is a correct one. From all reports, it seems to be highly possible that I will be given an early release from active duty.

I want you to know that I appreciate very much the trouble you have taken to help me.

Sincerely,

S. Sgt. GEORGE HICKS, *USAF.*

I have saved many of our small post offices from closing by being able to convince the authorities in Washington that these offices are truly the center of activity in many of our smaller communities and serve a real purpose. I feel that many of my people have seen the results of my efforts in securing the extension of mail routes throughout the District to serve them better.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I was instrumental in beginning the first projects of public buildings that had been undertaken since the beginning of World War II. The legislation under which this nationwide building program was authorized was originally authored by me and is called the Lease-Purchase plan. Because of my efforts in these regards, I was able to have approved a $2 million post office and Federal court building for Lake Charles as the first such project in the United States. I am looking forward to more of this much needed construction in other parts of the district.

I have assisted in the development of civilian airports throughout our district and helped to sponsor ever-improving air service for our people.

The work of a Congressman in our modern day life is varied and exacting. My activities in Washington for my district have been many. I have welcomed to my office all groups from the district who have visited Washington and have always attended to the extent that I could to the needs of my constituents having business in the Nation's Capital. I have received groups of school children and have always endeavored to see that they were given every opportunity to learn the workings of their Federal Government because I believe this to be of major importance in their education.

Louisianians in Washington each year sponsor a Mardi Gras Ball, one purpose of the Ball being to advertise Louisiana. The queens of all our Louisiana festivals are presented, which goes a long way toward calling attention nationwide to the products of Louisiana. I have been active in our Louisiana State Society and was able one year to have our Ball dedicated to rice, which served well in assisting in the plans for promotion of that product.

I have worked toward the development of legislation concerning soil conservation, reforestation, more liberal farm loans, rural electrification, better highways, better farm-to-market roads, establishing of rural telephone service, legislation for the benefit of our trapping and fishing industries, better weather reporting facilities in the Gulf areas, and I have constantly engaged in a battle for more economy in Government.

My 18 years of experience in State government before becoming a Member of Congress has served me well and I feel it qualifies me to engage in all of the facets of governmental work required of a United States Representative. I have no other business or interest and therefore, am able to put in full time service for my people. My only purpose and ambition in Washington is to continue to serve the people of southwest Louisiana in a manner that will reflect credit upon them and gain for them those services that a deserving people should receive from their Government. The following letters are indicative of the response I have received for the type service I have given:

ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Jennings, La., June 5, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Thanks very much for your letter concerning additional boxes for the Jennings post office.

Perhaps you know that on Tuesday, June 8, bids will be opened on the installation of additional boxes at the Jennings post office. I want to assure you that we very much appreciate your interested handling of this matter for us.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

L. E. BLOCH, *Secretary-Manager.*

SUNSET, LA., *January 23, 1956.*

DEAR SIR: I want to thank you and all who made it possible for us to get back our mail route.

Yours truly,

PERCY VAUTROT.

KINDER, LA., *June 7, 1954.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Your letter of May 24 received with great pleasure, telling us of the approval of mail service for our community. It was the most welcome news we have had in a long time. Thanks to your efforts, we received what the postal people told us was going to be hard to get.

Thanks again, and we hope to have the pleasure of your visit soon.

Sincerely,

RICHARD BROTHERS.

ARNAUDVILLE, LA., *November 10, 1953.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Through the kind interest of Mr. Walter C. Smith and your prompt attention to his letter requesting a mail route between Leonville and Arnaudville, we are now enjoying rural delivery in our community. We thank you sincerely on behalf of our neighbors for your efforts to serve the people of the seventh district and hope you continue doing so for many years.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. CLESS EMOND.

UNITED STATES POST OFFICE,
DeQuincy, La., April 4, 1954.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Please accept my thanks for your timely assistance in the matter of getting the Department to grant me an allowance to cover the cost of a step-ladder which we need in the Post Office. I have now received the allowance for this item, due, I am sure, to your assistance.

Again thanking you and assuring you of my appreciation for the fine way you are looking after the interest of your people, I am

With kindest regards,

M. A. KENT, *Postmaster.*

LAWTELL, LA., *March 25, 1956.*

DEAR T. A.: Thanks a million for the favorable report on the extension of the rural route I requested.

Sincerely,

SID

(Sidney Sylvester, State representative).

LAKE CHARLES AMERICAN PRESS,
Lake Charles, La., August 17, 1954.

DEAR T. A.: I am enclosing the letter you received from Speaker JOE MARTIN and you will notice that I have commented on it in today's column in the American Press.

I repeat what I said when you were here—it is an accomplishment of which you may be justly proud.

Hoping to see you again soon, I remain,

Yours truly,

KENNETH L. DIXON,
Managing Editor.

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 10, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: The interest you have displayed in the development of legislation providing for the construction of postal and Federal court facilities in areas where they are needed is appreciated.

I am happy to present to you my gavel which was used in final approval of the conference report on H. R. 6342, the lease-purchase bill. This legislation is a definite accomplishment of the 83d Congress.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.

KELLY, WEBER & CO., INC.,
Lake Charles, La., July 28, 1953.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I note with a lot of interest the work you are doing to try to get a post office and office building for the Government here at Lake Charles.

There is no need to tell you about our need for such a building, but let me know what the thinking is in Washington as to what the citizens of this community can do to further this program.

Kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

ARTHUR L. GAYLE, *President.*

LAKE CHARLES ASSOCIATION
OF COMMERCE,
Lake Charles, La., June 17, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Attached is a copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Association of

Commerce on Wednesday, June 15, concerning the location of the proposed new post-office building for Lake Charles.

In sending this resolution to you, we would also like to express our deep appreciation to you for your untiring efforts to help us secure this new facility which we have needed so long. Without your interest, your continued support, and your diligent efforts, it is doubtful that this project could have been consummated as rapidly as it has.

Please be sure of our continuing interest in this matter and of our sincere thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN L. MILLER, *President.*

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *December 12, 1955*

Representative T. A. THOMPSON:

Would like to express sincere appreciation to you on behalf of the entire Lake Charles delegation for the excellent assistance offered in our behalf before the air-space panel. Your assistance and that of your office secretary contributed in a large manner to our success.

LEE WELCH,
Chairman, Airport Advisory Committee to Calcasieu Police Jury.

LAKE CHARLES ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Lake Charles, La., September 28, 1955.

Mrs. CLARA I. HARRISON,
Secretary to T. A. Thompson.

DEAR MRS. HARRISON: We are deeply grateful for your cooperation in checking with the Civil Aeronautics Board on the status of the Trans-Texas renewal case.

It was our understanding, following the hearing, that it would probably be a month or so before the Board could render a decision. However, we are interested in pursuing this matter as closely as possible and we are most grateful for your help in keeping in close touch with the CAB.

Thanks again for your courtesy and kindness during our visit in Washington and please be sure of our sincere thanks for your continuing interest in our efforts to secure new airline service for Lake Charles.

With sincere good wishes and kindest regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

J. WALKER OWENS,
General Manager.

EARL K. LONG,
STATE CAMPAIGN HEADQUARTERS,
New Orleans, La., May 27, 1955.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I have sent Otto and Ed a recent photograph of me and would be glad to send one to you if you want it. However, Blanche tells me we had only a limited number and they are gone; but I will have more—probably by the time you reply—if you want one.

We enjoyed seeing you and Mrs. Thompson and hope to have the pleasure of doing so again soon.

With every good wish, I am,

Most sincerely yours,

EARL K. LONG.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Baton Rouge, La., March 31, 1953.

DEAR T. A.: Thanks for your letter of recent date . . .

You are doing a fine job in Washington and any time I can be of help to you, please let me know.

Sincerely,

HORACE LYNN JONES,
State Representative.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF LOUISIANA,
Alexandria, La., March 11, 1955.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON: During my visit to Washington the first week in March I was happy to visit your office and to visit with you during my brief stay.

I was particularly pleased to be with you, as a guest of the Louisiana Department of the American Legion, at the national rehabilitation conference banquet on Thursday evening, March 3.

We are grateful to you for your kindness and continued support of our efforts in behalf of the veterans of this great country.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

PERCY A. LEMOINE,
Department Rehabilitation Chairman.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT MARITIME COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., June 2, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: We have read with great interest in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 24 your very excellent address before the annual meeting of the Rice Millers Association. Your analysis and treatment of the cargo-preference provisions were indeed timely and gratifying. Yours is the kind of support the American merchant marine needs and we take this opportunity to say "thanks."

Respectfully yours,

EARL W. CLARK,
HOYT S. HADDOCK,
Codirectors.

LAKE CHARLES ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Lake Charles, La., February 8, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: This is a note to express to you our sincere thanks and appreciation for the many courtesies and kindnesses extended our delegation during our visit to Washington last week.

We are deeply thankful for your continuing interest in our community problems and for your gracious cooperation in helping us to solve them.

It was extremely kind and courteous of you and your staff to extend us the hospitality of your offices, and we want you to know that we appreciate it very much.

Please let me know if we can be of service to you in any manner whatsoever.

Cordially yours,

J. WALKER OWENS,
General Manager.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *March 1, 1955.*

MY. DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I want to thank you for appearing with us before the Federal Communications Commission relative to the educational TV matter for the State of Louisiana. I know how busy a Congressman is and that makes your effort all the more appreciated by my friends and me.

Again thanking you and wishing for your success during your administration, I am

Your friend,

WILLIAM J. DODD.

THE CALCASIEU-MARINE NATIONAL BANK,
Lake Charles, La., May 21, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: You have certainly rendered a fine service to southwest Louisiana during the past 4 years and I know that we can expect you to continue this good work.

I certainly appreciate the courtesies which you and Mrs. Thompson extended to Mrs. Blackman and Mrs. Field during their recent visit in Washington.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

FRANK FIELD, *Vice President.*

SOWELA VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOL,
Lake Charles, La., May 22, 1956.

DEAR T. A.: I want to thank you for the courtesies shown me during my recent trip to Washington. It was very kind of you to arrange the conferences, and your interest in our work is appreciated.

I wish you would extend my appreciation to your staff for being so nice to Dr. Mobley and me.

Sincerely yours,

REX H. SMELSER, *Director.*

SUNSET, LA., *May 17, 1955.*

DEAR MR. AND MRS. THOMPSON: First of all, let me thank you for the enjoyable time we spent in Washington. I could not choose the proper words that would fully express our gratitude to you. I know that we could not possibly have covered all the points of interest in Washington as we did, had you not given us so much of your time. The students, their parents, and many friends who are so grateful to you have asked me to say "thank you."

Whenever you are in Louisiana, don't forget your many friends in Sunset. Come to see us and in some way let us repay the kind favors you showered upon us.

Sincerely,

Mrs. FLOYD DOMENGEAUX.

SHILSTONE TESTING LABORATORY,
New Orleans, La., May 30, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I wanted to tell you how much I enjoyed our short meeting in my recent visit in Washington.

I hope this letter to you will be rather unusual from the many you must receive, as I am not asking for anything, you are not in my district and it isn't collect. Truly, I just wanted to say to you that I feel privileged to have the opportunity of chatting with you personally.

If there is anything I can ever do to further your aims and career I shall consider it a privilege to do so as I was very much impressed with your conception of your responsibilities.

Most sincerely,

CECIL M. SHILSTONE.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Jennings, La., January 19, 1955.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I want to thank you for the things you did to make our trip to Washington so enjoyable. We found it all very interesting. I gave one of the pictures to the Jennings News so I am sure they will have it in the paper before long.

Tell Mrs. Thompson hello for us and tell her how much we appreciate her doing so many nice things for us too.

Drop by and see us the next time you are in Jennings.

Sincerely,

CLAUDE KIRKPATRICK.

AMERICAN RICE GROWERS COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Elton, La., February 29, 1956.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I have never had the pleasure of meeting you, however, I have long admired you for your conscientious and competent service to the people of Louisiana, and especially to us in the rice industry.

Aside from my work with the Rice Growers Association, I am an active member of the Louisiana Highways Users Conference. Our secretary, Mr. Jimmie Major, and I were discussing your highway bill. While I am not too familiar with your bill, he assured me and convinced me you are on the right track. Needless to say, I am very interested in anything that will affect our rice farmers, be it declining farm prices or highways restriction.

Mr. THOMPSON, I want you to know that the American Rice Growers membership are very appreciative of your efforts on behalf of the rice farmers in this rice acreage problem we are now experiencing. If we can be of help in this fight, feel free to call on us.

With sincere best wishes, I am,

Your very truly,

SHELTON LA FLEUR,
Division Manager.

RICKERT RICE MILLS, INC.,
New Orleans, La., February 23, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Thank you very much for sending me a copy of the program of the Louisiana Mardi Gras ball just recently held in Washington.

I feel sure that this colorful event and the publicity that goes with it, will bear home the importance that rice plays in our everyday life down South; we all feel very grateful for the interest you are taking and the efforts you are making for the well being of our great industry.

Thanks again for your thoughtfulness. With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

CYRIL R. C. LAAN, *President.*

OPELOUSAS, LA., *June 6, 1955.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: We have had an extension of the REA light lines and now practically everyone on the grant has electric lights.

We wish to thank you for the cooperation and courtesy extended us, and me have all come to the same conclusion, and that is that we have a very good representation from Louisiana in Washington.

Yours truly,

MARTIN COSGROVE.

JEFFERSON DAVIS ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.,
Jennings, La., January 25, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Your past efforts, hard work for REA, and fine representation of the people is appreciated by us. For the future, I wish you a very successful, prosperous, and continued career.

Sincerely,

J. S. ROBBINS,
President, Louisiana Electric Cooperative Association.

POLICE JURY, PARISH OF ALLEN,
Oberlin, La., April 7, 1956.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: We acknowledge your letter of April 3, with enclosure, and are happy to say that the Army has delivered the 655 cubic yards of washed gravel to complete our claim for damages during Exercise Sagebrush in Ward 4.

We want to thank you for the kind interest you manifested and the promptness which has brought this matter to a close.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

GRACE A. RHORER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

ST. CHARLES ACADEMY,
Lake Charles, La., October 26, 1955.

DEAR SIR: We received the material that you recently sent to us on the debate question. My fellow colleagues and I wish to thank you sincerely. This material has proved a wonderful source of evidence. We wish to again extend our many thanks.

Sincerely yours,

HELEN JO MAXEY,
Debate Secretary.

EUNICE, LA., *September 15, 1953.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for your prompt and courteous attention in assisting me in obtaining a passport.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. GEORGE F. KARL, Jr.

STARKS, LA., *August 2, 1955.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Thank you very much for your letter of July 29, along with the copy of the letter Mr. Agate wrote. I am contacting the person he recommends for the FHA loan.

I wish to take this means to let you know that we certainly do appreciate the interest you have shown us in this matter, and we will not forget it.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. WAYNE STANDLEY.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 11, 1956.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: My family and I wish to thank you for the help you have given them through the welfare department. They are now receiving $75 a month, which is not as much as we had prayed for, but it is a great help.

Again, let me tell you we are most grateful for your help.

Sincerely,

(Name withheld.)

PORT OF LAKE CHARLES,
September 13, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: It was certainly nice of you to make us a gift of the flag which had flown over the United States Capitol and we appreciate very much receiving this and your thinking of us. I am enclosing picture from the American Press which was taken here last Friday.

Again thanking you for presenting us with the flag and with kind personal regards, I remain,

Yours very truly,

ERNEST CHRISTMAN,
Director of Port.

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *May 18, 1956.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: It was a great deal of pleasure to receive your letter about the Agriculture Yearbooks. We have an aggressive Agricultural Committee and these books should certainly stimulate more interest for the boys along these lines.

The village will more than welcome any publications or information which you might send, and will leave it entirely to your discretion as to what you might think appropriate and useful to the boys.

Sincerely yours,

W. S. GUILLORY,
President, Boys' Village.

ROADSIDE DEVELOPMENT,
DeRidder, La., August 15, 1955.

MY DEAR MRS. THOMPSON: Thank you and Congressman THOMPSON so much for the wealth of material which you sent to me from Washington on Roadside Development.

Thanking you for this and for all the favors which you and the Congressman have rendered to the people in our section, I remain,

Most sincerely yours,

Mrs. LOUISE M. HANCHEY,
Seventh District Director.

THE MULLER CO., LTD.,
Lake Charles, La., May 15, 1956.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: It was very kind of you to take time from what we know is a very busy schedule to think of us.

May we in turn express our respect for the fine work that you have done in Washington and particularly for your active sponsorship of every project for the betterment of Lake Charles and southwest Louisiana.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

ADOLPH S. MARX, *President.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., August 8, 1955.

DEAR ASHTON: I do not want the long labors of our Public Works Committee to fade from memory without expressing my appreciation and admiration for your outstanding work as a member of that committee.

Very few Members of Congress ever have a duty assigned them of such great magnitude as was encompassed in our committee deliberations on the proposed highway legislation in the session of Congress just ended. While accomplished legislation did not result from our many and long sessions, I feel that that should not detract from our earnestness in wrestling with a problem of such controversial nature. Possibly our labors will yet bear fruit.

Serving with you, my friend, in the world's greatest parliamentary body, and especially on the same committee, has been an enjoyable experience.

May I wish you a pleasant vacation and a happy return to Washington in January.

Sincerely,

BRADY GENTRY,
Member of Congress.

THE CALCASIEU-MARINE NATIONAL BANK,
Lake Charles, La., January 30, 1953.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are all well pleased with your appointment as a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. We all feel that this is a very important committee and especially so since you hail from the gulf coast area.

T. A., I have been hearing some good reports from your activities in Washington, and I want you to know that your friends in the Seventh Congressional District are very proud of the man they selected to represent them in Congress.

With every good wish to you and Mrs. THOMPSON, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. JAMES, *President.*

FISHERMAN'S COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
May 9, 1956.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of the boatowners, fishermen's unions, and citizens of this area, it is my pleasure to write you with appreciation for your introduction of a fisheries bill.

This legislation has the blessing of all segments of the fishing industry and, as far as I can ascertain, has no outspoken critics. I certainly hope that our combined efforts will see the legislation through this session. To this end, please notify us at once should an occasion arise where we may be of particular assistance.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MASON CASE, *Manager.*

NEW ORLEANS AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
New Orleans, La., June 20, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I wish to thank you for your time and efforts in connection with the Gulf Weather Station, particularly our session with the Weather Bureau last Tuesday. We feel convinced that we are now well on the way to the establishment of the Gulf Weather Station as a permanent operation.

It was indeed a pleasure to see you, and I hope to have the opportunity again soon on the occasion of one of your visits to New Orleans.

Sincerely yours,

S. S. MORRIS,
Director of Aviation.

OZIO FISHERIES,
Morgan City, La., July 13, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: The interest you have shown in our weather-reporting service is highly commendable.

Such service will mean a saving to the oil companies and to shrimping interests and in no small way will make the lives of the men who go to sea in both industries much less hazardous.

The bill which you have introduced into Congress providing for an appropriation to establish ocean station weather service in the Gulf of Mexico has our fullest support, and it is our earnest hope that your efforts toward its enactment will meet with success.

Yours truly,

TOM OZIO.

MATHIESON CHEMICAL CORP.,
Lake Charles, La., January 11, 1955.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 5 to which was attached a copy of Mr. Reichelderfer's statement incorporated in his letter to you of January 4.

We wish to thank you for the interest that you have exhibited in this matter and feel that as a result of that interest we may expect to continue to receive the quality of services from the weather bureau that we have enjoyed in the past.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I remain,

Very truly yours,

C. C. HIGHTOWER.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Lake Charles, La., July 30, 1953.

DEAR T. A.: The people of Lake Charles are through with swatting and slapping and are singing and clapping because of your help. Consequently, this note to say thank you for your fine cooperation with our "Operation Mosquito." We were sprayed this morning by a United States Air Force plane, and I know that 50,000 or more people in Lake Charles join me in saying thank you.

Cordially yours,

SIDNEY L. GRAY, *Mayor.*

AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY,
Crowley, La., June 7, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: It gives our American Legion Auxiliary great pleasure to know you have our interest at heart.

Thank you very much for your generous donation to our Poppy Day Program.

I also wish to thank you for your letter paying tribute to the outstanding work being done by the members of the American Legion Auxiliary in your home State of Louisiana.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JERRY ASHLEY,
Department President.

MAY 22, 1956.

(Memorandum from George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, Washington, D. C.)

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Congratulations are due you in behalf of small business, in affixing your signature to House Resolution 414.

It is more important than ever to protect the future of independent business of this Nation. Destroy the effectiveness of the Robinson-Patman Act and small business can close its doors.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
FIELD OFFICE,
Lake Charles, La., August 3, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Tomorrow completes my services with this Bureau, with the exception of some administrative details required in turning over my official duties to the new district manager of this office who will be Mr. Donald E. Saulnier of Welsh as acting manager.

May I take this opportunity to express both my personal and my official appreciation for the many courtesies which you and your staff have extended to me, and I sincerely hope that in the years to come that the friendship which we have created will remain.

I know that the same excellent spirit of cooperation will continue to exist between you and the new district manager.

Sincerely yours,

M. MILES SNIDER.

IOWA, LA., *May 2, 1956.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: This letter is to thank you for helping us. I suppose you have forgotten helping me get a scholarship for my little girl after she graduated from high school. One of the most important things in my life was to send Joyce on to college, and so with your help and the help of Mrs. Bryan, the Lacassine teacher, we have sent her through college. She didn't take summer vacations, but studied and worked and now she has signed her contract for a teaching position in Lake Charles for next year.

I'm sure you will never know how much I do thank you for I would never have had the the privilege of sending her to college without your help. Many, many thanks and may God bless you throughout life. If there is anything I can do for you or someone of your choice, please let me know.

Thanks a million times.

Sincerely,

MRS. DELLA HOFFPAUIR.

TURO INFIRMARY,
New Orleans, La., August 12, 1955.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: It gives me great pleasure to advise you that Miss Julia Maum, Route 2, Box 251, DeRidder, La., was accepted into the School of Nursing July 21, 1955.

Miss Maum proved to be a very intelligent, well-poised, lovely young lady. We are very fortunate to have her in the School of Nursing. Thank you for the recommendation.

Yours very sincerely,

ZELMA ALLEN, *Registrar.*

SULPHUR, LA., *March 9, 1955.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I would like to thank you for the attention and action you have taken to find scholarship aid for me at Parks College. I am extremely grateful for your consideration and feel sure that you can help me. If there is anything I can do, please let me know.

Thank you again for all you have done. I sincerely hope you can help me.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. ARNOLD,

WEST POINT, N. Y., *August 4, 1954.*

DEAR SIR: I would like to express again my deep appreciation and thanks for the appointment that you obtained for me and for the chance to enter West Point.

I have completed my first summer of training known as New Cadet Barracks and am about to begin my first academic year.

I assure you that I will strive, to the best of my ability, to attain the high standards that I know you expect of me and that I, myself, owe to you. Thanking you again, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FRANK M. SMITH, *Class of 1958.*

GRAMBLING COLLEGE,
Grambling, La., October 4, 1955.

DEAR SIR: We are in receipt of your letter dated September 21, 1955, concerning Miss Sevelle Landers of Ville Platte, La., who is desirous of work aid in order to attend college.

We shall be happy to be of some help to you and Miss Landers by providing a job for which she can earn at least half of her expenses.

We shall inform this student that we are trying to make some kind of work provisions for her.

Very sincerely yours,

R. W. E. JONES, *President.*

RAYNE, LA., *August 27, 1955.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: My dad and I recently asked your assistance in securing a job at Bossier Base for A. F. Stamm, Jr. Although he did not get the first job he applied for, he will get further consideration when another job is open.

This is due mainly to your efforts to assist us, and we want you to know that we appreciate all that you have done on Stamm's behalf.

Sincerely,

ARNOLD AND ALFRED KAHN.

WELSH, LA., *June 6, 1953.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As you already know, the proposed budget cut of the Labor Department and Federal Security Agency will mean a cut of $4,624,391 for carrying out the provisions of the George-Barden Act which will severely cripple vocational education in Louisiana.

Please don't let me down for I need this report. As for your efforts in fighting this cut, I know you well enough to know that you will be in there fighting for the cause of education.

Keep up the good work. You are doing a fine job. I am proud that I had a small part in getting you there. With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I remain,

Very truly yours,

MARION VALLEE.

DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE
AND FISHERIES,
New Orleans, La., May 28, 1953.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON: The enclosed is for your information in the event it becomes necessary for us to seek your support in obtaining the property described for use by this Department.

This is of vital concern to the State of Louisiana and would mean much to our conservation program. We know that in the past you have always supported every undertaking in behalf of wildlife conservation and that we will have that support again when we request it.

Thanking you and with best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

L. D. YOUNG, Jr., *Director.*

CROWLEY, LA., *April 29, 1955.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I will be very grateful if you use your influence for a prompt House committee hearing on H. R. 3792.

I have been reading about all the nice things you are doing for our farmers and others.

Thanking you and hoping when in Crowley, I will see you.

Very truly,

MRS. ERIN DORE CANAN.

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *November 5, 1955.*

HONORABLE SIR: I wish to thank you for the material which you sent me pertaining to Federal aid for higher education. From this literature that you have sent I have found much valuable information which will be of great help to our debate team.

Respectfully yours,

RUSSELL FONTENOT.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Baton Rouge, La., March 25, 1955.

DEAR T. A.: I appreciate your letter of March 16, 1955, and your cooperation with reference to H. R. 3322. Thanks for your interest and cooperation in behalf of public education. This will help your district very much.

Let us hear from you at any time your State Department of Education can be of assistance to you.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

SHELBY M. JACKSON,
State Superintendent.

LOUISIANA LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,
Baton Rouge, La., May 18, 1956.

DEAR ASHTON: Thanks very much for telephoning your congratulations on the passage of the Library Services bill in the House. We are highly pleased.

We deeply appreciate your continuing support of this legislation which will certainly accelerate the library development program in our State. Funds under this act will make public library service available within 5 years to every citizen in Louisiana.

The legislation is designed, as you know, to promote library development in rural areas. In this connection, I think you will be particularly interested in knowing that last year in Louisiana one-third of the total books borrowed were checked out from bookmobiles. One-fourth of Louisiana public library readers are bookmobile patrons.

My best regards to you.

Cordially,

SALLIE FARRELL,
Chairman, Federal Relations Committee.

NEBO OIL CO., INC.,
Good Pine, La., June 30, 1955.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I would like to express my appreciation and thanks to you for the help that you rendered in securing a special appropriation of $300,000 for research in the longleaf-slashpine belt of the Deep South. I am sure all of us in Louisiana who are interested in forestry feel that you were particularly helpful in obtaining this appropriation.

I was very glad that I was able to meet you when I was in Washington earlier in the year to testify on behalf of this appropriation and hope that I may again have the pleasure of talking to you and thanking you personally for your help.

Very truly yours,

W. M. PALMER, Jr., *Chief Forester.*

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Baton Rouge, La., May 22, 1953.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I called at your office while in Washington on May 14, to thank you personally for having appeared before Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Labor Department and the Federal Security Agency in interest of vocational education.

I have read in the published hearings before the subcommittee the remarks that you made and the exhibits that you filed regarding the need for continued Federal support for vocational education. You may be assured that all of us are grateful to you for your efforts and we sincerely hope that we may still be able to secure as much money in 1954 as was made available this year.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am

Yours very truly,

A. E. ROBINSON,
State Director, Vocational Education.

DERIDDER, LA., *August 31, 1955.*

DEAR SIR: I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for all Home Demonstration Club members of Beauregard Parish for your part in having funds restored to home economics research.

We, as well as homemakers over the country, look to our home demonstration agent for homemaking information. We realize that our agent cannot obtain this information without home economics research.

Again, may I say, "Thank you."

Sincerely,

MRS. A. E. FRANCIS,
President, Home Demonstration Council.

The people I represent in the Seventh District are an enlightened people. They have earned every gain that has been made. The future holds for our areas many great things and with my ever-mounting seniority in the Congress, it is my hope that I can play a part as their representative in the accomplishment that will be ours.

MIDDLE EAST PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachuetts. Mr. Speaker, developments unfavorable to the cause of peace in the Middle East took place this week in the Security Council of the United Nations.

American policy has sought progress toward peaceful solution of the real issues between Israel and her Arab neighbors, such as those relating to Arab refugees and Jordan River developments, and others.

Actions in the Security Council this week were unfavorable in respect to progress along such lines.

With Russia's support, the Arab States refused to accept a British resolution looking to the consolidation of the gains made by U. N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold's recent Middle East peace mission. The resolution was accepted only after having been changed in two important respects.

The resolution in its original form urged that Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold should continue to use his good offices in connection with the Israel-Arab dispute. It expressed hope for a "peaceful settlement on a mutually acceptable basis."

As finally adopted, the reference to a peaceful settlement was eliminated, and the provision urging the continuation of the Secretary General's good offices was toned down to limit his good offices mainly to matters relating to the recent cease-fire, and to the reduction of border incidents. The opposition evidently did not wish his authority to be broad enough to include the more basic issues in the dispute between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

A British-Russian statement about Middle East problems issued at the time of Mr. Khrushchev's recent visit to London had agreed on the desirability of a "peaceful settlement on a mutually acceptable basis." Yet in the Security Council, Russia supported Arab opposition to these same words in the British resolution in its original form.

Statements made in the debate by Arab spokesmen were also disquieting. They indicated a continued unwillingness to negotiate with Israel, or even, in their most extreme form, to accept the existence of Israel.

In mitigation of these developments, it was pointed out in debate that the Secretary General, under his general powers, could make broad use of his good offices in seeking peaceful solutions.

These events are a further indication of the difficulties confronting those who are seeking a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. They seem to call for a further development of American policy. They give added weight to the arguments of those who have urged a firming up of American policy through the furnishing of defensive arms to Israel, a refusal to furnish arms to the Arab States so long as they refuse to negotiate in good faith with Israel for peace, and through measures to buttress existing security guaranties.

America's national security can best be served by finding the road to peace in the Middle East and by promoting an atmosphere in which the new democracy of Israel can develop and prosper.

THE EISENHOWER - REPUBLICAN PARTNERSHIP POLICY IN WATER-RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, in the 1952 presidential campaign Dwight D. Eisenhower said in a speech in Seattle:

> We need resource development, and we need it on a river-basin basis. We need resource development, not to the limit of the whim of any administration in power, but to the limit of the capacity of the region to benefit. And to do that we need partnership to the limit of everyone's ability.

This policy of partnership in water-resources development was also officially announced in the President's annual state of the Union message to Congress in January 1953. The President said:

> The best natural-resources program will not result from exclusive dependence on the Federal bureaucracy. It will involve a partnership of the States and local communities, private citizens, and the Federal Government, all working together. This combined effort will advance the development of the great river valleys of our Nation and the power they can generate.

Since that time this policy has been further defined and enunciated by the President and other members of the Cabinet and Republican leaders in Congress.

Recently the meaning of partnership in resource development has taken on a broader concept not limited to describing merely those projects in which local interests and Federal interests share financing and responsibility. Partnership, according to the broader definition, means maximum utilization of the capacity of Federal, non-Federal, and private agencies.

The basic argument for partnership is that this policy of encouraging everyone to do as much as he can will remove any artificial limitation from the development of our resources. The antipartnership idea, which would restrict resource development to only that which might be undertaken by the Federal Government, would place a serious restriction on how far our country can progress.

Specifically, the question of Federal non-Federal cooperation and whether or not such an idea can be made to function can best be answered by pointing out that such cooperation has a long and successful history.

PARTNERSHIP IS NOT A NEW DEVELOPMENT

It should be made clear that partnership is not a new development in our country. As early as 1908, when Theodore Roosevelt was President, the Reclamation Bureau planned three small hydroelectric plants in connection with a Utah irrigation project in the Strawberry Valley. One, the first, was built by the Bureau and 2 by the water users. These plants are all operated by the local water users. This general plan was repeated at several other projects during the Taft and Wilson administrations.

In 1935, during the Roosevelt administration, the Kanawha Valley Power Co. became a partner with the Federal Government and installed the power facilities at a cost of $1,440,000 while the Federal expenditure was $3,269,000 for navigation facilities on the Kanawha River.

PARTNERSHIP DURING NEW DEAL DAYS

In the same year this private power company was a partner installing the

power facilities costing $1,403,000 at the Marmet lock and dam on the Kanawha River where the Federal cost was $3,566,000.

The New Deal also granted the same private utility a partnership power production license at the Winfield locks in West Virginia where the Federal cost was $6,340,000 and the cost to the utility $1,903,000.

The Roosevelt administration in 1941 approved a partnership at the Harry L. Englebright Reservoir project in California where the Federal cost was $4,003,000 and the cost to the partners for the installation of the power facilities was $1,500,000. The partners were private hydraulic mining interests and private utilities, the Sacramento Valley Utility Co. and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Under the Truman administration in July 1950, the Federal Government began replacement of a navigation lock and dam at St. Anthony Falls, Minn., which cost the Federal Government $9,743,000. The partnership was entered into with the private utility, Northern States Power Co., which remodeled and installed power facilities at a cost of $1,535,000.

It is important to note the number of these partnerships during the New Deal and Fair Deal administrations and that they were with privately owned utilities.

It seems to me that the reasoning of the Eisenhower administration on this matter is very sound—the Eisenhower administration advocates partnership power development with the Federal Government as a matter of policy and encourages publicly owned utilities in States, municipalities, and other subdivisions to enter into partnership arrangements and does not hold this field open solely for privately owned utilities.

POWER PROBLEM IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

It has been estimated that 25 million kilowatts of electric capacity economically could be constructed in the Columbia Basin. An additional 15 million kilowatts of very high cost hydro power could conceivably be installed sometime in the future.

The economic hydro potential in the Pacific Northwest has been approximately 20 percent developed. There is about 5 million kilowatts of installed hydro capacity now functioning in the region. Nearly 70 percent of this is contained in federally owned and operated plants.

Rapid population growth and the expansion of electrical use by all classes of consumers in the region have brought about a tremendous increase in the demand for power. The region now faces an unprecedented requirement for even more energy in the future.

Peak electric load for the area in 1920 was about 700,000 kilowatts. Since that time, there has been a continuous rise. In January 1954 the peak load had risen to 7,160,000 kilowatts, and in January 1955 it was 7,750,000 kilowatts.

Load estimates made by Federal and non-Federal utility systems in the region indicate that the requirements of the region will continue to grow in the future at a rate which equals or exceeds that of the past.

The total area requirement in 1961 will be 11,750,000 kilowatts; in 1964, 13,550,000 kilowatts, and in 1969 the load will be 19,150,000 kilowatts, nearly 12 million kilowatts more than is presently available.

POWER NEEDS IMMEDIATE

Construction of a major new hydroelectric project requires from 3 to 8 years, and the average construction period is 5 years. This means that the problems of 5 or 10 years must be faced at this time and that planning of future generation must begin immediately.

There are either under construction or definitely scheduled, projects which will provide enough energy to keep pace with the load growth until 1960–61. Unless other new projects are started immediately, however, the region will suffer critical shortages beginning in 1961–62, and the years following.

In order to assure carrying all loads in the years following 1961, nearly 1 million kilowatts of new capacity will be required in excess of that which is now under construction. By 1964, the requirement for additional resources will have risen to 2½ million kilowatts.

This means that during this period, there must be added to generating capacity of the region each year a new plant with the capacity equivalent to that of Bonneville Dam, i. e., 500,000 kilowatts.

MONEY REQUIREMENTS

All agencies which bear a share of the responsibility for providing electric energy to the people in the region are generally agreed on the area's predicted load requirements.

These utilities, public, private and Federal, also agree that the annual expenditure necessary to finance construction of projects which will supply this energy is in the neighborhood of $250 to $350 million.

An objective analysis of the situation establishes beyond question that this financial responsibility cannot be borne by any single class of utility now serving the Pacific Northwest.

Federal appropriations for water resources projects in the Pacific Northwest during the past 10 years have averaged 140 million dollars annually. This is less than half of the average annual requirement indicated for the future 10 years. There is no evidence that Federal appropriations in this field will be increased. There is, in fact, considerable evidence that such appropriations might be reduced below that level. The appropriation bill for 1956, for example, contained about $120 million for the purpose under discussion. This is $30 million below the 10-year average; is the smallest amount the region has received since 1948; and is $180 million less than the annual requirement.

WHY PARTNERSHIP?

In view of the staggering amount of money required to keep the Northwest even with its demands for electric power, it is obvious that the Federal Government cannot be expected to carry the entire burden. It is equally obvious that the non-Federal utilities in the region cannot assume the entire responsibility. What will be required is all hands participation by both the Federal Government and non-Federal agencies.

This then is the basis of the partnership program of the Eisenhower administration. The Federal Government will do what it can, and the non-Federal agencies must be encouraged and permitted to do what they can. In some cases, where a project especially lends itself to that type of development, the Federal Government and non-Federal agencies ought to cooperate in the construction or financing of such projects.

In view of the tremendous need for new projects in the region, projects which will require the annual expenditure of $250 to $350 million, it is urgent that the utilities in the area and the Federal Government each do its utmost to provide needed electric power.

It is to provide rapid, comprehensive, and adequate development of our resources that the Eisenhower partnership policy is directed. All of the major private utilities in the area, plus the city of Seattle, the city of Tacoma, the city of Eugene, Oreg., the Grant County PUD, and others, including the Bonneville Power Administration, have agreed that the adoption of this policy is the only way by which the Pacific Northwest can properly develop its water resources.

The success of this policy, however, can be measured only in terms of the new kilowatts it creates. Politics is of paramount importance to those who oppose this partnership program. They seem to be willing to sacrifice the welfare of the people for questionable political gain.

THE BLOCKADERS

Recently, one of our great Oregon daily newspapers applied the description of blockaders to the small group of public-power advocates who want total Federalized power—or nothing.

This small, but vocal segment of blockaders oppose partnership power development regardless of whether it is initiated by public or private power agencies.

This group still holds to the unrealistic concept that Uncle Sam should and must supply us with all the money we need to meet our growing power needs.

The blockaders believe that an all-Federal dam is wonderful, but a partnership dam is no good. They are fighting the municipal power operations. They fight the private companies. They will fight the public utility districts if they attempt to supply their own power needs.

The blockaders cannot seem to realize that the public today is not interested in an all-Federal-or-nothing battle. Their motheaten and dogeared battle cries today do not count any more. Kilowatts do. Apparently, everyone but the blockaders have learned this vital lesson.

The voters of the Northwest are not interested in an obstructionist idealogical battle. They know how critical are our power needs. And, these needs must be met by cooperative action. The Federal Government simply cannot do it all.

There is no question but that the partnership idea will work. The basic philosophy that people working together can accomplish more than people working separately has been demonstrated time and time again.

CURRENT PRESENT APPLICATION OF THE PARTNERSHIP

At the present time there are many proposals which fit into the general theme of partnership.

Among those which can be described as Federal-non-Federal cooperation, are several which have been enacted into law. These include the Priest Rapids development, the Markham Ferry project, and the Coosa River development.

Included among the proposals which are now being considered are Cougar, Green Peter, Trinity River, John Day, and Bruces Eddy.

ARGUMENTS FOR PARTNERSHIPS

First. It is the surest method by which the Pacific Northwest can get the electric power it needs, when needed.

Second. The requirements of the Pacific Northwest for additional electric power will be over 500,000 kilowatts per year for the next 10 years.

Third. The money requirements for this additional power will be nearly one million dollars per day, every day for the next 10 years.

Fourth. It is doubtful that this amount of money will be appropriated by Congress. It is more than twice as much as the average appropriation for the past 10 years and almost 80 percent of the total appropriation for public works in the entire United States.

Fifth. There is no reason for a public-versus-private-power dispute here. Many of the partners in the cooperative developments are public agencies. No one is suggesting that the Federal Government "get out of the power business." The partnership idea merely encourages and permits total cooperation in the responsibility for providing desperately needed power. Otherwise, we will experience crippling power shortages and brownouts.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BUSH (at the request of Mr. FENTON), 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. CURTIS of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COON, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MEADER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BYRD, for 10 minutes, on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANHAM and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDMONDSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHENCK.

Mr. KEARNS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENKINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COOPER and to include a press release issued by him today.

Mr. WICKERSHAM.

Mr. MEADER, to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MERROW in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COLMER (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) and to include a speech by Senator STENNIS.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3638. An act to promote foreign policy of the United States by amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1866. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton;

H. R. 8123. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; and

H. R. 9390. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3255. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to preserve in certain cases the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees whose positions are placed in lower grades by virtue of reclassification actions under such act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8225. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Pipestone National Monument in the State of Minnesota; and

H. R. 9822. An act to provide for the establishment of a trout hatchery on the Davidson River in the Pisgah National Forest in North Carolina.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 7, 1956, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2, of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1931. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 3, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Floyd River and its tributaries, Iowa, submitted in response to a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on March 29, 1944, requesting a review of reports on Floyd River, Iowa, with a view to determining if improvement in the interest of flood control is advisable at this time (H. Doc. No. 417); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with five illustrations.

1932. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 20, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a survey of Port Townsend, Wash., submitted under the authority of the River and Harbor Act approved on May 17, 1950, for a preliminary examination and survey of Port Townsend, Wash. (H. Doc. No. 418); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1933. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 5, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a survey of Amite River and tributaries, Louisiana. This report is submitted in final response to the authority for a preliminary examination and survey of Amite River and tributaries, Louisiana, for flood control and other purposes, contained in the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944. It is also submitted in partial response to the authority for preliminary examinations and surveys of Amite and Tangipahoa Rivers and tributaries, Louisiana, for flood control and other purposes, authorzied by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 419); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1934. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1957 in the amount of $895,000 for the General Services Administration and the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 420); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1935. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend section 28 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1936. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting certification that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the land in the Ventura River project, and that the land to be irrigated is susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Seventeenth intermediate report on the General Accounting Office (Rept. No. 2264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4652. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain property to the Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6245. A bill to authorize the Panama Canal Company to convey to the Department of State an improved site in Colon, Republic of Panama; without amendment (Rept. No. 2266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 9801. A bill to authorize and direct the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal at Balboa, C. Z.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7811. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions relative the registration of the practice of architects and professional engineers; with amendment (Rept. No. 2268). 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. BOGGS:

H. R. 11619. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 11620. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 11621. A bill to modify and release certain conditions and limitations on the use and disposition of land conveyed to the town of Montgomery, W. Va., pursuant to the act of Congress approved June 14, 1938 (52 Stat. 675); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 11622. A bill to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 11623. A bill to provide that veterans may continue to accrue eligibility for education under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 for so long as conscription continues, and that hereafter the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay tuition charges for veterans receiving education under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 11624. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 11625. A bill to prescribe administrative procedure for the government of the District of Columbia, to require the maintenance of an official publication for said government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 11626. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Western Research Laboratory for the study of animal disease at or near Montana State College; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 11627. A bill to authorize research by the Fish and Wildlife Service to determine methods of, and to provide for grants to the States to assist approved research or other projects for, control or extermination of sea nettles and jellyfish in marine waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 11628. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army in certain cases to undertake small river and harbor improvement projects not specifically authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 11629. A bill authorizing retroactive payments in lieu of taxes by the Housing Authority of the city of Sacramento, Calif.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 11630. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, to provide nonoccupational group major medical expense insurance for Federal employees and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 11631. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life and perpetuate the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington" to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in connection with the celebration of the centennial anniversary of the birth of Booker T. Washington; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 11632. A bill to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 11633. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, to provide nonoccupational group major medical expense insurance for Federal employees and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 11634. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 11635. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, relating to animals, birds, and fish; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 11636. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, relating to animals, birds, and fish; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 11637. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 11638. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 11639. A bill relative to transfer of surplus property within the Fort Sill Indian School Reserve, Okla., to Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. J. Res. 640. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Labor Racketeering; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. J. Res. 641. Joint resolution providing for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. Res. 524. Resolution disapproving the sale of the alcohol butadiene manufacturing facility at Louisville, Ky., Plancor No. 1207; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 525. Resolution requesting the Secretary of Labor to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 11640. A bill for the relief of James D. Laingor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H. R. 11641. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jane Henderson Cannon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. R. 11642. A bill for the relief of Erma Murer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 11643. A bill for the relief of Shmuel Zwi (Herman) Adler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 11644. A bill for the relief of Ennio Gerin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 11645. A bill for the relief of Chow Liang Ting-Wei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 11646. A bill for the relief of M. Neil Andrews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 11647. A bill for the relief of Raul Hernandez; to the committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 11648. A bill for the relief of Fred Chia-chun Hung and Hwa Ching (Lok) Hung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H. R. 11649. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Elefantis Kritselis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. J. Res. 642. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim certain property in Coahoma County, Miss., to the Home Demonstration Club of Rena Lara, Miss., Inc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1105. By Mr. RABAUT: Petition of F. E. Anderson, Detroit, Mich., containing the sig-

natures of 45 residents of Detroit urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1106. Also petition of Homer S. Bruce, Detroit, Mich., containing the signatures of 45 residents of Detroit urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows, and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1107. Also, petition of Frank A. Constable, Detroit, Mich., containing the signatures of 45 residents of Detroit urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows, and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1108. Also, petition of Alfred Hanson, Harper Woods, Mich., containing the signatures of 45 residents of Detroit urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows, and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1109. Also, 3 petitions from Peter E. Harris, Detroit, Mich., containing the signatures of 135 Detroit residents 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.

1110. Also, petition of Fred W. Keat, Detroit, Mich., containing the signatures of 27 residents of Detroit urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows, and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1111. Also, petition of Fred Kohn, Detroit, Mich., containing the signatures of 45 Detroit residents urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows, and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1112. Also, petition of George A. Miller, Detroit, Mich., containing the signatures of 45 residents of Detroit 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.

1113. Also, petition of Joseph A. Schiappacasse, 2505 Baldwin Avenue, Detroit, Mich., containing the signatures of 45 residents of Detroit urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows, and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1114. Also, petition of William J. Schwartz, Detroit, Mich., containing the signatures of 45 residents of Detroit urging immediate enactment of separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1115. Also, 2 petitions from the Eddie Stinson Post 2407, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Detroit, Mich., containing the signatures of 90 residents of Detroit urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows, and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1116. Also, petition of George W. Zedd, Detroit, Mich., containing the signatures of 47 Detroit residents, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows, and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1117. By Mr. SILER: Petitions of 4,484 residents of the counties of Ashtabula, Butler, Carroll, Champaign, Clark, Clermont, Clinton, Columbiana, Crawford, Cuyahoga, Defiance, Delaware, Fayette, Franklin, Fulton, Greene, Guernsey, Hamilton, Hancock, Allen, Lucas, Highland, Huron, Jefferson, Licking, Logan, Lorain, Mahoning, Marian, Miami, Morgan, Muskingum, Perry, Ross, Sandusky, Seneca, Stark, Summit, Trumbull, Tuscarawas, Union, Warren, Wayne, Wood, and Wyandot, Ohio, urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1118. Also, petitions of Margaret C. Smith, Kentucky legislative representative, BRC, and some 227 other residents of Louisville, Ky., and that area, urging enactment of H. R. 10578 and H. R. 9065, to help relieve the economic distress of railroad people dependent upon annuities for their sustenance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1119. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry J. Molony, and others, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the adoption of the proposed Bow amendment to the Mutual Security Act (H. R. 11356); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, at De Pere, Wis., Memorial Day Patriotic Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a Memorial Day address I delivered on May 30, at the De Pere, Wis., patriotic observance.

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

FULFILLING THE MEANING OF MEMORIAL DAY, 1956: MORE B–52's, B–47's, GUIDED MISSILES ESSENTIAL NOW FOR OUR DEFENSE

(Excerpts of address delivered by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, at De Pere, Wis., patriotic observance, May 30, 1956)

Today, we decorate the graves of America's heroes of its past conflicts.

We lay flowers—in fact and in spirit—on the final resting places of those who made the supreme sacrifice that this Republic might endure.

We witness the proud marching formations of America's uniformed servicemen—the minutemen of defense of the atomic age.

HONORING HEROES WITH DEEDS

But I know that all who are in this audience would agree with me today on this: If we are truly to decorate the final resting places of our honored dead, if we are truly to cooperate with our Armed Forces, we must do so with constructive deeds, and not mere words, however sincere as truly those words are.

The challenge is, therefore, for everyone who is grateful to the heroes of Memorial Day—to rise to his or her own responsibility to help defend our beloved land.

FOUR-POINT PROGRAM OF DEFENSE

I should like to suggest a 4-point program by which we may prove worthy of the tradition which they left us.

1. Our first step is to protect this Republic from the menace from within.

That means promoting real brotherhood in America. It means strengthening the legislation by which we cope with the subversive, troublemaking forces in our midst.

Thus, a number of important anti-Communist bills are now pending before the Congress, including legislation to tighten penalties against seditious conspiracy (which I personally have cosponsored). This legislation must be enacted before Congress adjourns.

2. As a second step, we must fulfill our deep obligations to the Nation's 22 million exservicemen, and their families. Calvin Coolidge once stated, "A nation which forgets its defenders will itself be forgotten."

We must make sure that the compensation and pensions which our veterans have earned by their deeds of valor remain intact and are improved. We must make sure that pensions are brought up to date, are modernized wherever inflation may have so depreciated their purchasing power as to make them currently inadequate.

3. Our third step is to make sure that we are today thoroughly informed of the Soviet military danger to our country, and (4) that we are thoroughly prepared against it.

In past times, as you and I know, we did not need to concern ourselves with what was occurring beyond the broad Atlantic and Pacific Oceans—on foreign shores.

We Americans are, after all, not meddlers. We do not and did not believe in interfering in other people's problems.

OUR NEARNESS TO THE ENEMY

But in 1941, a ruthless enemy streaked thousands of miles across the Pacific, and, on a quiet Sabbath morning, blasted the American flag at Pearl Harbor. And so, with World War II, the age of America's isolation drew to a close.

Today, every single newspaper, every radio broadcast and telecast confirms our nearness to the world—our nearness to a still more ruthless foe, the atheistic force of aggressive communism.

Already, 900 million people are in its iron grip, and it reaches hungrily for the one-third of the world which is still free and which is committed against it. It reaches as well for the so-called neutral one-third of the world.

COMMUNISM'S LETHAL CLAWS

Its reach has deadly claws—super-modern intercontinental bombers, 400 submarines, fast developing missiles, the largest ground forces in the world.

Under these circumstances, it would be tragic folly if we lagged in our own defense. We must and will therefore step up our production of B–52's, of B–47's, of guided and ballistic missiles and every other weapon of offense and defense, including protection devices for our own cities.

OUR DEFENSE PACE MUST BE SPEEDED UP

We are definitely not doing enough right now. Despite the best of intentions and the

best of military leadership, we are not advancing our defenses and our research at the necessary pace.

Remember, at this very minute, we here in De Pere are but a half-dozen hours away from jet bases in Soviet Siberia. Moreover, the Communists are on their way to developing an intercontinental guided missile which will bring us within 30 minutes' time of the Red rocket launching sites.

Under these circumstances, we dare not be uninformed, and we dare not be unprepared—or second best.

PRESERVE OUTER RAMPARTS

Throughout the world, we have erected outer ramparts of defense. Why?

So as to protect the weak and helpless. Moreover, our aim is simultaneously to keep the potential battlefield as far from our own shores as possible.

I am sure that everyone in this audience will agree, that if war should come, we would prefer not to have to fight it on our own continent, if possible. We would prefer to fight it at far distances from our own land.

And so we have erected these outer ramparts of our defense—far-flung ramparts on Formosa, on Okinawa, Iceland, Greenland, North Africa and elsewhere in the world. These ramparts are today threatened—not only from without but from within. In many places, Communist agitators are at work trying to stir up hatred so as to kick us out of our outer defenses. The Reds are trying to force us back to our own land, so as to reduce our overseas air bases and so as to make us more vulnerable to direct attack.

But, in cooperation with our friends, we must protect our outer ramparts. Our bases must remain intact.

Consider this analogy: There is no one in this audience today who has not seen fire engines rushing across town in order to put out a blaze before it reaches our own home.

So, today, we and our allies have set up an international fire department to try to put out blazes before they get to our shores. We have made military pacts with 45 nations to protect them and to protect ourselves from the Communist arsonists. Only a fool would sit back in his own home and ignore a fire, simply because it seems small and because it is still on the other side of the town. Once a fire breaks out, however small—once it goes unchecked—then every house everywhere is endangered.

COMMUNISM HAS NOT CHANGED

Today, communism—despite Joseph Stalin's death and the so-called Soviet new look—is still a form of deadly arson. Communist arosnists, firebugs, are lighting flames in north Africa, in south Asia, and elsewhere.

Meanwhile, they are spreading the false line that Soviet communism has actually changed for the better. They have denounced the memory of Joseph Stalin, but they have not denounced Stalinism.

They have not denounced the slaughter of Polish soldiers in the Katyn Forest or the mass murder of millions of Russian peasants in the mania for collectivization.

Moreover, they have not freed Poland or East Germany or the Balkans or the Baltics.

Why then should we accept their sirupy words at face value. Why should we be so naive as to swallow their lies?

We dare not be; we must not be; we will not be naive.

CONCLUSION

And so, under these circumstances, we must be both well-informed and well-prepared against the Communist menace.

By fulfilling a comprehensive program of defense, we will, in truth and in action, honor America's war dead.

If our heroes of the Civil War, of the Spanish-American War, of World Wars I and II, and the Korean conflict, could arise, they might say this: "We are grateful for your remembering us, but do not honor us with lip service; do not simply praise us with words. Praise us by your deeds. Preserve the Republic for which we died. Give to it your all, as we did. Make any sacrifice, financial or other, so that Old Glory will keep flying. Support the National Guard; support the Reserve; support the Armed Forces of our country—keep the Stars and Stripes proudly aloft forever."

This then, is the message of the heroes of Memorial Day in the year 1956, the 11th year of the Atomic Age.

Results of the 1956 Poll for the Fourth Congressional District of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks I have been conducting a poll of my constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of New Jersey. This was done to ascertain their opinions on the many important issues facing the Nation on which Congress will be called upon to make decisions.

This poll was mailed to a cross section of the voters in my district representing all shades of political opinion. The response was quite good, indicating a freshening of interest in national political issues in this election year. Significantly, of those answering the poll, the two questions receiving the greatest number of "Yes" or "No" answers as opposed to "No response" were those dealing with the deepening of the Delaware River Channel to Trenton from Philadelphia and the question of governmental sponsorship of a flood-insurance program. The question on which those polled showed least interest was that dealing with the Taft-Hartley Act.

I feel that the results of this poll will be of interest to my colleagues in the House of Representatives, and I include as a part of my remarks the questions which were asked, together with a breakdown by percentages of the responses I received. These percentages are based on a total return of 5,387 questionnaires. The results follow:

Questions	Percent							
	Total		Democrat		Republican		Independent	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you think Congress should set up a system of flood insurance so long as private companies are unable to provide it?	78	22	87	13	71	29	76	24
2. Charges have been made that Federal and State authorities have been lax in preventing the denial of civil rights for minority groups, including preventing Negroes from voting. Do you think Congress should establish a bipartisan commission to investigate these charges?	72	28	73	27	62	38	81	19
3. Do you think Congress should investigate possible abuses of union welfare funds to see whether legislation is needed to protect the contributors?	89	11	88	12	90	10	91	9
4. Do you think Congress should support the President's recommendation for a 1-cent increase in 1st-class mail rates to reduce postal service deficits?	62	38	54	46	67	33	64	36
5. What policy should Congress follow toward immigration:								
(a) Reduce present yearly quotas?	34	xxx	38	xxx	31	xxx	33	xxx
(b) No change in present law?	19	xxx	20	xxx	24	xxx	14	xxx
(c) Increase in present quotas along the lines recommended by the President?	25	xxx	15	xxx	33	xxx	28	xxx
(d) Replace present quota system with one not based on national origins?	22	xxx	27	xxx	12	xxx	25	xxx
6. Farm prices and income have been dropping. Do you think Congress should increase Federal spending this year to help farmers cut back surplus production?	55	45	70	30	49	51	47	53
7. What policy should Congress follow regarding the Taft-Hartley law:								
(a) No changes?	31	xxx	18	xxx	40	xxx	35	xxx
(b) Remove injustices claimed by union leaders?	21	xxx	29	xxx	11	xxx	23	xxx
(c) Put greater restrictions on labor unions?	30	xxx	20	xxx	40	xxx	29	xxx
(d) Repeal the law?	18	xxx	33	xxx	9	xxx	13	xxx
8. Do you think Congress should establish a Presidential fund for sending outstanding representatives of American culture—art, music, literature, education, industry, etc.—abroad on good-will tours?	54	46	59	41	47	53	54	46
9. What policy should Congress follow on public housing for low income groups:								
(a) Build less public housing?	11	xxx	06	xxx	12	xxx	14	xxx
(b) Build more public housing?	36	xxx	49	xxx	25	xxx	36	xxx
(c) Stop building public housing?	15	xxx	08	xxx	21	xxx	15	xxx
(d) Continue to build public housing at the present rate?	38	xxx	37	xxx	42	xxx	35	xxx
10. Do you favor reduction of the national debt, even if it means no tax cut this year?	83	17	70	30	90	10	90	10
11. What policy should Congress follow on economic aid to other countries?								
(a) Increase aid?	14	xxx	15	xxx	10	xxx	18	xxx
(b) Decrease aid?	32	xxx	32	xxx	35	xxx	29	xxx
(c) Keep aid at present level?	38	xxx	38	xxx	42	xxx	33	xxx
(d) Stop all aid?	16	xxx	15	xxx	13	xxx	20	xxx
12. Do you favor deepening the Delaware River Channel to Trenton?	91	09	95	05	86	14	90	10

NOTE.—Party percentages for those answering poll: Democrats, 43 percent; Republicans, 32 percent; Independent, 25 percent.

Memorial Day Address of Hon. Chester E. Merrow, of New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the Memorial Day address which I delivered in Rochester, N. H., on May 30, 1956:

Ladies and gentlemen, I was glad to receive an invitation from my good friend Dick Cooper to speak here in Rochester at these Memorial Day exercises. I have been here on several occasions and it is always a pleasure to participate in Memorial Day ceremonies in your city.

SIGNIFICANCE OF MEMORIAL DAY

Today is one of the most significant days of the year. It is Memorial Day and we have gathered here to pay tribute to our honored dead who have made the supreme sacrifice that this Republic may live and to honor those still among us who have borne the strife of battle for the glory of our country. By appropriate ceremonies which are being held in every portion of this great free land, we commemorate the valor and the sacrifice of the veterans of all our wars, from the Revolution to the conflict in Korea.

Although Memorial Day came into existence folowing the Civil War, it is fitting and proper that we remember all those who have died for the United States of America from the earliest days of this great Nation to the present hour. We think, today, of those who have fought and bled and died that the people of this Nation may be free. In retrospect our minds turn to the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, the First World War, the Second World War, Korea, and all the other wars in which our country has been engaged. We know that because of these struggles and the great, decisive victories which were achieved, we live in the finest Nation on earth and in the world's greatest citadel of democracy the world has ever known.

IN COMMEMORATION

At this season of the year, we commemorate the valiant deeds of our fallen heroes by placing American flags above their graves, by heaping beautiful floral tributes on their last resting places, by Memorial Day parades, by statements and speeches apropos to this occasion, and by appropriate ceremonies, religious services and affairs such as these in which we are participating. How feeble our attempts to do them honor when what they did and what they have accomplished speaks far more eloquently than anything which may be said on this Memorial Day in 1956.

A DAY OF DEDICATION

Not only is this a day of doing honor and paying tribute—not only is this a day when we recall with ever-deepening pride the many valorous acts performed by so many patriotic Americans on the battlefields throughout the world. Actually this is a day of dedication. We dedicate our minds, our hearts, and our lives to the cause for which so much has been sacrificed.

A day of tribute and a day of dedication. This is the abiding and eternal theme of Memorial Day ceremonies. As Abraham Lincoln said: "It is for us the living rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus so far nobly advanced." These words are eminently applicable at this hour. What is the work our honored dead of all wars have thus so far nobly advanced? It is the work of preserving the American heritage of freedom. It is the work of building a constantly better democratic society. It is, today in the middle of the 20th century, the work of world leadership among the nations of the free world. It is the work of continuing with unabated and unrelenting vigor the struggle against the diabolic forces of Communist tyranny until freedom is known to all men around the globe.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PRESENT WORLD

We live in a world of illimitable power and in a world which is sharply divided between the free and the enslaved. On May 21 the United States Air Force dropped a hydrogen bomb over a desolate area in the Pacific. The explosion which followed dwarfed all previous man-made explosions. It was by far the most stupendous release of energy that man has ever made. Forty miles from the explosion the luminosity exceeded 500 suns. The power of this bomb was from 15 to 20 megatons—a megaton being the equivalent of a million tons of TNT.

Tremendous power is within our hands and in my opinion, with this power we are in a position to give leadership in a world gravely dangerous. This power has terrifyingly augmented our responsibility.

This is a divided world. The tyranny of communism seeks to annihilate freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religion and the opportunity of the individual to develop according to his innate ability. The issue confronting us was well stated in what is now known as the famous Declaration of Washington issued on February 1 by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Anthony Eden and President Eisenhower. They stated: "We are conscious that in this year 1956 there still rages the age old struggle between those who believe that man has his origin and destiny in God and those who treat man as if he were destined merely to serve a state machine." We propose to win this struggle. We must and we are determined to win this struggle.

RESOLVE TO KEEP THE FAITH

The United States is the indisputable leader of the free world in this universal struggle to ensure the continuation and the spread of freedom. In this world of power and Communist tyranny, we must ever be on the alert and constantly rededicate ourselves to the cause for which our honored heroes of all wars sacrificed so much — many of whom have given the "last full measure of devotion." We must not be misled by the blandishments of communism and by the new tactics of the Soviet Union—by their soft words and by their fabrications. Their fundamental principle is the same. They seek to destroy the free world. I am glad that the House of Representatives on May 10 passed a military apropriation bill amounting to $33,635,066,000 by an overwhelming vote of 377 to 0. This certainly is one resounding answer to the Communist endeavor to subjugate the world. It is telling evidence that we are not going to be deceived by their change of tactics which are designed to accomplish their nefarious goals.

On this Memorial Day in 1956 we recognize that our heritage of freedom and democracy so dearly bought by blood and sacrifice is in danger if we do not remain constantly alert, vigilant and adequately prepared for any emergency. We are fully aware that we face one of the gravest and most sinister challenges to human liberty that free men have ever experienced. We can best do honor and pay tribute to those who have fought in the wars of our country by being firmly resolved that we will rise to the occasion of world leadership, that we will employ our strength and our influence in exercising this leadership in the military field, the economic field, through the United Nations and its associated agencies and that we will give leadership spiritually—steadfastly determined that we will keep the faith with those who have maintained the republic on many a bloody battlefield throughout our history. This is a day of consecrated dedication—a day in which we evaluate the current struggle—a day in which we will endeavor to envision the future—and a day of firm resolution to be successful in the endeavor to maintain and add to our heritage of freedom.

Much has been accomplished but there is much to be achieved. As we contemplate our objectives we know full well that in their realization the accomplishments of the future will be something of which all Americans can be proud. Ours is a civilization based on religious faith. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in a speech to the 4-H Club in Chicago on November 29, 1954, said: "The reality of the matter is that the United States, by every standard of measure, is the world's greatest power not only materially but spiritually. We have national policies which are clear and sound. They fit a civilization based on religious faith."

We say to our honored dead and to those who have fought that this Nation may live: Our faith in the ideas and the ideals for which you sacrificed so much is a living, vital force as we seek to solve the problems that confront us. We believe today as you believe, in the achievement of a better way of life for men, women, and children wherever they may live. We accept the challenge on this Memorial Day in 1956. We will preserve our heritage against the ruthless and unconscionable tyranny of Communism and with zealousness we will seize the opportunity to give leadership in building a better world. We say to all those whom we are honoring today, we derive inspiration from what you have done and we hasten to exercise our leadership in the many phases of world affairs by rededicating ourselves to the ideas and the ideals which have made this Republic what it is—the ideas and the ideals which are the core of democracy and for which you have fought unflinchingly with no thought of self. We pledge our determination to carry on the work which you "have thus far so nobly advanced" and we pledge to you that in the years which are given to us, we will continue to strive as you have striven to bring into existence the realization of the very thing for which you have prayed and we are praying: "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

Vote, It Is Your Patriotic Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, we should make a start in taking an earnest interest in self-rule, and thereby insure for the future generations the implanting of a mighty good habit—that of being a real good citizen. It is a serious responsibility to be a citizen. Your first ethical duty in the field of public service is your duty as a voter. Use, protect, and cherish this right.

If we are to maintain a government of the people, by the people, and for the

people, we must vote. Democracy depends upon it. A democracy is a group of people who get together in a common enterprise for the purpose of governing themselves.

Registered adult citizens, regardless of property or poverty, may vote. Our wishes can be best expressed through the ballot. You do not have to be a king or of nobility to have a part in our Government.

We, as American voters, should not be derelict in our duty, and we must not be negligent about taking part in our elections. Under a democratic system of government like ours, the character of the Government is largely what the voters make it. Every voter is a part of the Government. As such, he has a distinct moral duty to exercise his franchise in such a manner as to bring about the best welfare of the Nation as a whole.

As a result of 50 years of agitation by those who felt that the discrimination against women was unjust and unreasonable the 19th amendment to the Constitution was adopted, giving women equal suffrage with men. Since then women have taken a deep interest in elections.

You mothers, fathers, wives, sweethearts, and relatives of veterans, should remember that the ballot is just as essential to the maintenance of good government in time of war and peace as arms and a willing soldier in time of war, especially when our servicemen have been sacrificing their lives for the freedoms we enjoy.

There should be no indifference on our part. If popular government is to be a success, we must have an electorate, not only intelligent and honest but also wide awake and vigilant at all times.

Among the greatest dangers of popular government are indifference and neglect on the part of voters. We should be greatly concerned about the failure of our friends to vote. You should contribute your share by going to the polls and voting and urging your neighbors to do likewise.

We have no right to criticize unless we do take part in elections. To fully participate in the official activities of our Government is a patriotic duty, privilege, and opportunity no citizen can afford to shirk because the majority rule is determined by the will of the people.

Schenck To Confer With Residents of His District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

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

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

Five years ago I initiated the idea of holding "grassroots conferences" throughout our district, and I have continued this practice each year during the time Congress is in adjournment. I also have a full-time congressional service office at the United States Post Office Building, in Dayton, where I can meet with people personally at any time that my official duties permit me to return to the district.

During the time I am in Washington, attending to legislative and official duties, a competent secretary is in charge of my district service office to assist callers and to help them with requests for aid in dealing with the Federal Government so that I can be of every proper assistance to them.

In these ways I have sincerely tried to keep well informed as to the personal opinions of my constituents, and I have also tried continuously and sincerely to be of every proper service to them.

Members of Congress are constantly called upon to give careful and earnest consideration to legislation dealing with many complex national and international problems. These day-to-day decisions often affect the lives and living of every citizen in our Nation. Consequently, these personal and private conferences help me to serve all of the people in my district in a much more effective manner.

This year during our official congressional recess, I am again taking time to hold these "grassroots conferences" throughout our district at convenient public buildings. I deeply appreciate the fine cooperation of the many officials who have made these meeting places available to me as an aid in rendering this public service.

This is the schedule I have arranged:

Dayton Post Office, room 314: September 10 and 11, 9 a. m. to 4 p. m.

Miamisburg City Building: September 13, 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Germantown City Building: September 14, 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Hamilton Court House: September 17 and 18, 9 a. m. to 4 p. m.

Middletown American Legion, 116 South Main Street: September 19 and 20, 9 a. m. to 4 p. m.

Oxford Municipal Building: September 21, 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Fairfield, Butler County, City Building: September 22, 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Brookville City Building: September 24, 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Each year an increasing number of our folks have visited with me at these conferences, and the attendance has been most encouraging. It is sometimes surprising to see how much can really be accomplished when a citizen and his Congressman can sit down face to face and talk over problems of national concern.

Special appointments are not necessary for these conferences, and I sincerely urge individuals or groups to meet with me on the date and at the place most convenient to them. The knowledge obtained through those "grass roots conferences" will help me to render better service—both legislative and personal—to all of the people of our important Third District here in the Congress of the United States.

Proposed Changes In Excise Tax Administrative Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means today resumed consideration of the report of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems. As I have done in the past, I will insert in the RECORD at this point a release which I issued as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to the action taken by the committee today.

The committee will meet in executive session on Friday, June 8, 1956, to resume consideration of the subcommittee's report, as set forth in the press release:

CHAIRMAN JERE COOPER OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS ANNOUNCES TENTATIVE DECISIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXCISE TAX TECHNICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

The Honorable JERE COOPER, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, announces the tentative decisions reached today by the committee with respect to the recommendations contained in the report of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems. Previous announcements with respect to earlier decisions of the committee were issued on May 10, 14, 16, and 17, 1956. These announcements are printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS for May 10, 15, 16, and 17, 1956, and appear on pages A3818, A3918, A3965, and A4020, respectively.

Chairman COOPER stated that the committee would resume its consideration of the subcommittee's report in executive session at 10 a. m., on Friday, June 8, 1956. A table

of revenue estimates relating to the subcommittee's recommendations is printed in the subcommittee report, beginning on page 13. A more detailed explanation of the recommendations appears in the subcommittee report beginning on page 16. The decisions reached by the committee today are as follows:

XI. TOBACCO AND ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE TAXES

1 through 3. The committee deferred further action with respect to these paragraphs until Friday, June 8, 1956, at 10 a. m.

4. Cigar manufacturers should be authorized by the Treasury Department to shift over to a daily return basis for reporting receipts. This should be optional with each manufacturer and should be effective July 1, 1956.

5. Refunds or credits for the tax attributable to losses of distilled spirits, beer and wine in a disaster, as declared by the President, should be made available directly to retail liquor and beer dealers as well as to manufacturers and wholesalers.

6. The phrase limiting refunds or credits in the case of alcoholic beverage or tobacco product losses attributable to a disaster, to the tax paid on products condemned by a "duly authorized health official of the United States or of a State" should be broadened to include health and police officials of cities and towns.

7. Refunds or credits in the case of the tax paid with respect to losses of alcoholic beverages or tobacco products in the floods and hurricanes on the east coast of the United States in 1955 should be made available in the same manner as is proposed for the future where a disaster is declared by the President. In addition, the committee adopted an amendment to allow refunds for beer lost, destroyed, or condemned as a result of the Mississippi and Missouri Valley floods of 1951, along the line of the refunds already allowed as a result of those floods in the case of distilled spirits.

8. The committee deleted the subcommittee recommendation which would have disapproved a proposal included in the ATTD revision which would extend to breweries operated by different corporations the right to transfer beer from the plant of one corporation to the plant of another corporation if the controlling interests in each of the corporations is owned by the same person or persons.

9. Under present law a drawback is provided under the distilled spirits tax with respect to $9.50 of the total tax of $10.50 in the case of spirits used in the manufacture of medicines, medicinal preparations, food products, flavors, or flavoring extracts which are unfit for beverage purposes. The language of the drawback provision should be changed to provide a refund of all but $1 of the distilled spirits tax, so this provision will not need to be changed with each change in the distilled spirits tax.

10. Provision should be made for the tax-free withdrawal from bond of alcohol for any pathological laboratory exclusively engaged in making analyses, or tests, for hospitals or sanitariums.

11. The right of the Treasury Department to waive the application of any internal revenue provisions relating to distilled spirits (except the taxes) where the Secretary of the Treasury deems it desirable from the standpoint of national defense expires July 11, 1956. The committee acted to extend this authority for 3 years to July 10, 1959.

XII. ADMINISTRATIVE

Action by the committee with respect to recommendations 1 through 3 of the subcommittee was deferred pending receipt of a report from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on the information covered by these recommendations. It is expected that this report will be available by June 15, 1956.

XIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

The committee took no action at this time with respect to matters referred to in this section of the subcommittee report.

XIV. MANUFACTURERS' EXCISES

The committee acted to reconsider its previous action with respect to recommendation 11 (f) under section I, Manufacturers' Excises. This recommendation as previously approved by the committee would impose on tubeless tires a tax rate 1 cent a pound higher than tires requiring separate inner-tubes. The effect of the committee's action today is to delete this recommendation.

The committee adjourned to meet again in executive session at 10 a. m., June 8, 1956, at which time consideration will be given to recommendations 1 through 3 in section XI of the report pertaining to tobacco and alcoholic beverages taxes. Following the consideration of these recommendations, the committee will give consideration to those recommendations which had previously been passed over by the committee.

Congressional Secretaries To Visit New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, June 8, 9, and 10, the Congressional Secretaries Club, which includes the secretaries of nearly all Members of Congress, are making their annual trip to New York City. This annual pilgrimage has become traditional with our secretaries. Since I have the honor to represent a sizable portion of our fair city in the United States Congress, and since a large number of the secretaries making this trip are my personal friends, I want to extend a very hearty welcome to them and my sincerest wishes for a most enjoyable visit in New York.

I am naturally very proud of our great city of New York. I think it is about the greatest place in all the world, and there is no equal to it. I am also very proud of our employees here at the Capitol who assist us so ably in taking care of the needs of our constituents back home. Therefore, it is my distinct pleasure to welcome the "best" to the "best."

Mr. Speaker, as you and all our colleagues know, the Congressional Secretaries Club was formed in 1935 for the purpose of helping to obtain information so that the secretaries could better serve their Congressmen. The organization has grown from 25 members at the first meeting in 1935 to over 1,200 members last year. Practically every congressional and senatorial office is represented in the club by one or more of its staff members.

This year's trip has been arranged with the kind cooperation of my good friend Milton H. Berger, one of the most outstanding public relations men in New York, whose efforts have always been directed towards the public good and the welfare of the Nation. He has been extremely helpful in setting up part of the itinerary, particularly the visit to Steeplechase Park in Coney Island, which is often described as the "Playground of the World."

The visit to Steeplechase Park is scheduled for Sunday, June 10, and this means fun in the sun, hot dogs, cotton candy and the like for the entire party. Mr. Berger has reserved combination tickets free for the entire group, including the amusement rides, food, and soft drinks.

I believe it is of interest to note that Steeplechase Park, which opened on May 19, is now in its 60th year of existence. It was founded by the late George C. Tilyou, one of America's greatest showmen. This amusement mecca for millions covers 25 acres in Coney Island and employs a crew of over 350 men to operate the park and its numerous rides and other attractions.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert at this point the itinerary of the Congressional Secretaries Club during the coming weekend:

CONGRESSIONAL SECRETARIES ANNUAL TRIP TO NEW YORK, JUNE 8, 9, 10

This is the complete itinerary as to the time of each of the planned functions. The time given is the departure time and it is suggested that you be a few minutes early on each occasion in order not to be left.

FRIDAY, JUNE 8

9:45 a. m., District of Columbia time: Special train will leave by B. & O. from Union Station. Sign will be on gate. Mr. Bob Petzold, of B. & O., will be with us the entire trip for any service he can render. Luncheon will be served on the train.

1:45 p. m.: Arrive at Jersey City. Board buses for transportation to Hotel Governor Clinton, 7th Avenue at 31st Street. Hotel rooms will be assigned on train and it is urged that each person mark their name and room number on the baggage stubs which will be given them on train in order that bag may be placed in room on arrival at hotel.

3:30–5 p. m.: Cocktail party by Frank L. Sundstrom, of Schenley Industries, Inc., on the 37th floor of the Empire State Building, 350 Fifth Avenue. Tickets for the observation tower of the Empire State Building will be available for those who wish to visit the observation tower through the courtesy of Mr. Sundstrom. Transportation will not be furnished as Empire State Building is only 3½ blocks from Hotel Governor Clinton. Arrive at your leisure.

5 p. m.: Leave by bus from Empire State Building for Whitehall Club, 17 Battery Place, Manhattan, for cocktail party as the guests of the United States Lines. Buses returning to the hotel will leave at 7 o'clock from the Whitehall Club.

Rest of Friday evening open.

SATURDAY, JUNE 9

8:30 a. m. Buses will leave Hotel Governor Clinton at 8:30 for B. Altman's Department Store for breakfast and style show for ladies only. The show and breakfast will be in the beautiful Charleston Garden Restaurant at 9 o'clock. Charge of $1 additional is required for payment of breakfast. Corsage and door prizes will be given. After style show you will have free time for shopping, etc., until 12. Independent transportation back to hotel.

12:15 p. m.: Buses will leave Governor Clinton for pier 1, North River, Manhattan, to embark on Coast Guard cutter for cruise around Manhattan Island, and luncheon. Lt. Cmdr. Frederick Goettel will be acting commanding officer. Those having tickets

to Perry Como dress rehearsal will debark by tug at pier 9. Others will continue to pier 1 and debark. Buses will take both parties to their destination.

Rest of Saturday evening open.

SUNDAY, JUNE 10

11 a. m.: Brunch at Governor Clinton Hotel.

12 noon: Those in party desiring to do so may visit Steeple Chase Park, Coney Island, through the courtesy of Mr. Milton Berger of that company. Tickets have been reserved for our entire group and should be requested upon arriving at the ticket office at Steeple Chase Park. They are being given a complete list of members and guests on the trip. To get to Steeple Chase Park, Coney Island, walk east to 33d and Broadway. Take BMT downtown express to Coney Island (ask subway cashier for route number of train). It is estimated that it will take 45 minutes each way. It is suggested, therefore, that those going to Coney Island leave by 3:30 in order to check out of the hotel and board last bus which leaves at 4:45.

4:45 p. m.: Board bus for Jersey City. Train leaves at 5:45. Dinner will be served on train and is included in your ticket.

9:45 p. m.: Special train arrives in Washington, D. C.

Those having tickets to Steve Allen show, "Tonight," Friday night, are required to be in the Hudson Theater, 141 West 44th Street, at least by 10:45. The shows lasts 1 hour and 30 minutes.

Those having tickets for the Perry Como dress rehearsal Saturday afternoon are required to be at the Century Theater, 57th Street and 7th Avenue, by 4:45. As we only obtained 100 tickets to each of the above shows, members can choose which show they wish to attend as long as tickets last. Tickets for these shows will be distributed by Bob Petzold at the Whitehall Club cocktail party.

Tickets to Radio City Music Hall and Roxy Theater will also be available when we get to New York.

Your tickets cover cost of hotel room. However, upon checking out please see cashier and pay incidentals such as telephone calls, room service, etc.

We will see that your bags are placed in your room upon arrival, but it is up to you to see that your bag is placed on bus when you check out. Customary tip is 25 cents per bag.

Buses are furnished to us by the courtesy of Mr. John E. McCarthy, president, New York City Omnibus Corp.

LONG-RANGE WEATHER FORECAST

New York City temperatures will average near or a little below normal. The highest temperature will be near 80° and the lowest near 63. Friday will be warmer, turning a little cooler late Saturday or Sunday. Scattered showers Saturday or Sunday. Not more than one-fourth inch precipitation expected.

Soil-Bank Plans Need Clarifying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, most members of the Oklahoma delegation are deeply concerned by the uncertainty in the Department of Agriculture concerning the soil-bank program.

Yesterday we read in the press a report on Secretary Benson's speech in Wisconsin which indicated that only limited use of the soil bank could be expected in drought and flood damaged areas. The reason given was the Secretary's desire to get a dollar's worth of value out of every dollar invested in the soil bank.

Today we read that the Senate Majority Leader has been advised by the department that no soil-bank applications will be accepted before June 15, although we had been promised "immediate" inauguration of the program once enacted.

A Member of this House on the minority side, who has read the full text of the Secretary's Wisconsin speech, today assured me that Mr. Benson did not in any way intend to curtail the soil-bank program in drought or flood areas, but merely stated it was not intended as a "relief" program.

According to this colleague, a farmer in a drought or flood area will be given the same opportunity to participate in the soil bank as any other farmer—and can do so by all the means provided for by the law, so long as he signs up for the full period required in the acreage reserve.

I earnestly hope this is true, and the farmers who are victims of drought or flood are not to be discriminated against in the new program. It is not so much a question of "relief" as it is a matter of equal opportunity without penalty due to adversity.

The farmer who lives in a drought or flood area, and who puts land in the soil bank, should get the same "normal yield" credit as the farmer in a more fortunate section of the country—and to provide otherwise would surely be unfair and discriminatory.

Yesterday seven members of the Oklahoma delegation wired the Secretary of Agriculture to urge that he clarify at once his position in this regard.

We hope for an early answer to this wire, the text of which follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 5, 1956.*

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.:

Under provisions of Public Law 540 as enacted last month you were given clear mandate to put soil bank in effective operation this year and all allotted acreage was made eligible by law for participation in soil bank. Legislative history clearly indicates intent to include farmers who are victims of adversity, as evidenced by remarks of Congressman POAGE and others on floor of House May 23. Associated Press now quotes you in Wisconsin speech with remarks indicating soil-bank plan will not be offered in drought or flood-damaged areas where full value in conservation or crop reduction not available to government. Please reply by wire clarifying your intentions in drought and flood disaster States and sections. We are reluctant to believe you intend to penalize farmers already victimized by disaster by reducing or limiting in any way their opportunity to participate in soil-bank program. This would deprive farmers most in need of assistance at critical time, and certainly would violate intent of Congress in passing this legislation. Under your reported interpretation soil bank would be reserved only for prosperous or fortunate farmers while denying farmers who are victims of natural disaster a chance to participate.

ROBERT S. KERR,
United States Senate.
A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
United States Senate.
ED EDMONDSON,
Member of Congress.
CARL ALBERT,
Member of Congress.
TOM STEED,
Member of Congress.
JOHN JARMAN,
Member of Congress.
VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress.

Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Presents 20-Point Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address delivered by me over radio station WGN, Chicago, June 3, 1956, in connection with my 20-point legislative program.

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

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN, PRESENTS 20-POINT LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—URGES BACKING OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER WITH REAL DEEDS, NOT PHONY LIPSERVICE

Senator WILEY. Your United States Congress has but 2 months or so before it recesses its current session. During these next 60 days we must, therefore, act on a great many important issues. These issues affect the 48 individual States, affect the Midwest and other areas, and, most important of all, contribute to the well-being of our entire country.

I believe that each Senator and Representative should offer his own ideas of a constructive program for the Congress to enact during these remaining 2 months. And each of us legislators should not only have such a program, but he should and must fight for that program.

And so I would like to use the next few minutes to describe what I regard as an essential 20-point program.

I am going to urge my colleagues in the Senate and in the House of Representatives to enact what I regard as this vital program before Congress' adjournment.

Now, friends, I am going to answer some questions about this 20-point program. And I want to invite you, my listeners, to write in and give me your personal reactions to it.

Tell me what you frankly think—about peace, about our efforts against communism, about tax reduction, etc. It will be a pleasure to hear from you.

DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN PLANKS ESSENTIAL

Question. Senator WILEY, broadly speaking, what are the major parts of the program?

Answer. They are very simple—two in number. First, the program consists of en-

lightened action on our own domestic front—for a prosperous, sound, healthy America. And, second, there must be action on the world front on behalf of the great goal of peace—avoidance of atomic war.

AN EISENHOWER PROGRAM FOR AN EISENHOWER-MINDED AMERICA

Question. How would you characterize this program in general?

Answer. Basically, this program is an Eisenhower program.

It is not a partisan program. It is designed to carry out the type of clear, American, middle-of-the-road thinking, as well as the specific suggestions, of the great President of the United States.

I personally have pledged the President my continued loyal support. Of course, I don't believe in mere lipservice—in emptily praising our President in words and not backing up with deeds. I believe in carrying out my pledges. And I think my record proves it.

But some people do believe in mere lipservice for the President. They believe in giving only token support. They pretend to be Eisenhower supporters in their words, but they try to sabotage him with their actions. In particular, they try to sabotage his great efforts for world peace.

We've got to combat such sabotage.

We've got to rally behind Ike in the fight to avoid war. We Americans hate war.

Question. That, then, is the first point on your program—the sincere promotion of President Eisenhower's efforts for world peace.

WHAT MODERN WAR COULD MEAN

Answer. Absolutely. We must avoid war, avoid it with honor, with strength, not with dishonor or appeasement.

That, then, brings us to the second point of my program—invincible military strength.

Question. How would you define this strength, Senator WILEY?

Answer. I am referring to invincible strength in the air, with our long-range and medium bombers; invincible strength on the sea, with atomic submarines and surface craft; invincible strength on the ground. As regards our land forces, I don't want to see obsolete mass armies, armed with "pea shooter weapons." I want our men equipped with the strongest, most modern weapons in the world, so that they can be effective against the Communist menace, if ever it should strike again.

Question. Peace and invincible military strength against the Communist menace—points 1 and 2. Now, what is the third point on your program, Senator WILEY?

DON'T BE BLIND TO ANY PHASE OF RED THREAT

Answer. I have referred to the Communist menace abroad. That brings us to the Communist menace at home, because it is part and parcel of the worldwide threat. I say, enact every needed bit of anti-Communist legislation. Complete action on the Wiley bill for more effective registration of Communist foreign agents.

Use every law that we already have on our statute books, including the Smith Act, for an unending crack-down on the 22,000 Reds in our country and on fellow travelers.

Question. Peace, combatting communism abroad, combatting communism at home. What are the other elements of your program, Senator?

SPEED UP SEAWAY CHANNEL WORK

Answer. In the few remaining moments, I am going to just run down a few of them, briefly.

The next point—the fourth—is to complete as speedily as possible the 2,300-mile St. Lawrence Seaway, and to complete action on the Great Lakes connecting channels—the channels to the upper lakes.

Question. That is certainly an immensely important point. Now, how about other issues, Senator, on the home front? How about the farm problem?

Answer. Yes, indeed. Point 5 on my program is to halt the serious decline in farm income, the drop in agricultural purchasing power. This is June Dairy Month. Dairying provides the greatest single source of cash income of American agriculture as a whole.

The city man cannot prosper unless the farmer prospers. And so, I am taking action in this June Dairy Month and in every month to help the farmers of America's Dairyland—my own State—and to help the farmers throughout America.

I am glad that at least we are beginning to get some action under the new soil-bank law. It is unfortunate, however, that provision was not made to provide for prepayments to farmers this year who cooperate with the soil-bank program. But this is only part of our program.

What we must do is, of course, to increase our citizen's consumption of farm products. That means—eat and drink more wholesome, nutritious dairy products—milk, butter, cheese, ice cream, nonfat dry milk solids.

VETERANS, OLD FOLKS, SMALL BUSINESS

Question. Now, turning to other groups in our population, Senator, how about the veterans, how about the old folks, how about the small-business man?

Answer. Yes; how about them?

Congress must assure a square break for them. Taking the old folks first, Congress must and will liberalize the inadequate social-security system. Inflation has seriously depreciated the purchasing power of old folks' pensions. Not enough people are covered under these pensions. Elderly women are not provided a fair break. And so we must strengthen the pension system.

Now, as regards our veterans, the 22 million Americans who have saved this country on the field of battle with their heroism, Congress must reject—I stress—reject the unwise recommendations made by the Commission which would slash veterans' benefits.

Instead, Congress must take action as I have repeatedly recommended, to strengthen the program, particularly for combat-disabled veterans.

I have mentioned old folks and veterans. Now, I want to turn to another group which has also been having a hard time. That is, of course, the small-business man. I am a cosponsor of legislation to ease taxes on them. Right now, they are hit by a terrific 52 percent tax which prevents them from expanding and competing with bigger business.

If we are truly to prevent the dangerous growth of monopoly in our country, if we are to keep small business alive—small business which is the real backbone of our free enterprise economy—then we should enact this amendment to ease the taxload on small business.

Question. Those are three additional points. How about taxes, generally, Senator?

Answer. Well, as a ninth point of my program, if we have sufficient surplus in the Treasury, I see every reason for us to provide a tax break for our people this year.

We should ease taxes particularly on the low-income brackets to the greatest extent possible. We should enact various liberalizing deductions.

Question. Thus far in your program, Senator WILEY, you have mentioned 9 points of your overall 20-point program. You have discussed the battle for world peace, the battle to support President Eisenhower, rather than simply giving him lipservice.

You mentioned your fight against communism abroad, because of the desire of the Reds to conquer the two-thirds of the world which is still not Communist ruled. You have turned to communism on the home front urging action on the WILEY and other antisubversive bills. You have mentioned the St. Lawrence Seaway which is appropriately titled the Wiley seaway law. You have referred to the battle for fair dealing for old folks, for veterans, for the small-business man, and for 50 million American taxpayers.

Now, would you mention some of the other points in the program?

Answer. Yes. Here they are:

10. Floods: Complete action on legislation to provide insurance against flood disaster which have taken a terrific toll on our country.

11. Roads: Complete action on the Federal highway bill to modernize our horse and buggy interstate road system which is choked with 60 million cars and trucks.

12. Schools: Ease the terrific crowding of the Nation's classrooms by expanding school construction.

13. Health: Expand health research. Strengthen our hospitals and medical schools, so as to improve the health of our people.

14. Conservation: Strengthen our program to preserve the United States outdoor heritage—its wildlife refuges, its national parks and forests. Protect these beautiful national assets from being despoiled.

Question. What are the remaining points on your program?

Answer. Here they are.

15. Fair dealing: Pass civil rights legislation, legislation to assure a fair break for all Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color. But to do so with reason, with judgment, and with maximum voluntary—I emphasize—voluntary cooperation by men of good will.

16. And now, the mighty atom. Spur domestic development of atomic energy. That means providing insurance, so as to help cover the risks which are inevitably involved in dealing with this powerful nuclear force.

17. Here is point 17. Combat the underworld. Fight the hoodlums, the racketeers, the thugs who, for example, threw acid in the face of columnist Victor Riesel. Pass the Daniel-Wiley bill against the terrible narcotics evil, the dope problem in our country.

18. Housing: Liberalize Federal credit so as to expand United States housing construction. This year, 1.2 million homes will be built, but with proper sound credit, that figure might well be increased.

19. My next to the last point is for clean elections legislation. The present bill before the Senate must be amended to include clean primaries, honest primaries, with all campaign contributions fully reported. In that way, the people will be aware of any dishonest lobby dealings.

20. And finally, my last point relates to governmental streamlining, Federal efficiency. I mean economizing whenever possible, by genuine reorganization and improved businesslike management.

CONCLUSION

Question. Senator, you have mentioned your 20-point progam for Wisconsin, for the Midwest, for all America. I know that your listeners have enjoyed your remarks. And I know, too, that they will take you up on your invitation by giving their reactions to your program.

I know that you mean this program and that you intend to carry it out. That it is not simply a paper program, but one which you will fulfill with all possible effort.

Answer. That is indeed my purpose in presenting it tonight. This is an action program, a battle program. I will be helped on it by hearing from my listeners.

I want to thank station WGN for its kind courtesy in carrying this broadcast. And I want to thank each of you for listening to it, and I hope, for giving me your reactions.

This is Wisconsin's senior Senator, ALEX WILEY, signing off from Washington.

Congressman Carroll D. Kearns Reports on His Mission to the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I submit the following report on my recent mission to the Far East:

CONGRESSMAN CARROLL D. KEARNS REPORTS ON HIS MISSION TO THE FAR EAST

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to take this opportunity to pay high tribute to the United States Air Force and its capable Secretary, the Honorable Donald A. Quarles, for good discretion in sending the United States Air Force Symphonic Band to the Far East on a mission that was cosponsored and approved by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. The mission was not only timely but will prove to be a great investment in the years to come.

I want to pay special tribute to Col. George S. Howard, his staff, and the members of the band—whom I call our music ambassadors—for the marvelous performances they gave on this mission.

I know that each and every Member of Congress, and each and every citizen of the United States, would have been happy and proud if they could have seen these representatives abroad. In fact I find it is practically impossible to envision any American product which, when presented for the consideration of foreign nationals, could meet with such an overwhelming unanimity of acclaim.

The band's tour of the Far East—and unfortunately I could not accompany the group on the first part of their tour—began in Hawaii on April 12 where a concert was heard by 25,000 people, breaking all previous attendance records for a musical event in Honolulu. The impression that the United States Air Force Symphonic Band made in Hawaii will last for a generation. Mrs. ELIZABETH FARRINGTON, the Delegate from Hawaii, suggested that this band should repeat its tour of the Pacific and Far East, and emphasized that its friendly efforts are in a different but supplementary field from those of previous international aid programs.

Next stop was Japan and the tour there was a colossal success. Besides playing for nearly 100,000 people, and turning away almost an equal number because of inadequate seating capacities, the band had a radio audience of 32 million and a television audience of close to 5 million.

Thus practically everyone in Japan either heard—or heard of—the United States Air Force Symphonic Band. Press coverage of the events was the widest and most prolonged ever accorded a visiting artist or cultural group, and the concerts proved even greater than anticipated.

In Hiroshima, for example, where the memory of the atom bomb is vivid 11 years after the war, 6,000 Japanese jammed into Peace Memorial Hall that normally seats 1,800. Another 15,000 had to be denied tickets and were turned away for lack of standing room.

Mayor Watanabe, of Hiroshima, who previously had never attended a concert by foreigners, wrote to an Embassy official: "The band certainly brought music nearer to our hearts than has any other great orchestra visiting this city and thereby has brought the hearts of our nations closer together."

Throughout Japan the band set startling attendance-breaking records. In Kyoto, cultural capital of Japan, the largest crowd ever assembled for a single event turned out for the band. 20,000 crowded into an open-air theater that normally would hold only 5,000. Outside, students perched in trees; old men clambered to high places to see inside; and women with babies on their backs (traditional Japanese style) pushed and jostled to get inside. The overflow was so great that the mayor, as a last resort, got up on the stage and announced that thousands of people would have to leave before the concert could proceed because serious injury might result to the mass assembled.

In Fukuoka, where the concert was held in one of the largest indoor arenas in Japan, 10,000 secured seats. They were the lucky ones; they had stood outside in queues 3 blocks long, 5½ hours before concert time.

Press comments throughout Japan, all of them favorable, filled hundreds of columns of newspaper space. What amazed the critics most was the versatility of the band. "They have something for every musical taste," one said.

Marcel Grilli wrote in the Nippon Times: "In its physical makeup this 84-piece combination is a purely military band, though its spirit is far from martial. In its musical conformation it is a far cry, too, from the days of such stalwart bandmasters as John Philip Sousa and Arthur Pryor. * * * From romantic music to jazz, and from operatic arias to folk songs, this ensemble can elicit the special flavor of different musical styles."

Masato Yamamoto, chief of band music of the Tokyo Academy of Fine Arts, wrote: "We who are concerned with band music certainly learned much from the performance of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band. From now on we should give up our old concept of band music, stop imitation, and bend our efforts toward the development of this new form of band music."

The newspaper, Nishi Nippon Shimbun (circulation 452,000), cosponsor of the band in Nagoya, reported for days after the concert that letters of appreciation were flooding its offices. Commented the official in charge of special events: "We have never had this kind of response before to any project."

Our Ambassador to Japan, the Honorable John M. Allison, said in a letter to me that the cultural acumen of the members of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band, coupled with their great professional ability and polished manner, generated a good will towards the United States, particularly to our military units in Japan, that would have far-reaching developments in Japanese-American understanding. Mr. Walter Nichols and Mr. Robert M. Allen of the United States Information Service in Japan made a great contribution to the success of the tour.

Following this phenomenal and unprecedented reception in Japan, the band took to the skies for its next stop, Korea. 50,000 people turned out for the concert at Seoul. Colonel Howard told me afterward that in his very wonderful conference with Syngman Rhee, the veteran President informed him that more Koreans went out and attended the concert of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band than any public performance heretofore held in Korea. Public Affairs Officer John P. McKnight, cabled the State Department: "This concert of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band was received with even more enthusiasm than the NBC Symphony of the Air concert last spring. Korean audiences, normally undemonstrative, received the symphonic band with great enthusiasm and insisted on several encores."

Next on the itinerary was Okinawa, our supreme fortress of the East, where everyone, our military personnel, the Okinawans, and even the schoolchildren were unanimous in their enthusiasm for the band. The visit there was beautifully summarized by Father Kevin Smyth of the Catholic Mission at Naha who wrote: "Being in close contact with the Okinawan people, I can say that such concerts do more to promote good will than many other direct methods. Here representatives of our Government meet the Okinawan people in mutual respect and share the riches of culture in a language that all can understand."

The next stop was Taipei in Taiwan, known to us as Formosa, where a 1-night concert was scheduled. That was where I joined the tour. Our distinguished Ambassador, Mr. Rankin, very graciously met us upon our arrival, and at 5 p. m. I had the pleasure of accompanying him on a visit to the President, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The Generalissimo and his lovely wife told me that this visit of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band marked a new milestone in our cultural relationship that had not previously existed. The response to the concert that evening certainly upheld Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's evaluation. Although rain fell all day long and into the evening, 15,000 people crowded into the semisheltered Armed Forces Stadium (again breaking all existing attendance records), and despite a leaking roof that made it necessary for the performers to wear raincoats—I recall loaning mine to one of the trumpet players—the concert was played to one of the most genuinely enthusiastic audiences of our entire tour.

The next morning found the band boarding our C–124 Globemaster bound for Hong Kong, the international city of the Far East, and probably the most fabulous city in the world. The first of our three concerts there was a VIP concert in honor of His Excellency, the Governor of Hong Kong, Sir Alexander Grantham, Mrs. Grantham, and our American Consul General, the Honorable Ernest F. Drumright and his wife. This VIP concert was held at the beautiful Empire Theater, with appropriate appointments for a concert of this type, and was attended in formal dress. The program began at 9:30 p. m. with a definite understanding that His Excellency, the Governor, had to leave at 11:23 p. m. The music proved so tasteful, however, that the Governor decided during intermission to abandon his 11:23 p. m. departure. He stayed for the entire program, and even remained an hour on the receiving line following the concert.

The other two concerts at Hong Kong were public concerts and were played for capacity audiences of civilians and schoolchildren. Here is the reaction of the Hong Kong Standard music critic, Mr. K. C. Harvey: "My few hours' association with the United States Air Force Symphonic Band has confirmed my original belief that in this somewhat unique combination of symphonic and military band, chamber music and instrumental group, dance and rhythm band, lies a near perfect answer to music for every occasion." The United States Air Force Symphonic Band will long be remembered in Hong Kong.

From this international city we headed skyward for a visit to Clark Field, which is located on the large island of Luzon in the Philippines. There the band played to 5,000 wildly cheering military and civilian employees of the base.

The next morning, Sunday, May 6, at 8 o'clock, Colonel Howard and I greeted Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, Commander of the Far East Air Forces, who arrived from Baguio with the chiefs of staff of the 12 nations assembled at Clark Field to inspect the Air Force equipment of their countries. The inspection took 4 hours and was followed by a luncheon at the officers' club, after which I flew to Manila with General Kuter and the chiefs of staff in the general's private plane. General Kuter was kind enough to tell me on our flight to Manila that the repeated presence and sustained interest of a long-time Member of the United States Congress like myself was a source of inspiration to the members of the band and to all the members of the Far East Air Forces. In his opinion the fact that I traveled right

with the band and personally conducted some of their brilliant numbers added greatly to the national stature and public acceptance of the Air Force Band.

At Manila that afternoon the greatest air show since World War II was given, participated in by all 12 nations of the Far and Near East, and witnessed by nearly everyone in the Philippines. One of the highlights of the show was the exhibition put on by Gen. Tiger Wang, of Taiwan, Commander of the Chinese National Air Force, who had his pilots do acrobatic stunts 10,000 feet in the air.

As the shadows of evening started to fall, thousands of people began to stream to Luneta Park in Manila, and by 6:30 p. m. some 200,000 had assembled to hear the concert of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band. On the stage was the Vice President of the Philippines, together with the chiefs of staff of the 12 nations, in full dress; and, of course, our boys were in full dress too. It was a most glorious concert, and all numbers were intermittently interrupted by wild applause from the crowd, indicating their approval of the repertoire which Colonel Howard had selected for this important concert. Following the concert, President Magsaysay entertained the chiefs of staff, Colonel Howard, and me at a formal dinner at his mansion. During my conversation with him at dinner, President Magsaysay expressed his gratitude to the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Donald Quarles, and the State Department for sending this marvelous musical organization to the Philippines. He said it had written another chapter in the great sincere feeling between the Philippines and the United States, which had been expressed in the afternoon in the might of the military, and in the evening by the beauty of music.

From Manila we flew to Saigon in South Vietnam, a country that just recently obtained its independence. The concert site was at the city hall, where stands had been erected and an audience of 20,000 heard the concert. It may be said here that the visit of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band during the early days of the independence of South Vietnam was highly significant and really made a terrific impression. President Diem was loud in his acclaim of the band and personally expressed his deep appreciation to Colonel Howard and me for this visit of the music ambassadors from America, saying it had had a wonderful effect upon his people.

The next morning, because of transportation difficulties, only part of the band could go to Phnom Penh in Cambodia. The others left in our C–124 for Bangkok in Thailand. The concert at Phnom Penh was most unique inasmuch as it was given at the Royal Palace with the royal family in attendance, along with a record-breaking crowd of 50,000 Cambodians. Here Colonel Howard was awarded the highest decoration ever given to any foreigner, with the exception of Vice President NIXON. Colonel Howard, in accepting the honor, was most gracious and told the people how pleased he was, but explained that he accepted it not for himself but for every citizen of the United States of America who would share the honor with him.

Next was Bangkok, Thailand (often called the Venice of the East), where the band was reunited and a VIP concert was given the first night, which was attended by the Prime Minister. It was his first appearance in his box at a concert given by foreigners. Seated with him were members of the royal family, Ambassador Max Waldo Bishop and his lovely wife, and Col. Ben Garland, the United States air attache, who had assisted with arrangements, and Mrs. Garland.

Our Ambassador, in introducing the band, praised the United States Air Force for sending their music ambassadors to Thailand and paid tribute to Colonel Howard and me for our musical talents and abilities. He stressed that there is much to be gained in the way of understanding, and mutual respect and regard, through cultural exchanges such as this—good things in life that come to us from our strength and from our freedom.

The people of Thailand obviously had not had much opportunity to hear classical music and seemed especially interested in the music of a lighter vein, particularly, American jazz; however, they were most enthusiastic about the numbers they liked and we evaluated our mission to Thailand as one of a pioneer nature which can be effectively developed in the future.

The Prime Minister told me later that he had never attended a concert that he enjoyed as much, and he thought the band had brought to the people of Thailand a new concept of appreciation of the works of American composers. The Princess also expressed delight at the concert and said she had spent one of the most enjoyable evenings of her life.

We had two public concerts at Bangkok, attended by 25,000 people each night, and then returned to Tokyo for a command performance, which unfortunately was rained out. So the band left Tokyo on Tuesday, May 15, for the United States.

In all, 32 concerts were given, and the total personal attendance was 500,100, making an average attendance per performance of 15,625. In all cases admission was free of charge. Of the 500,100 persons who heard the band, 200,000 were Filipinos, 91,500 were Japanese, 50,000 Koreans, 50,000 Cambodians, 34,000 Okinawans, 22,000 Hawaiians, 20,000 South Vietnamese, 18,000 Thais, and 12,000 Chinese. Wherever they went, they made friends for America.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the annals of American history will show that the United States Air Force Symphonic Band was the pioneer organization in what may be known in the future as "Cy-War"—that is, fourth dimensional or psychological warfare.

The role the Air Force Symphonic Band played exemplifies our boy in uniform—his rearing, education, specialized training, and many talents and gifts. He, by preference, enjoys sharing his talents and performing so that he can bring happiness to many, many people, not only at home but abroad. In the need of combat, however, he is just as effective and willing to perform. Thus there was a double significance to this great symphonic band, in full dress military uniform, putting aside military tactics to play the national songs of the countries they visited.

As a Member of Congress, I have been privileged to have one of the greatest experiences of my life, and I wish that each and every one of my colleagues would consider sometime during his tenure in Congress accompanying Colonel Howard on a tour like this so that he could fully realize the appreciation and affection overseas for our famous Air Force musicians.

The personnel of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band on this highly successful tour of the Far East is as follows:

Col. George S. Howard, conductor.

Maj. Samuel Kurtz, project officer.

Capt. Robert L. Landers, director, The Singing Sergeants.

Lt. Harry H. Meuser, assistant conductor.

M/Sgt. Michael R. Mudre, advance representative.

M/Sgt. Floyd E. Werle, arranger.

Clarinets: Russell A. Mitchell, Charles T. Foster, Oscar A. McGregor, George L. Dietz, Anthony J. Grado, Harold J. Rigg, Glenn J. Valmont, Leslie R. Ticknor, Bertrum S. Glick, Robert E. Gerken, Jay Hauenstein, James B. Preus, Robert C. Barker, Alan A. Dore, Raymond E. Stahura, George D. Yeatman, Robert J. Luther.

Cellos: Boleslaw D. Zukowski, Bert Kuschan, Chester G. Wood, Charles A. Baker, Carleton B. Spotts.

Harp: Phillip M. Young.

Flutes: Robert E. Cray, Erich R. Seehafer, Warren F. Halt, Jack V. Tuk, Thomas P. Perazzoli.

Oboes: Oscar Ghebelian, William J. Weber, Roger W. Sutherland.

Bassoons: Franklin M. Biskey, Stanley D. Petrulis.

Cornets: Arthur R. Will, Ivan D. Genuchi, Joseph A. Latinski, John A. Maiocco, Delbert A. Dale.

Trumpets: Robert J. Markley, Charles J. Gorham.

French horns: Joseph Freni, George E. Roberts, Frank A. Dearstyne, John I. Strylowski, Edward E. Searle, Jr., Peter W. Siverson, Robert N. Drake, Harrison C. Raper.

Baritones: Edward J. Whitfield, Robert A. Sadler, Karl T. Humble.

Trombones: Edward J. Zeman, John A. Velke II, Alexander Nichiporuk, Bruce C. Whitener, Harry S. Beltz, Jr.

Percussion: Robert F. Moore, Paul M. Dolby, Frank D. Rinaldi, Jr., Ronald K. Holmstrand.

String basses: William J. Zschunke, Frederick Sollner, Jr., Edward C. Skidmore.

Tubas: Edward G. Grace, Glenn Orton, Raven E. Corn, Robert J. Chab, Jr.

Soloists: William K. Dupree, tenor; Thomas M. Edwards II, harmonica; Joseph R. Soprani, accordian; Robert D. Kerns, baritone; Edward G. Grace, typewriter.

Singing Sergeants: William S. Brower, Jr., Paul V. Hull, Howard J. Ruff, Harry H. Haywood, Jr., Henry E. Gerhart, Robert L. Conforti, Donald L. Boothman, William S. Jennette, Jr.

In conclusion, Colonel Howard and I, and each and every member of the band, are most grateful to the fine crew that piloted us safely on this tour of the Far East. Under the command of Col. Hollis B. Tara, this C–124 operation was a model of efficiency, safety and dependability. The fact that they were operating the world's largest production model transport did not concern them in the least. They handled their Globemaster at gross weights up to 190,000 pounds just as if they were flying an ordinary transport aircraft. The names of this efficient crew are as follows: Col. Guy Cooke, Jr., Maj. William E. Shelton, Capt. Henry G. Henderson, Capt. Wilbert C. Oltman, Capt. Wilkes A. Wilk, Lt. George R. Adams, T. Sgt. Marshall Purcell, S. Sgt. Glen Moore, S. Sgt. Garry Wilson, S. Sgt. Ted Grosshopf, S. Sgt. Harold E. Kozee, A1c. Terry Cassidy, A1c Robert Cantrell, A2c Thomas J. Wilson, Jr.

Textile Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including a letter written by Mr. L. W. Turner, Jr., president of the Southern Garment Manufacturers Association, of Nashville, Tenn., to the Washington Post and published under the heading of "Letters to the Editor," in the June 5 issue of the Post as follows:

TEXTILE IMPORTS

Our attention is called to your editorial of May 27 to the effect that the Senate Finance Committee takes the position imports of textiles and apparels from Japan

are not offering sales competition to domestic industry. The Tariff Commission apparently has little grasp of the ruinous effect of these imports. Total imports of women's blouses and men's and boys' shirts alone in 1955 and thus far in 1956 seriously approach domestic production figures.

Japanese imports of men's and boys' shirts and ladies' blouses were several million dozen. What the Tariff Commission evidently does not understand is that it takes only a relatively small quantity of cheaper priced goods or articles to set the market price in a given market. In other words, 1,000 dozen men's and boys' Japanese shirts and ladies' blouses can set the market price for all American competitive garments in the city of Washington.

It is in this manner that Japanese imports of apparels and textiles are setting the market price for such domestic-made goods, thus pulling down the price structure with consequent discouragement to American producers. This we have seen happening right along for more than 1 year. Some plants are closed, the owners say, because of Japanese competition and some are running on short time for the same reason their owners say.

The Tariff Commission has rendered disservice in not getting the full facts and ascertaining the effect of Japanese competition on the textile and apparel industry which we have herein briefly explained.

There is reason to wonder whether textile or apparel industry has any friends at all connected with the Government.

L. W. TURNER, Jr.,
President, Southern Garment Manufacturers Association.

This letter is very timely and has my wholehearted approval.

I too wonder, as Mr. Turner does, whether or not the textile or apparel industry has any friends at all connected with the Government and by that I mean the administrative branch of the Government and not the Congress.

The Congress has refused to pass the OTC bill which would, in effect, approve all that GATT has done in strangling the American textile and garment industry. Because we have not had the backing of the textile industry in our efforts to get legislation passed to prevent the destruction of this great industry, we have not been able to get such legislation reported out of committee. We can and will continue to fight OTC which, as I say, would be a ratification of the GATT agreements.

Apparently the administration believes the textile industry is expendable for the benefit of the steel, automobile and other huge industries which want all tariff barriers removed. They too are calloused and unconcerned just as the executive department of our Government is about the problem of the textile and garment industries.

The Tariff Commission, now dominated by the executive department although it is allegedly an arm of the Congress, has refused to get all the facts about the effects of Japanese competition on the textile and apparel industry and has apparently abandoned these industries to their fate.

It is often said that because Japan buys some of the American farmer's cotton, the cotton farmer of the Nation ought to support the disastrous agreements which permit the importation of textiles from countries where wage scales are so low that our own textile and apparel industries simply cannot meet the competition. However, if the textile industry in America is destroyed, 60 percent of the farmer's market for his cotton will go down the drain with the textile industry.

It is encouraging to see now that Mr. Robert Jackson, the president of the ACMI, has learned the lesson that he cannot expect any help from the administration although rumor has it that most of the industry supported Mr. Eisenhower and his party. We Members of Congress who are so vitally interested in the preservation of the textile industry have been trying to convince Mr. Jackson and the ACMI of this fact so that we might get the necessary backing for legislation that would do what the administration fails and refuses to do. It is rather late now for any such legislation to be passed. It is understandable, however, that the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute was loath to turn to the Congress for protection before all avenues of relief in the administrative department had been explored and found closed. We have at least been successful in holding up action upon the bill which would create a "super-duper" international organization in which the United States would have only one vote to control our foreign-trade policies.

Will Soviet Union Confess the Katyn Massacre?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I presented before the political action committee of the Polish-American Congress at Philadelphia on Thursday, May 31, 1956:

WILL THE SOVIET UNION CONFESS THE KATYN MASSACRE?

Again and again my voice and my petitions have been heard crying out in my own country, to the nations of the world and to the high heavens, against the enormity of the crime perpetrated by the Soviet Union and known in the catalog of international outrages as the Katyn massacre. It may be asked of me in the Department of State in Washington, or they may ask it in the United Nations, or in the Kremlin itself: When will I forbear raking up old wounds, when will I cease the clamor for justice and the law? My answer, I am pleased to avow before this, the Polish-American Congress, is as simple, and as fair, as devoid of rancor and vindictiveness, and as righteous as the facts testify. My answer is that neither I, nor the Congress of the United States, nor any international tribunal in the United Nations, can shut its eyes to the horror of the calculated mass murder of the Polish officers and civilians in the forest of Katyn until the truth shall have been acknowledged by the perpetrators or their associates and successors and due contrition observed. For me or for any just official, or for any government in the free world, not to press for adjudication in this wise of an atrocity so enormous, is to make one's self a kind of passive accessory to the crime after the fact.

This I shall never be and thus I stand here today symbolizing, if you please, the conscience of the Congress of the United States and the people of this country. It is not enough that the select committee of which I was a member found unanimously in its investigation and study of the facts, evidence, and circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre that there was irrevocable and conclusive proof that this horror had been committed by the Soviet NKVD or People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs. It is not enough to establish the date as not later than the spring of 1940. It is not enough to conclude as the select committee unanimously concluded that the "Soviets had plotted this criminal extermination of Poland's intellectual leadership as early as the fall of 1939—shortly after Russia's treacherous invasion of the Polish nation's borders." I am quoting House Report No. 2430, 2d session of the 82d Congress, which goes on to say: "There can be no doubt this massacre was a calculated plot to eliminate all Polish leaders who subsequently would have opposed the Soviets' plans for communizing Poland."

I say it is not enough to have probed for the truth, unearthed it, exposed it, proclaimed it. For what is involved here is the very heart of the moral values for which World War II was fought, a war that cost mankind 40 million lives and $2 trillion. If we merely find the truth, as we have here, and then tell it and let it pass into history like a forgotten page in a book that is out of date we shall have performed a disservice to western civilization and the free world. For that is only half of the task. We shall have acted weakly and ineffectively and in a manner destined to make us look vapid and hypocritical in the eyes of posterity and pusillanimous before the bar of world opinion. It is one of the major prides of my career in the Congress of the United States that I have not permitted this matter to sleep in the archives of government. Nor could I rest comfortably in my conscience knowing that the job of the select committee, magnificiently accomplished both on American soil and in Europe, might evaporate without a fixed result, like a case tried adequately before a qualified court but without the resultant improvement to society that litigation is expected to yield.

If there is genuinely a new policy in the Kremlin since the death and desanctification of Stalin, I was determined to put it to the acid test.

Thus it was that on May 3 of this year—1956—I wrote Secretary of State John Foster Dulles asking that he transmit to the Polish Government the report of the select committee which is now a public document of the United States. I asked also that the Secretary of State transmit to the United States delegation of the United Nations the same report "so that all members of the United Nations," my letter to the Secretary said, "may be officially aware of the existence of this public document." And finally I asked Secretary Dulles that the report and hearings record of the select committee be placed in all our embassies and libraries overseas through the Secretary's efforts and that of the United States Information Agency.

Since then I have heard from Theodore C. Streibert, Director of the United States Information Agency, indicating that the Voice of America had broadcast my statements and that of my colleagues in the House to Poland and other Iron Curtain countries, in connection with Polish Constitution Day. Likewise Director Streibert in that same letter of May 18, 1956, informed me that on last

April 13 they had broadcast a special commentary on the anniversary of the Katyn massacre. Other broadcasts, the letter said, were forthcoming that might be useful should the Polish Government initiate an investigation of its own into what may be termed one of the outstanding atrocities of the Soviet Union in World War II.

On May 18 of this year the Department of State in response to my letter informed me by letter that they had given practical effect to my suggestions. I was informed that the Department had even before my letter instructed Ambassador Lodge on January 30, 1953, to transmit to the Secretary General of the United Nations 70 copies of the select committee's report. Ambassador Lodge was instructed to send a note, the Department's letter to me said, to the Secretary General of the United Nations describing the work of the select committee and asking him to transmit a copy of the report to the representatives of each member of the United Nations. This was done, and other steps were taken to reveal definitely before the pertinent body of the United Nations the details of the outrage which concerns us here.

As for the possible establishment of a Soviet or joint Soviet-Polish commission to examine the Katyn Forest massacre; that, the letter from the Department of State informs me, is still in the rumor stage with nothing to confirm the rumor's authenticity.

And that brings me to the issue of the day.

What we are in fact asking for is a second and a honest investigation from behind the Iron Curtain of all the facts behind the Katyn Massacre. The first investigation made by the Soviet Government yielded findings which perpetuated the fraud that sought to absolve the Soviet Union from guilt. We know, and the Russians know, and the Germans know—all the world now knows—that the Kremlin has murder on its hands for the Katyn Massacre. What justice and history, what the ethics of a religious society demand, is that the alleged new masters of the Kremlin who repudiated Stalin, now stand up and be counted. They are asked to give mankind for all time on the basis of a thorough investigation of their own the confession of guilt without which this case cannot be said to be closed. Abundant evidential materials and witnesses still exist. And on the basis of this confession the guilty should be asked to make whatever retribution is yet possible.

It is to this end that in my letter to Secretary Dulles on May 3, of this year, I asked that the Polish Government be furnished anew the report and hearing record of the select committee. It is easy enough to make the findings we made, powerful and conclusive as they are, and to now drop the matter. But this course of placid acceptance of a frightful wrong does violence to the most elementary precepts of justice that have evolved in our civilization since the dawn of time. We did what we could in the circumstances, but we must not stop now. The issue before the United States and the world is a strategic one and can be lifted now to the highest vantage point of international drama. It can be lifted to this exposed area because the Kremlin has professed to reform. Whether this is true or just another Communist fraud may now bluntly be determined by a simple question from the President of the United States to the so-called collective leadership of the Soviet Union. The eyes and the ears, the heart and the conscience of mankind, are riveted on these two mighty centers of executive power: the Kremlin and the White House. If Khrushchev and Bulganin mean what they say then let the President ask him to admit forthrightly the guilt of the unspeakable Stalin—on the corroborative evidence they must have in their archives—of this atrocity that brought the record of crime, even in war, to a new all-time high. This crime of crimes must be exposed for what it was just as world society had at Nuremberg condemned the overwhelming crimes of Hitler and his unmentionable associates.

But this time it should be done by confession arrived at by authenticated evidence, from within the Kremlin's own walls, not because the crime needs further authentication, but because this proposed open confession, voluntarily arrived at, is one of the basic penalties communism should be willing to pay in the interests of justice and as proof of the sincerity of its protestations of reform. We have to remember that when the Soviet Union sat in as a judge during the international military trials held in Nuremberg after World War II it came with blood on its hands and guilt in its heart. The adjudications of that court, in my judgment, were the adjudication of the outraged conscience of mankind and were valid, sound, and merited. But the Soviet Union, on the basis of its conduct in the forest of Katyn, came to the judgment table with an unclean soul. Moreover, the 20th century has been the special victim of the type of national fake by which the perpetrator of murder, arson, and torture fabricates the evidence and then the propaganda blaming his crime on the enemy.

The solution of the Katyn crime, in accordance with my suggestion, will help conclusively to nail this type of lie to the masthead of international publicity, so that in the future it will be more difficult to perform this kind of international fraud. Khrushchev and Bulganin must not be invited to come to the United States. They must first be persuaded to go to Canossa in contrition and in penance. Unless a world of justice and righteousness rubs the nose of mankind's ruthless enemies in the ghastly evil of their own deeds, what chance is there for moral progress? I ask you, the Polish American Congress, to join with me in an unrelenting and persistent determination to keep this crime alive in the conscience of the world until the Soviet Union shall have confessed and made amends even at this late date for an outrage that is beyond atonement.

The Administration's Foreign Policy Wins Tremendous Victory in Egypt (Serendip-style)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 1956, James Reston's article in the New York Times on "Serendipity in Capital" advised us of the cure-all the administration has discovered. A remarkable elixir originally found by the English writer, Horace Walpole, it gets its name from his fairy tale, The Three Princes of Serendip. The three princes were never dismayed by misfortune, but always managed to discover the most wonderful things.

In the prevailing fashion in Washington these days of always creating the impression that all is well in the world I have come to the startling conclusion that our foreign policy has just won for us a tremendous victory in Egypt.

Mr. Speaker, for reasons of state it is not likely that the future American historian will take special note of the 5-day celebration that began in Cairo last Wednesday, June 13. This is a period of rejoicing in Egypt where they are celebrating the most glorious event in their modern history. That event is the departure of the last British soldier from the Suez Canal base and the transfer of the canal to Egyptian hands. To mark the end of 74 years of British guardianship, the Egyptians climaxed their celebration on Monday by naming it Evacuation Day.

This day should be marked in our own diplomatic history as a milestone in American Middle East policy, for we were primarily responsible for persuading our British allies to give up this life line of empire. Apparently we also insisted that no conditions were to be attached to this generous gift of a powerfully equipped military base and a critically important international waterway.

At the same time the American people were assured that a new day was dawning in the Middle East. Egypt was going to be made safe for democracy and freedom, and we could believe her claim of being an enemy of Communism. Egypt could not be any other than our everlasting, grateful friend. With our help, living standards would go up and American technical know-how would speed the modernization of Egypt. We were told that under Naguib and Nasser a grateful Egypt would surely be a cooperative Egypt and that as a result tensions in the Middle East would disappear.

The author of this profound policy was our former Assistant Secretary of State for the Near East and present Ambassador to Egypt, Mr. Henry Byroade. To him must go the applause for inspiring this spectacular change, and its execution should have earned him at least the eternal gratitude of Egypt. Mr. Byroade is now in Cairo. And no doubt the Egyptians planned to honor somebody on Evacuation Day. But these Egyptians are a strange people. They did not respond the way Mr. Byroade said they would. The guns they fired during the celebration were Communist guns, and the jet planes that flew overhead were Soviet MIG fighters. Furthermore, the man they invited to help them celebrate Evacuation Day was not Mr. Byroade, but Mr. Dmitri Shepilov, the new Foreign Minister of Soviet Russia. Perhaps Mr. Shepilov will suggest to his new Egyptian friends that they rename Monday, June 18, Byroade Day.

No doubt there is some logical explanation for Egypt's choice of Mr. Shepilov in place of Mr. Byroade. It may have something to do with the mercurial nature of the Egyptian rulers who find such extraordinary ways to show their devotion to freedom and democracy. No doubt Mr. Byroade has an explanation.

But if he has, he should come home to enlighten us. And if he has not, he should come home to tell us why he has not. Either way, it is high time that Mr. Byroade, who started the administration's last agonizing appraisal of our Near East policy, step aside to let someone devise a program, more appreciative of the danger and more faithful to America's own best interests.

Radio Corporation of America Dedicates Enlarged Plant in New Jersey Expanding Capacity To Aid National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Radio Corporation of America has made an enviable contribution to the cause of science by its continued and far-reaching research over a period of many years. Its numerous and varied activities in advancing the art of communications and related subjects has been of incalculable value to our Nation and its people in time of peace and war.

In its ever-expanding program and creation of new and additional facilities, to enable it to give even greater assistance in the cause of science, RCA on Friday, May 4, 1956, dedicated a major enlargement of the RCA missile and surface radar engineering plant at Moorestown, N. J., representing an important expansion of RCA's capacity to aid national defense.

The ceremonies, which included demonstrations of some of RCA's latest developments in military electronics, were witnessed by military and Government guests, representatives of the press, and more than 1,500 employees at the RCA plant.

During the program Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the RCA board, announced RCA activity in the new defense missile program, as well as development of RCA's abilities to design and produce complex electronic systems for the military services.

General Sarnoff said RCA is developing and producing, under contracts with the Department of Defense, land-based tactical launching and guidance systems for the Talos guided missile, a defense weapon designed for use against enemy aircraft. This surface-to-air guided missile is being built for the United States Air Force by RCA, which also has the responsibility for a portion of a shipboard system for the United States Navy.

RCA'S GROWING RESPONSIBILITIES

RCA's growing responsibilities in guided-missile activities were commemorated by meetings at the Moorestown plant of the board of directors of RCA, the National Broadcasting Co., and RCA Communications, Inc.

General Sarnoff presided at the meetings and later joined with Frank M. Folsom, president of RCA, and other executives to welcome Government and military guests who included Maj. Gen. F. L. Ankenbrandt, director of communications-electronics, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and myself as a Member of Congress.

Also present for the dedication were New Jersey State Assemblyman C. William Haines, Chairman W. J. Hall, and Moorestown Township Committee Members Thomas Cunningham, Irving Hollingshead, and J. Aubrey Sutton; Donald Dunn, administrative manager of Moorestown, and the Reverend Mr. Victor S. Griggs, pastor of the Second Baptist Church of Moorestown and president of the Moorestown Council of Churches, who delivered the invocation.

Climaxing the ceremonies General Sarnoff unveiled a plaque which officially commemorates the RCA Moorestown plant as a missile and radar systems center.

In accordance with the consent granted by the House, I now wish to include as part of these remarks, the address of General Sarnoff, and that of General Ankenbrandt, Dr. Engstrom, and T. A. Smith.

General Sarnoff, in his address, declared:

During the past decade, developments in electronics have revolutionized the ancient art of warfare. Foremost among these has been the development of the guided missile to a stage of perfection that makes it awesome in its capacity for destruction.

The German buzz-bombs that rained from the skies of Britain during World War II were as BB-gun pellets, compared with our modern guided missiles. The sobering fact is that our vast oceans and Arctic wastelands have been converted into highways for weapons that can destroy cities and their populations on a scale never before experienced by man.

The Soviet leaders Bulganin and Khrushchev have openly boasted of their "mighty guided missiles." We in the United States have no rational alternative but to meet the menacing competition whereby world communism has perverted science and technology to its evil purposes. For the sake of our own security and the survival of our civilization, we dare not permit the Kremlin to gain even a temporary monopoly on such appalling weapons.

The Radio Corporation of America has long been dedicated to the principle that our prime responsibility is to serve the Nation—by providing the Armed Forces with equipment vital to the success of their operations.

In line with this principle, we recently concentrated the engineering and production of military equipment in an operating unit devoted exclusively to this mission. This is our defense electronic products unit, and the organization here at Moorestown is a part of this unit.

"TALOS" PROJECT

General Sarnoff, in announcing the "Talos" project, stated:

RCA is developing and producing, under contracts with the Department of Defense, land-based tactical launching and guidance systems for the "Talos" guided missile. We have as partners in this program the American Machine & Foundry Co. "Talos" is a surface-to-air guided missile developed by the Johns-Hopkins applied physics laboratory for the United States Navy Bureau of Ordnance. The initial land-based "Talos" system was developed by RCA under contract with the Navy Bureau of Ordnance.

RCA is building land-based "Talos" systems for the United States Air Force and has responsibility for a portion of a shipboard system for the United States Navy. This "Talos" project at the Moorestown plant represents one of the most comprehensive of all electronic systems, and utilizes the latest techniques developed by RCA.

This plant, and the people who give it meaning and significance, symbolizes RCA's effort in the fulfillment of our foremost responsibility—to serve the Nation.

And so it is with a deep sense of pride in RCA's work on behalf of our national defense that I unveil this plaque, dedicating the RCA Moorestown engineering plant as a missile and surface radar development center.

REMARKS BY GENERAL ANKENBRANDT

In his remarks, General Ankenbrandt declared:

For some time it has been recognized by the military that the essential elements for true national defense include far more than the Department of Defense and the military departments themselves.

This realization has grown from a very small beginning in the years leading up to World War II, on through that war and the succeeding days to the present, when all of us in the military are very conscious of the essential part being played by our partners—science and industry. That this realization has grown to its present proportions has been due in considerable measure to the expanding activities of such fine organizations as AFCEA (Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association), NSIA (National Security Industrial Association), IRE (Institute of Radio Engineers) and the like. Parenthetically, as most of you know, the theme of this year's AFCEA annual convention in Boston later on this month is "military and industry: partners in progress."

However, in greatest measure, this realization has come from the positive results which have accrued to the military from this partnership—the tremendous outpourings of scientific, engineering, production, and servicing assistance from American industry, without which our present-day advanced weapons systems for defense would not exist or could not be operated efficiently.

It is with this background that I take great pleasure, on behalf of all of us in the military, in participating in the dedication of this new and great facility here in Moorestown of RCA, devoted as it is to the creation of highly sophisticated systems for the defense of our Nation—systems involving, as most now do, heavy radar and complex electronic fire-control elements for missiles and weapons of all types—ground, sea, and air based.

I congratulate you, General Sarnoff, the board of directors of RCA, and all the members of your company, and this city who had a part in providing this forward-looking facility—a splendid testimonial to the teamwork of industry and military working together for our common national defense.

REMARKS BY DR. ENGSTROM

Dr. E. W. Engstrom, senior executive vice president of RCA, in his remarks preceding his introduction of General Ankenbrandt and General Sarnoff, said:

I am honored to participate in these ceremonies; for today we dedicate not merely a building, or a facility, but a major national resource in the field of missile and surface radar operations—one that is probably unequaled in the world. In these critical times, the significance of this operation to our Nation and to our traditional way of life cannot be overestimated.

RCA's pioneering in radar has contributed much to the extraordinary growth of this primary instrument of national security.

Our work in radar has continued and is continuing for the Navy, the Army, and the Air Force.

On this occasion, I think it is appropriate to point out the extent of RCA's engineering and productive capacity not only here in the Delaware Valley, but also throughout the State of New Jersey. Our activities here, for example, are closely integrated with the corporation's David Sarnoff research center in Princeton, N. J. We also have important plants and associated activities, for military

or civilian goods, in eight other major locations in the State—Camden, Cherry Hill, Harrison, Jersey City, Woodbridge, Rockaway, Somerville, and Clark Township.

Total RCA employment in New Jersey, excluding Princeton and Clark Township, is 26,700 persons. The annual payroll is more than $135,000,000. As a former resident of Camden County, now residing at Princeton, I believe I can speak for all RCA employees in expressing deep pride in the contributions that we make to the economy of our State.

REMARKS BY T. A. SMITH

Theodore A. Smith, vice president and general manager, RCA defense electronic products, who welcomed guests to the dedication ceremonies, declared:

It seems only yesterday that we stood at this location to dedicate the original buildings in December 1953. At that time we expressed the hope that this was only the beginning of our expanded program in the broad field of radar, and that we would grow and flourish with the community.

Now, 2½ years later, much of that healthy growth has been accomplished. Our engineering capacity has been virtually doubled. From an employment standpoint we have grown from 600 to more than 1,500 persons. Far more important than physical statistics, however, is the fact that we are now equipped to make substantially increased contributions to national security.

DEMONSTRATION OF MILITARY ELECTRONIC PRODUCTS

To symbolize RCA's varied research and development activities for national defense, a program of demonstrations disclosed three major RCA developments in the field of military electronics:

A portable electronic detector for "nerve" gas—developed by the Army Chemical Corps and RCA. The first such detector accepted for military use, the unit not only can serve as a field alarm for military personnel and installations, but also can be utilized for gas-detection protection of population and industrial centers. It has possibilities as a detector for hazardous industrial and commercial gases.

An RCA-developed wide-spaced image orthicon tube, or television camera tube, which can be used for televising scenes and objects under light conditions as low as those of a moderately cloudy moonlit night.

Noise-canceling microphones and headsets for aircraft intercommunications systems, which RCA has developed and is producing for the United States Air Force. The highly selective and sensitive equipment provides clear communication under noise conditions which would make intelligible conversation virtually impossible by other known means.

The electronic "nerve" gas detector was demonstrated by special detachment of the Army Chemical Corps under the command of Lt. Col. Oliver R. Hertel, Chemical Corps, Engineering Command, Army Chemical Center, Maryland.

Described, but not demonstrated at Moorestown, was the RCA "cat eye"—an electronic light intensifier which is capable of seeing objects in the dark to produce sharp and clear television pictures. The Air Force has announced that the "cat eye" enables airmen to see in the dark with almost daylight clarity and that it is expected to become a valuable aid to the Air Force as a reconnaissance device.

SERVICE GUEST LIST

In addition to General Ankenbrandt, officers of the armed services attending the Moorestown dedication included:

Army: Maj. Gen. V. A. Conrad, commanding general, Ft. Monmouth, N. J.; Brig. Gen. Marshall Stubbs, commanding general, Army Chemical Center, Edgewood, Md.; Brig. Gen. H. V. Gaskill, Office of Chief of Research and Development, United States Army, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Colin Hudson, Office of Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, Washington, D. C.; Col. C. A. Poutre, Signal Corps Supply Agency, 18th and Locust Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.; Col. H. M. Murray, Frankfort Arsenal, Bridge and Tacony Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.; Lt. Col. O. R. Hertel, Chemical Corps, Engineering Command, Army Chemical Center, Edgewood, Md.

Navy: Rear Adm. F. S. Withington, Chief, Bureau of Ordnance, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.; Capt. R. L. Taylor, Bureau of Ordnance, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.; Capt. A. C. Packard, Bureau of Aeronautics, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.; Rear Adm. H. C. Bruton, director, Naval Communications Division, Office of Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.; Capt. D. O. Lacey, United States Navy Aviation Supply Office, 700 Robbins Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.

Air Force: Maj. Gen. G. R. Acheson, commander, Middleton Air Materiel Area, Olmstead Air Force Base, Pa.; Brig. Gen. I. L. Farman, Assistant for Electronic Supporting Systems, deputy commander, Weapons Systems Headquarters, Air Research and Development Command, Post Office Box 1395, Baltimore, Md.; Brig. Gen. S. T. Wray, ADES Project Officer, 220 Church Street, New York, N. Y.; Col. A. R. Shiely, Air Research and Development Command, 220 Church Street, New York, N. Y.; Col. Jay Jaynes, Office of Deputy Chief of Staff, Development, United States Air Force, Washington, D. C.; Col. W. J. Adams, Eastern Air Procurement, 1411 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

PRESS ATTENDANCE

Newspapers, wire services, magazines, and television stations represented at the RCA Moorestown program included: The Associated Press, United Press, Tele-News, station WRCV, station WRCV-TV, station WFIL-TV, the New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Wall Street Journal, Aviation Age magazine, Tele-Tech magazine, Popular Mechanics magazine, Radio and TV Daily, Aviation Week magazine, Electronic Design magazine, Research and Engineering magazine, Philadelphia Inquirer, Philadelphia Daily News, Philadelphia Afro-American, Philadelphia Tribune, Camden Courier-Post, Pittsburgh Courier, Moorestown News Chronicle, Mt. Holly Herald, American Aviation magazine, Electronics magazine, Popular Science magazine, Broadcasting magazine, Aeronautical Engineering Review, Radio Electronics magazine, Electrical Engineering magazine.

The 730th Air Force Band, under the direction of Chief Warrant Officer Dieter, Maguire Air Force Base, Trenton, N. J., participated in the ceremonies.

Progress Toward the Integration of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a speech given by me before the First Regional Model Assembly of the Council of Europe in Rochester, N. H., Saturday, May 19, 1956. The speech is entitled: "Progress Toward the Integration of Europe":

Mr. President and members of the Model Assembly of the Council of Europe: It is a great pleasure, a high privilege and a distinct honor to be here in the Spaulding High School Auditorium this afternoon to address the High School Model Assembly of the Council of Europe under the sponsorship of the New Hampshire Council on World Affairs and the International Relations Club of the University of New Hampshire. I am delighted to have the opportunity of delivering the closing address to the members of this assembly.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the New Hampshire Council on World Affairs, the International Relations Club of the University of New Hampshire, and the students of the participating high schools in New Hampshire for your efforts in making this Model Assembly an outstanding success.

I am greatly pleased that New Hampshire has a Council on World Affairs. We need to devote our attention to international problems since they affect our everyday life. Whatever happens in one part of the world sends repercussions around the globe because of the closeness of the continents in this age of rapid scientific advancement. I notice that in the brochure put out by the New Hampshire council entitled "World Affairs Are Your Affairs," it is stated that the purpose of the organization is to "create an informed public opinion as the democratic basis for a sound foreign policy, to operate as a ccordination point and service center for interested organizations, advocating no specific policy or action, and to promote the widest possible understanding of world affairs as an essential step toward lasting peace." I hope this organization continues to grow and that it will have a wide membership in every section of the State, for we certainly need to have the broadest possible understanding of foreign affairs in this nuclear era.

I know of no more worthwhile endeavor than the organization and the holding of a Model Assembly of the Council of Europe. This interest in foreign affairs is most encouraging and it is most important, since the United States of America, this Republic, is the leader of the free world. We are in foreign affairs to stay and as the days come and go, we will find that it is necessary for us to have an ever-increasing understanding and to take an ever-increasingly active part in the solution of international problems.

We need to know more and more about foreign affairs and the shaping of foreign policies because the future of the world will depend directly upon how wisely the United States exercises its destiny-given position of leadership in the new role in which the Republic finds itself.

REPORT OF STUDY MISSION

My specific object this afternoon is to discuss with you the progress toward the unification and integration of Europe. This is a subject in which I have long been interested. In the fall of 1953 I had the opportunity of being the chairman of a study mission to Europe. The mission made a thorough study of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, also a complete survey and appraisal on European unification and integration. In the section of our report dealing with European integration, we gave detailed information on the Benelux Economic Union, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the European Coal and Steel Community, the Western Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the proposed European Defense Community, and the Council of Europe, all having the purpose of bringing about a closer unity among the nations in Europe.

NEED FOR UNITY

In our report dated February 25, 1954, the study mission stated: "At the end of World War II, the concept of unity took on new meaning and significance. * * * Cooperation among the nations of Europe had become more than an ideal or a dream. It had become a matter of life and death for free peoples. The formidable obstacles to unity, so long recognized, were at last challenged by the overwhelming need for unity.

"Since the closing days of the war, efforts toward increased cooperation among the European nations have followed many different lines and assumed many different patterns. These have ranged from consultation among national governmental representatives on international committees to the surrender of portions of national sovereignty to supranational organization, with one objective in mind: To achieve peace, security, and economic prosperity through the joint action of two or more nations."

In an article entitled "United States Leadership in a Divided World," which I wrote for the 1953 September issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, I stated: "As I think of the disunity in Europe and as I think how important the achievement of unification—political, economic, and military—has become, my mind turns to the history of the 1860's in which Abraham Lincoln gave leadership to his country. His farsighted statesmanship prevented the division of our country and made certain the continuation of the United States."

Had it not been for Lincoln's leadership the United States today might not be in existence and our continent would undoubtedly be an atomized continent, with many divisions, and instead of one nation we might find ourselves hopelessly factionalized. Happily, this is not the case. Although it would be impossible to make one nation out of the European countries, nevertheless, a much greater degree of unity is possible and a much greater degree of unity is essential if Europe is not to perish in a maelstrom of differences, rivalries, dissensions, and conflict.

INTEGRATION IMPERATIVE

By the end of World War II it had become perfectly apparent to thinking people that a greater integration of Western Europe was imperative if the nations on that continent were to survive the threat of communism and if they were to preserve the culture developed over so many years. The Soviet Union insisted upon maintaining large standing forces. The policy of Moscow was intransigent and aggressive. The Soviet Union presented a threat that was far beyond the ability or capacity of any of the European states to meet as individuals. Collective action was the only way that the countries could be preserved. It was also apparent that Europe by itself could not survive.

With United States help and by moving together, the countries had the possibility of achieving a power sufficient to form a balance. The economic problems created by a series of small States separated by tariff barriers and trade restrictions seemed to mean continued economic difficulties for all, while integration offered the efficiency and economy of a mass market and specialization. Integration, in short, seemed the one logical way of meeting a number of different problems. It is my purpose to trace the development and the contribution made by various European organizations toward a greater integration of the continent, economically, militarily, and politically.

BENELUX

In 1944 the first attempt at integration economically was the so-called Benelux group, consisting of Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg. These countries established a customs union which merged, to some extent, the economies of the member States. The agreement provided for the elimination of tariffs existing between the member countries and the establishment of common tariffs on imports coming into the union. Complete union has not been achieved, since all trade barriers have not been eliminated.

ORGANIZATION FOR EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COOPERATION

Three years later, in 1947, steps toward a broader economic integration occurred when 16 countries in Europe cooperated to create the Organization for European Economic Cooperation. This organization, established to implement United States economic aid under the Marshall plan, had four aims: First, to reduce trade barriers; second, to facilitate the distribution of essential materials; third, to promote economic stability; and fourth, to utilize more effectively European manpower.

In our report on the unification and integration of Europe, our study mission stated that "the long-term aim of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation is the achievement of a sound European economy through the economic cooperation of its members. In pursuing this goal, its immediate purpose was to insure the success of the European recovery program through cooperation with the United States." The program was most successful and in the present mutual-security bill there is no economic aid programed for Europe.

EUROPEAN COAL AND STEEL COMMUNITY

Another of the organizations making an outstanding contribution to economic integration is the European Coal and Steel Community. It is particularly important because it created the first effective supranational agency. For the first time nations surrendered a sufficient amount of their national sovereignty to the new organization, the authority of which was considered superior to the individual authority of each member state.

The members of the European Coal and Steel Community include Belgium, Italy, France, Western Germany, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. Its purposes are: First, to enlarge the European market; second, to encourage the increase per capita steel consumption; third, to pool their resources; and fourth, to assist member states to adjust their economies to an intensified competition in Europe and elsewhere. In establishing a dominion over the distribution of coal, iron ore, steel, and ferrous scrap within the political frontiers of the member countries, the European Coal and Steel Community is a real supranational authority and is making a valuable contribution to the economic integration of Europe.

THE EUROPEAN PAYMENTS UNION

Another organization contributing to economic integration was founded in July 1950. This was the European Payments Union. The Union provides a common currency pool for balancing international payments on a multilateral basis. In this way a freer flow of currencies and goods has been made possible.

WESTERN UNION

The establishment of the Western Union on March 17, 1948, by France, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, was the first step toward the postwar military integration of Europe. Under this pact the countries pledged themselves to give immediate military assistance to any party against which aggression might occur.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

On April 4, 1949, a treaty was signed in Washington, D. C., which brought NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, into being. By negotiating this treaty, the North Atlantic Community reaffirmed its faith in the purposes of the United Nations Charter, seeking to stabilize the North Atlantic area by organizing for collective defense to keep the peace and maintain the security of the community. The treaty aimed to strengthen the free institutions of European nations and to encourage economic collaboration within the framework of cooperative consultation.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization has been an outstandnig success. At the moment the following nations—Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Western Germany—are members of the Organization.

In the military sphere the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is accomplishing the principal task for which it was intended, that is deterring Communist military aggression in Europe, insuring the territorial integrity and political independence of the European nations and enabling those nations to stabilize their respective economies. However, events of recent months have clearly demonstrated that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization needs to become more than a military alliance. The threat of the new look Russian foreign policy demands that new life and broader vision be given to NATO.

RECENT NATO ACTION

In view of the new tactics of the Soviet Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has taken some recent and significant action. At a meeting of NATO in Paris on May 5, it was decided to set up a committee of 3, including Foreign Ministers Gaetano Martino of Italy, Lester B. Pearson of Canada and Halvard M. Lange of Norway, to make a study of NATO problems and to develop ways and means of defeating communism. As suggested by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to the NATO meeting in Paris, this high level council would sit permanently, dealing with political and economic problems confronting the Atlantic community. Thus, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has reacted to the new situation created by the change in the tactics of the Soviet Union—a change which is, of course, calculated to help them in their fundamental objective of world domination, which does not change.

Today perhaps more than ever before, Europe is aware that its very survival rests on the strengthening of economic, military and political ties within the Atlantic community. European nations must realize that there are issues involved that require the sacrifice of certain nationalist goals and de-

sires. For Europe to assume her rightful place in any international negotiations and decisions, she must work effectively and soon toward greater integration and unity.

Guy Mollet has said: "Russia's cold war has shown the need for a Europe united militarily; Russia's new look calls even more loudly for a Europe united politically." Progress has definitely been made toward European integration. Europe has moved toward the idea of a common market. A common coordinating authority will act as a spokesman for the common European interest, although a "United States of Europe" with executive, legislative and judicial powers is far from a forseeable realization. An agency coordinating on a supranational level to give Europe the strength she needs for survival and effective international cooperation is a reasonable expectation.

REJECTION OF EUROPEAN DEFENSE COMMUNITY

The foregoing is a brief summary of the principal successful European ventures since the termination of World War II. Concomitant with these successful ventures have been certain projects and proposals which have not fared so well. The aura of success which tends to surround these union efforts of postwar Europe must not blind us to setbacks which have occurred.

For one thing, I refer to the rejection by France of the European Defense Community. Although France had led the way in proposing the European Defense Community, the proposal for pooling the Armed Forces of the 6 member nations into a common army was turned down by the French assembly in 1954. Among the principal reasons for this rejection of the European Defense Community was the French fear that Germany would dominate it, being potentially more capable of developing military predominance in Europe. Of course, the concept of supranationalism associated with all these schemes for integration has always run headlong into the competing nationalisms of the respective countries. For this reason all the interested European nations have approached this concept with caution.

With the rejection of the supranational European Defense Community, the countries fell back upon a more orthodox military alliance. Some years earlier, Britain, France and the Benelux countries had signed a defensive alliance called the Brussels Treaty Organization. With this Organization as a basis, the Western European Union was established at the Nine Power Conference held in London in the fall of 1954, consisting of Britain, France, the Benelux countries, Germany and Italy. Since this alliance was a substitute for the European Defense Community, it naturally had the same purpose to add Western German strength to that of the allies and at the same time to control that strength. As stipulated in this Western European Union, Western Germany is pledged to abide by a continental arms control, not to manufacture atomic, biological or chemical weapons, to conduct its foreign policy in accordance with the United Nations Charter and never to resort to force to achieve German unification. Thus, although the Union does have certain aspects of supranationalism, it does not have such extensive ones as those the defunct European Defense Community would have had.

THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

In the report of the study mission several paragraphs were devoted to the Council of Europe. As you all know, it was in March 1948 that the French Parliament adopted a resolution calling for a European Constituent Assembly to establish a European federation. Established on May 5, 1949 with the aim of promoting "greater unity among the European countries in order to facilitate their economic and social progress," the Council of Europe now includes the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Italy, Ireland, Saar, the Scandinavian countries, Greece, Turkey, Iceland, and the German Federal Republic.

The major organs of the Council are: the Committee of Ministers, composed of the Foreign Ministers of the member States or their deputies, which meets at least twice a year in closed sessions; the Consultative Assembly, consisting of 132 delegates with delegations varying in size according to the relative sizes of the member countries, which meets in open sessions annually for 1 month in Strasbourg, France; and the Secretariat. Before the Consultative Assembly can make recommendations to the Committee of Ministers, a two-thirds majority vote is required, and such recommendations, if unanimously approved by the Ministers, are then transmitted to the member governments. A system of "partial agreements," agreements among certain members which do not bind those who abstain, which slightly modifies the unanimity rule, has only recently been adopted by the Ministers.

Because of the existence of other international organizations with functions similar to those of the Council of Europe, which in essence is a clearinghouse of ideas for the means of advancing European unification, the Statute of the Council provides that the work of these other organizations be kept in mind when the Assembly is planning its agenda, thus avoiding a duplication of effort.

PROSPECTS FOR FURTHER PROGRESS TOWARD INTEGRATION

We may now ask ourselves what are the prospects for further progress toward integration in Europe. In the first place, the new habits and institutions established within the European Community have taken root and have been accepted by Europeans and the world. The European idea has captured the imagination of even the once skeptical European. A new consciousness of "Europeaness," so to speak, about the common background of the European civilization has been realized by Europeans themselves.

More and more one hears Europeans speaking in terms of common interests and a common market. From the beginning of the Marshall plan the matter of a common market has persistently appeared. When Robert Schuman's plan for pooling coal and steel resources was accepted by the 6 European nations in April 1951, it was establishing a common steel and coal market for regulating production and eliminating trade and other restrictions. It is felt that this 6-nation common market of 150 million in a united Europe should increase production and prosperity by creating a larger and greater demand for new goods. Coal and steel were selected as the first sector to be pooled because these two resources are the major ones upon which the heavy industries of both France and Germany exist. By September 1955 progress had been made toward stabilizing the common market, as well as toward integrating other fuel and power resources into the plan. For the future there is talk of integrating transport, other conventional fuel and power, and even nuclear energy.

TOWARD THE FUTURE

In the report of the special study mission on International Organizations and Movements and on the unification and integration of Europe issued in 1954, we stated in our last paragraph: "The United States has steadfastly encouraged and supported unification and integration movements in free Europe. In the final analysis, however, these movements must spring inwardly from the will of the Europeans themselves. United States policy is premised on that will. But if the passage of a reasonable length of time indicates that such a will does not exist, the United States would be compelled—not by its own choosing—to readjust its policy."

I like to believe that there is springing from the hearts of the Europeans a desire for a closer integration and unification. The events of the past several months have posed new problems and in view of this, the United States is in the process of readjusting its policy, not because we have lost faith in the unification of Europe, but because we recognize that into the existing organization, particularly the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, there must be breathed a new life and a new vitality.

That Europe is endeavoring to come to grips with this problem is evidenced by the recent appointment of a committee of NATO members to study and report to the Council, which I mentioned previously. That we are coming to grips with this problem is evidenced by a suggestion which Secretary of State Dulles offered in his speech closing the mutual security hearings on May 10 of this year. The Secretary stated that consideration is being given to the establishment of a committee to conduct an independent study of various aspects of the mutual security program. In listing the topics under consideration, he included: "The relative role of the State and Defense Departments in administering the program; whether we should seek to put more of our program on a loan rather than a grant basis; whether the program needs to be enlarged and given greater continuity to meet the new Soviet tactics." Thus, the free nations of the world, because of the recent change in Soviet tactics, are endeavoring to shape policies to meet the new situation.

STATEMENT MADE BY THE UNITED NATIONS DELEGATION TO SECRETARY OF STATE DULLES

In connection with this shift in Soviet policies, the United States delegation to the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations, of which I was a member, submitted to the Secretary of State on December 9, 1955, a statement on foreign policy. In this communication we stated:

"The present period in history may one day be recognized as a major turning point in the struggle between communism and freedom. It appears to be clearly a shift in the cold war, in which economic and social problems have moved to the forefront.

"Members of the United States delegation during this General Assembly session have observed the effectiveness of Soviet tactics under these new conditions. This can be seen both in the way the Soviet bloc delegates work in various United Nations meetings and also in the voting that occurs in many committees. As we observed maneuvers, we were conscious that the Soviet Union, elsewhere in the world, was using economic and social collaboration as a means for jumping military as well as political barriers. Examples of this can be found in India, Egypt, and Burma.

"We believe that the United States must counter these Soviet efforts. We can succeed, not by outbidding communism in sheer amounts of economic aid, but by making newly independent and newly articulate peoples feel that they can best satisfy their wants by becoming and remaining part of the community of free nations.

"We welcome more emphasis on economic and educational endeavors, for we have a proven experience in these fields.

"We are in a contest in the field of economic development of underdeveloped countries which is bitterly competitive. Defeat in this contest could be as disastrous as defeat in an armaments race.

"We could lose this economic contest unless the country as a whole wakes up to all its implications."

CONCLUSION

Europe must continue its drive with constantly increasing intensity to become more

united economically, militarily, and politically, if the threat of communism is to be effectively met and destroyed. The Council of Europe, which is the political organization for the purpose of developing ways and means to bring about political unity, can well become the most important instrument for the realization of more cooperation among the countries of Europe. The unification of Europe has widespread support not only in Europe but throughout our own country. I know of no better way to become familiar with the problems inherent in the various moves calculated to bring about European unification than to make a study of this many faceted problem through a Model Assembly of the Council of Europe, such as you have held here today.

Europe is an integral part of the free civilization which it is our privilege to possess. Stretching back over the centuries, the nations of Europe have made a growing and an enduring contribution to the culture and the civilization of the West. From these countries we have received enrichment in art, music, literature, and many of the fields of human activity.

The revolution in scientific fields, particularly aviation and nuclear energy, is demanding that equal progress be made in the field of economics and politics. As the organizations we have been talking about become successful, we will find in the future a strong and invigorated continent continuing to make a contribution to the civilization of the West. This is our hope for Europe. We thoroughly believe in European unification and integration. We are endeavoring to shape our policies to bring about this desired end. I have confidence that we will be successful and I am certain that the nations of Europe, which are already hearing the clarion call of destiny, "unite or perish," will rise to the occasion in this mid-20th century, and will, with our help and our encouragement, move ever closer to unification and integration until the peoples of those countries are completely secure from the sinister threat of communism, are able to live free from the fear of war and are able in a peaceful environment to help in the bringing about of a prosperous and peaceful world community.

A Reappraisal of the Life of Jefferson Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on May 5 last a memorable occasion was held at Fort Monroe, Va. At that time the dedication ceremonies were conducted by the United Daughters of the Confederacy dedicating the Jefferson Davis Memorial Park.

On that occasion an outstanding citizen of the South, my distinguished colleague, Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, was the principal speaker. This was most appropriate since that great southern leader of the Confederacy, Jefferson Davis, was a Mississippian.

In view of the wealth of information concerning this truly great man contained in the address, it is appropriate that the remarks of Senator STENNIS on that occasion be given wider circulation. The address itself was a splendid one honoring this Mississippian, the leader of the Southern States in that unfortunate fratricidal strife.

Senator STENNIS' address is as follows:

A REAPPRAISAL OF THE LIFE OF JEFFERSON DAVIS

The United Daughters of the Confederacy do well to honor the spot where the very last drops of the lifeblood of the southern Confederacy were drained off, and the one man who was the symbol of that mighty cause suffered the ignominy and torture of chains and imprisonment.

The ironing of Jefferson Davis at Fort Monroe, where at first he was thrown to the stone floor and held down by four soldiers while a blacksmith riveted heavy shackles on his ankles, was as a cup of vinegar to the South, as much as it was a mortifying and painful attack on the body of the President of the Confederate States of America.

But even the rigors of this Gethsemane never daunted the spirit of Jefferson Davis.

There he was:

That great and good man from my own home State of Mississippi; that gallant soldier who had been the outstanding military figure of the Black Hawk and Indian wars; that renowned hero who had given luster to American arms in the war with Mexico at Monterey and Buena Vista; that calm and dispassionate scholar who had been the friend and confidante of America's great military captains, and friend and advisor to three Presidents of the United States; that wise and provident counselor who had stood on the floor of the United States Senate with Webster, Clay, and Calhoun, and pleaded for measures of justice and conciliation that might have saved the Union and saved it without bloodshed; and finally that stalwart, towering, and lonely figure, called by 13 American States to share their brilliant but tragic destiny in their second war of independence.

What could the stone walls and iron bars of Fort Monroe do to a spirit like this?

In spite of chains, imprisonment, and utter defeat, the President of the Confederate States of America was no lost leader of a lost cause.

The South was fighting, not for slavery, not for any white-pillared aristocracy, not for its own independent economy. She was fighting for a principle as old as the hills and as sacred as the covenants of all God-fearing peoples. She was fighting for autonomy and local self-government, something that men call freedom, something known as liberty, which men had fought and died for since the dawn of civilized man.

The truth is, the frightful and bloody fratricidal war she was called upon to wage in defense of her soil and rights to self-government, was merely a single engagement in the still greater and continuous war, which has been waged for centuries by freemen everywhere for freedom, for the right of self-determination, for local self-government, and for freedom from colonialism and empirical controls.

For his spirit to live, Jefferson Davis had to be a great man. And he was.

Governor Brown of Mississippi in proffering him a seat in the United States Senate referred to his military career in these words:

"The people will never cease to remember with pride and gratitude that to you, sir, and the brave Mississippians under your command, is our State indebted for honors as imperishable as the soil on which you won them; honors which shall last as long as chivalry is respected or valor has a place in the hearts of men."

Perhaps, as one who occupies the honored position of a successor to Jefferson Davis in the United States Senate, and as one who has as his desk on the Senate floor Jefferson Davis' own desk, my own mind dwells with singular propriety on the great career the Mississippian carved out for himself as a statesman in that body.

Davis was only 39 years old when he first took his seat in the United States Senate. In a few brief years, he came to rank well up with such towering figures as ex-President John Quincy Adams, Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, and John C. Calhoun. When Calhoun, the acknowledged Southern spokesman, died in 1850, Davis was immediately recognized as his successor.

His spirited defense of Daniel Webster, a political enemy, when for cheap partisan advantage Webster's integrity was challenged in the Senate; his tireless efforts, as member and chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, to enlarge and strengthen the Armed Forces of the United States; his wise and courageous battle against the Wilmot Proviso; his lengthy, brilliant, and arduous debates in behalf of a strict construction of the Constitution as to powers ceded to the Federal Government and those reserved to the States; and his magnificent resentment of the abolitionists and their attacks on the South, in and out of the Senate—all these marked Jefferson Davis as undisputed leader of the South and Southern thought.

But Davis was far and above the position of a mere sectional or partisan leader. He was well in the forefront of the national expansionists. It doesn't seem necessary more than merely to mention in passing the hiatus in Davis' Senate career when he went home to run for the Mississippi governorship and was defeated by 999 votes. For, when Franklin Pierce came to the Presidency in 1853, the Mississippi ex-Senator was literally drafted for renewed public service as Secretary of War in the new Democratic Cabinet. He became one of the outstanding War Secretaries in United States history.

With the termination of the Pierce administration, on March 4, 1857, Jefferson Davis resumed his career in the United States Senate, 24 hours after he had ceased to be Secretary of War, and 4 days before the Supreme Court rendered the Dred Scott decision.

From this time to the day when he had to rise in the Senate and announce the secession of his own beloved Mississippi, Jefferson Davis strove in every honorable way possible to find some way to preserve the Union as well as southern rights.

Jefferson Davis returned to Mississippi and offered his services to the State, and was made a major general of the Army of Mississippi.

But he had a rendezvous with an uncompromising and relentless destiny which was not to be denied; for on that fateful day of February 10, 1861, a messenger from Vicksburg arrived in hot haste with a telegram notifying him that he had been unanimously chosen President of the Confederate States of America. He thus became the leader, commander-in-chief and historical standard bearer of the most bloody, costly, and devastating revolution of modern times.

The whole life and career of this man, it would seem in historical retrospect, had been a schooling and preparation for such a climax. As Senator Yancey said, "The man and the hour have met."

Certainly, he had been one who never turned his back but marched breast forward.

I shall certainly not here pursue all the brilliant strokes of genius and doubtless grievous errors of judgment, of his tenure as President of the Confederacy. I do want to point out now that, on assuming the exalted office of President of the Confederate States of America, President Davis said:

"I come with diffidence and distrust to discharge the great duties devolved on me by the kindness and confidence of the Congress of the Confederate States. I will devote to the duties of the high office to which I have

been called all that I have—of heart, of head, and of hand."

History records that in every sense of the word Jefferson Davis lived up to that pledge.

As he left the city of Richmond that he had so long and so magnificently defended, he had the right to look the world in the face and say, "I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course. I have kept the faith."

Today a bronze statue of President Davis, presented by my State of Mississippi to the Federal Government, stands in the Vicksburg National Park, which surrounds that heroic city. Also, his likeness stands in Statuary Hall in the United States Capitol as the greatest Mississippian. By his side stands the great and peerless Gen. Robert E. Lee, placed there by a grateful Virginia. These men live on forever; their greatness inspires us with patriotic pride. Our southern way of life will continue inspired by the thoughts and deeds of the heroic men of Davis' day.

For nations, as with individuals, times change. Old problems are solved, or pass off the scene. New ones arise. But principles live and remain the same.

As worthy descendants of our illustrious forebears of the time of Jefferson Davis, we must turn our faces not to the past, but to the problems of our own future. To these problems, we must apply the same high principles of public trust, personal honor, and devotion to duty, as were applied by that generation. We must have the courage of heart and mind to do more, regardless of the odds against us, for the great principles of government which we believe are sound and essential to our Nation's welfare.

Jefferson Davis, a man of vision, saw the necessity of preserving the powers of the States. Otherwise and inevitably a strong centralized government would eventually destroy personal freedom.

That truth was never better expressed than in the following words of the late Raleigh C. Minor, formerly of the University of Virginia Law School, and truly one of the great law teachers of our Nation:

"If a power is one reserved by the States, and, after long and patient trial and experiment, the States prove incompetent to exercise it properly and it is essential that it be so exercised, then let the power be transferred to the Federal Government by amendment to the Constitution. If the necessity is not great enough and evident enough to induce the legislatures of three-fourths of the States to assent to the transfer, it may be fairly assumed that the transfer is not so essential after all.

"But in any event let it not be accomplished by a forced construction of the Constitution. This is even now the canker that is slowly but surely eating away the reserved rights of the States and sapping their powers. If the process be not checked, the time must certainly come when the sovereign States will be nothing more than mere municipal corporations with only such powers left them as their Federal Government may choose to allow. God save the fair fabric of the Constitution from such a fate."

These words, written in 1913, were applicable in the days of Jefferson Davis, and they apply as well today.

If we would truly honor our forebears of that generation, we will face the responsibilities that come to our generation.

If liberty and freedom and sound principles of Government are to be preserved, it will be through the efforts of our generation—not the generation of Jefferson Davis nor the generation that is to follow us, but those of us who are living now.

God give us the insight to see our duty and our opportunity, and the courage to act.

Thus and thus only can we preserve constitutional government.

Statement By Hon. John E. Henderson, of Ohio, in Opposition to H. R. 5550, Before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on March 7, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, when the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, was considering H. R. 5550, Congressman JOHN E. HENDERSON, of Ohio's 15th District, appeared before the committee to express his vigorous opposition to this measure. H. R. 5550 would authorize the United States to join an international organization known as the Organization of Trade Cooperation. The OTC would, in turn, have as its principal function the administration of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The seven counties of Representative HENDERSON's district in southeastern Ohio have suffered seriously for many years as a result of policies which have lowered tariffs on those products which they and adjacent areas of our State produce. Although H. R. 5550 would not, in itself, authorize further tariff reductions, it would, in my opinion, authorize participation in an organization whose actions and policies would soon accomplish this end.

I believe Mr. HENDERSON's testimony before the committee is an excellent treatment of this complex subject. It is as follows:

My purpose in appearing before your committee during the hearings on H. R. 5550 is to urge that the committee and the Congress act with extreme caution in consideration of this legislation.

The bill before you would, if enacted, authorize the United States to be a party to the Organization for Trade Cooperation among whose duties are the administration of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

I should like to point out at the very beginning of my remarks that the average citizen looks to Congress as the responsible agency for those things which control his commercial activities. He feels that if remedial action is needed in any phase of Government he can look to Congress for that action. Especially does he feel that the question of the regulation of trade rests within the purview of the Congress for he knows that the Constitution of the United States, brief as it is, has specifically enumerated the question of tariffs for especial treatment when it says in article 1, section 8:

"The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations."

This is a definite assertion of congressional responsibility for the regulation of duties and commerce with foreign nations.

The average citizen is somewhat bewildered to learn that the economic pinch that he feels because of a reduction of protective tariffs on the goods he manufactures has not been brought about by action of the Congress but by an international agreement which the Congress has not ratified.

The average citizen remembers that the courts at one time had declared that there were some powers which Congress could not delegate. He is confused to learn that today he is faced, not with a simple delegation of authority, but a complex delegation from the Congress to the Executive and, thence, from the Executive to an international entity known as GATT—to the end that even the executive branch, in becoming a party to the agreement, has lost some of the authority that had been delegated to it.

That is the state of affairs prior to the enactment of the legislation which is now before us.

At the time that H. R. 1, the Reciprocal Trade Act extension, was under consideration in the first session of the 84th Congress, many of us expressed ourselves on the subject of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and what it had done to weaken the economic position of the United States.

In the first place, it was pointed out that the entire GATT program had been directed toward the reduction of United States tariffs and toward the establishment of economic advantages of one sort or another for many of the nations who were parties to GATT. Seldom, if ever, has this organization worked to the economic advantage of the United States.

Parenthetically, I would like to endorse the statements which have been made by the two speakers who immediately preceded me that these agreements have worked more specifically for the advantage of other nations.

We have progressed to the point now where our tariff rates are among the lowest throughout the world.

Those who advocate low tariffs will say that the benefits lie in three categories. First, that it encourages world trade. To this some of us must answer that our exports as related to our national productivity have reached such a low ratio that the benefits cannot outweigh the detrimental effects of wrecking home industries and rendering jobless the pottery worker, the glass worker, the worker in our clay tile industry, and the coal miner. In other words, the price we pay for world trade places a great and unequal burden on many of the important industries of our Nation.

Secondly, it is argued that by giving economic advantages to other countries, we are helping them without expense to our own taxpayers. To this must be given the answer that such economic concessions will cost us far more in terms of lost income to American industry and ultimately in the tax revenues our Nation receives.

Let us not forget that every dollar of corporate profit in the United States means at least 50 cents in tax revenues. Where our tariff practices have reduced the profits of the American pottery, tile, and glass industries by a certain figure, those same practices have reduced the taxes paid by those industries by at least one-half.

Thirdly, the advocates of low tariffs will say that American industry is more prosperous than ever and shows no signs (except in certain specific industries such as pottery, glass, coal, bicycles, textiles, wool, etc.) of being hurt by the program. To this we must answer that we are enjoying prosperity not because of but in spite of our trade practices. The ill effects are slow to show themselves. In spite of our dollar export figures our quantity export figures have not kept pace.

All of which leads me to the point of saying simply that GATT and the concomitant low tariff policy has done nothing to help the American economy and that GATT and its international attitudes has done several things which may only be interpreted as harmful to notable segments of our industry

and the men and women who depend upon these industries for their livelihood.

First, it has reduced America's bargaining position to something less than its wealth and prestige would reserve for it at diplomatic level. Though our world position as a nation among nations is one of great influence, as a signatory to GATT it approaches the same degree of influence as the weakest member. Secondly, it has weakened the constitutionally granted authority of the Congress to regulate foreign commerce. You and I know, Mr. Chairman, that in recent years the Congress has been repeatedly cautioned that it must follow certain selected paths and that failure to do so would lead to embarrassment because of concessions which our Nation had granted through GATT. To say that GATT has no power to work its will upon congressional policy is ignoring reality. Each time that a cautious Congress attempts to look under the covers of a trade policy all sorts of taboos, both large and small, are raised.

Yes; it is literally true that Congress has not ratified or officially recognized GATT; that Congress can yet act in matters of foreign trade. But will it be true if H. R. 5550 is enacted?

In enacting this bill Congress will be authorizing membership in an agency that will have as its chief duty the administration of GATT. The bill clearly states that purpose. Since it has this as its chief function, do we not at the same time ratify the contract which it administers? True, the organization has other duties, but they are lesser duties and they are ones which can be ably performed in some other manner.

Let us ask ourselves several questions before we act upon this measure. First, do we want to continue down this pathway to ever-lower trade restriction? As we answered the rollcall on H. R. 1, many of us said we did not. Our industries, particularly those which produce our handmade products, our pottery and clay tile, our glass, and the industries which prepare our natural resources, coal and oil, and the thousands of American workmen engaged, or until recently engaged, in such production say that we do not. Secondly, do we want our trade practices so completely divorced from congressional authority through this process of double delegation to the point that we relinquish our prominence in the world today by being out-voted in a contractural arrangement such as GATT? As I see it, if we want an agreement, do we want this one? The Congress has never had an opportunity to express itself directly on this point. Thirdly, do we want to join this specific club, this organization, OTC?

Perhaps we have reached the point in civilization's march when we should direct more of our attitudes to internationalism—a march which has been fraught with disappointment in the past. But if we concede that we must now express ourselves as one unit of an international confederation, and must not only join, but, in return for some advantages must surrender sovereignty in some degree or other—if that is so, aren't we still privileged to carefully investigate the club we will join? Perhaps this organization which seems so bent upon bringing advantages to other nations is not the one for us. Possibly one can be fashioned which will meet our needs far better—one which will not reduce this Nation of ours to the voting position of a second or third rate power. For as surely as we concur in OTC, and indirectly in the activities of GATT, we will be reduced to that position in other things.

Mr. Chairman, the day has not yet come when American industry cannot find markets within our borders and among our growing population. The day has not yet come when other nations will not procure our goods just as we will buy that which we must have from other nations. The day has not yet come in America when we would, as a measure of national policy, say to coal miners and pottery workers that you will be deprived of your jobs and you must sell your homes and leave your established communities to find new fields of work, forgetting your skills and accomplishments, because of the decisions of an international organization to which your elected Representatives in the Congress gave such authority.

The people of the 15th Congressional District in southeastern Ohio, which I have the honor to represent, have suffered grievous economic hardship because of the tariff policies of the past several decades.

My constituents have written and called on me to urge that your committee proceed on this legislation with extreme caution. Mr. Chairman, in appearing here today, I am speaking for them.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 7, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, June 4, 1956)

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

Rev. Father Joseph F. Thorning, D. D., Frederick, Md., honorary professor in the Catholic University of Chile, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, King of our hearts and Saviour of our souls, look down with favor upon the Presiding Officer of the Senate and all the Members of the Congress of the United States.

Let the light of Thy countenance shine brightly upon all the Presidents of the American Republics who, in the final week of this beautiful month, will gather in historic conference in our sister Republic of Panama.

Grant to these gifted leaders, inspired by the ideals of the great liberator, Simon Bolivar, the vision of a Western Hemisphere where neighbors, partners, and friends freely can exchange ideas, skills, services, and the products of their toil.

Vouchsafe to the American Chief Executives and to all who counsel them the conviction that the divine revelation imparted in the Bible is the best fountainhead of freedom for the sons and daughters of the New World and for all humanity.

Do Thou, Most Holy Spirit, inspire every citizen of the American Republics to offer daily prayers throughout June that God's choicest blessings and graces may be showered upon our statesmen whose responsibility it is to advance the cause of brotherly love.

Confident in Thy holy protection, we seek these favors in the name of the Prince of Love and Peace, the Christ of the Andes. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 6, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 421)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

This message is submitted pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended.

Under the authority of the trade agreements legislation, the United States entered into a trade agreement at Geneva, Switzerland, on May 23, 1956, with other contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. A copy of that agreement is submitted herewith. The United States received tariff concessions from other countries on various products exported by the United States in return for tariff concessions by the United States.

On two products the United States by separate action negotiated increases in the existing rates of duty. In one case, involving certain fur-felt hat bodies, a court decision had in effect nullified tariff increases which were proclaimed a few years ago as the result of an escape-clause investigation. In its peril-point investigation on these hat bodies, the Tariff Commission found that the lower rates resulting from the court decision should be increased. The negotiated increases raise the rates of duty to the peril points found by the Tariff Commission, and in general restore the rates which had been applicable under the escape-clause proclamation prior to the court decision. In the other case, involving liquid sugar, there has been no peril-point finding that an increase was necessary; the objective was to equalize the rates applicable to dry and liquid sugar.

In the other two cases—certain tungsten alloys and violins and violas—in which the Tariff Commission reported that increases in existing rates of duty were required, it was found that the advantages of negotiating the increases would have been outweighed by attendant disadvantages which made it undesirable to accomplish the increases by this means. Also, in the case of tungsten alloys, only one group was listed for negotiation while others, including ferro-tungsten, the most important in terms of imports, was not listed. Increasing the duty on the listed alloys would thus have unduly complicated our tariff structure without adequate economic justification. For these reasons, increased rates on tungsten alloys and violins and violas were not included in the trade