jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 9304. A bill to amend section 12 of the act approved September 1, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 9305. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 9306. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing quantitative restrictions on the importation of mink pelts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 9307. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON (by request):

H. R. 9308. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes," approved March 10, 1934, as amended, known as the Coordination Act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 9309. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to bar absolutely the importation of contraceptive articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 9310. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act to permit corporations to act as trustees under deeds of trust; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 9311. A bill to credit certain teachers in the District of Columbia for services performed by them between September 1944 and July 1, 1955; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 9312. A bill to amend section 218 (f) of the Social Security Act with respect to the effective date of certain State agreements or modifications thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 9313. A bill to prohibit Government agencies from acquiring or using the National Grange headquarters site without specific Congressional approval, to provide for renovation of the old State Department Building, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. J. Res. 441. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of June 22, 1942, with respect to the days on which the flag of the United States should be displayed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Res. 400. Resolution recommending the creation of a permanent United Nations Emergency Force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 9314. A bill for the relief of Antonio Escobedo-Romo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 9315. A bill for the relief of John B. H. Waring; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 9316. A bill for the relief of Pierino Renzo Picchione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 9317. A bill for the relief of Oshiro Shoko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 9318. A bill for the relief of Elaine Marie Simonton (Yu Keum Ok); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. J. Res. 442. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Colonel William Mitchell a commission as a major general, United States Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Achievements in Agriculture—The Meat-Type Hog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1957

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, agricultural research has shown hog producers how to meet consumer demand for lean pork and to cut the fat surplus at the same time. Scientists in the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with State experiment stations have shown that meat-type hogs can be produced within any breed by selecting the right breeding stock.

These streamlined, meaty hogs dress out 50 percent or more of the preferred lean cuts, compared with 44 percent in the lard-type hogs that have been grown in this country for many years. This means an extra 13 or 14 pounds of good lean meat with a corresponding decrease in the amount of fat. Furthermore, these hogs produce just as big litters, which grow just as fast and just as economically as the old-fashioned lardy hogs do. Farmers can collect an extra dividend of as much as $5 a head for the extra pounds of lean cuts.

Between 15 and 20 percent of the hogs going to market these days are meat-type hogs, and the number is increasing as the advantages show up all along the line. Some packers are paying a differential for leaner hogs and others are discounting the price for fat hogs. Market grades have been established to help buyers identify hogs with the most desirable weight and degree of fatness.

Every man, woman, and child in this country is benefiting from the research that has made it possible for farmers to give us the kind of pork we want and need for best nutrition. It looks now as if our scientists will be able to do the same thing for beef. They are working hard to develop beef animals that will produce steaks and roasts that are tender and juicy without the large amount of fat consumers no longer want or need. They are making progress and deserve our full support.

Farmers Hold the Key to Future Hog Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1957

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, farmers hold the key to future hog prices. If the favorable prices and feeding ratio now enjoyed by producers prompt overexpansion of hog production, heavy supplies could easily bring about lower prices as past experience clearly demonstrates.

Too many hogs leads to inefficient use of resources with accompanying low prices and incomes as producers well remember from their experiences in 1949 and 1955. In 1949, hog producers increased the pig crop by 10 million head and hog prices dropped $5 to $6 per hundred. Again in 1954, producers increased total production by 9 million hogs followed by another 9-million-head increase in 1955. Hog market prices dropped sharply.

On the other hand as production is reduced, prices go up. Hog producers made a cut of 7½ million hogs in production in 1956. Hog prices have been running from $18 to $21 per hundred at Midwestern markets during recent weeks. A year ago prices, while markets were recovering from heavy 1955-crop marketings, were as much as $5 per hundred less.

There have been periods when prices have held when hog numbers expanded but usually this was during a period when demand was high due to emergencies such as World War II and the Korean war. In 1941, the United States Department of Agriculture asked for an increase in production and prices held in the war period. With stable production in years following the war, prices stayed high in 1946, 1947, and 1948.

Hog production was increased in 1950 and 1951 but prices held due to the Korean war. Sizable reductions in 1952 and 1953 production increased the price of hogs in 1953 and 1954.

The past shows that when production is balanced with demand, hog producers receive satisfactory prices. If production remains on an even keel during the coming months, price prospects for hogs should be favorable.

The Department of Agriculture has expressed the hope that producers will continue to avoid excessive increases at the time of breeding for the 1958 spring pig crop. It should also be pointed out that the trend toward production of meat-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

type hogs is continuing which indicates that producers are becoming increasingly aware of the need for producing quality pork for effective marketing.

Agriculture Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1957

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the agricultural conservation program has been saved for the farmers of America, and I am proud to have had a part in saving it. On July 9, I made remarks on this floor which exposed a brazen effort by Assistant Agriculture Secretary E. L. Peterson to literally wreck ACP in direct contradiction of the expressed will and intent of Congress.

Mr. Peterson's proposals would have been a killing blow to many farmers, particularly the small, family-sized farms. Having been born and raised on a farm myself and having spent my lifetime in the farming regions of southern Indiana, I know—only too well—of the many heartbreaking problems with which they have been faced for so many years. Our farmers are caught in a squeeze between higher costs of operation and lower income for the food and fiber they produce. It is a vicious thing.

My speech of July 9 caused a considerable furor, Mr. Speaker. One result was a public announcement by the Secretary of Agriculture that the ACP would be left intact and administered exactly as Congress intended. Another result—that of public reaction—is one to which I would call your attention at this time. It bears out my own contention, which I have expressed frequently over the years, that the ACP is of vital importance to the Nation's agriculture and is widely appreciated by farmers everywhere.

Daily for the past several weeks I have received letters from farmers all over the country expressing their appreciation of my efforts to keep ACP as an integral part of the agriculture program. They have pointed out the vast good ACP is doing in conserving the soil of America. I will quote from a few of these letters at this time, and my colleagues are welcome to inspect the many others I have in my office.

Richard S. Winder, Route 2, Bethel, Ohio, wrote:

I wish to thank you for helping to prevent elimination of the most important practices in the ACP. The proposals of Assistant Secretary Peterson would have made the program worthless to dirt farmers.

William H. Reichling, LaPuente, Calif.:

As a citrus grower in Los Angeles County, I wish to congratulate you and express my appreciation of your efforts in behalf of the conservation-minded farmers of this county in preventing deletion from the 1958 ACP many of the practices so necessary to conservation in various areas of the country.

Marlon King, Princeton, Ky.:

Having lived in a farming area all my life, I have had opportunity to observe at first hand the tremendous value of ACP to the farmers of our Nation. I express my personal thanks for all you did to save this program.

Everett Gould, West Pawlet, Vt.:

As an eastern dairy farmer I wish to thank you for helping to save the 1958 ACP. Conservation is an investment from which everyone can benefit. It does not cost—it pays.

Martin B. Thorson, Iola, Wis.:

Farmers of Wisconsin will thank you for your work in saving the practices of ACP. Any effort to weaken it would seriously threaten their security.

Raymond A. Klopp, Route 2, Fremont, Wis.:

In my opinion, ACP has done much to preserve our irreplaceable topsoil, and in many other ways. It is gratifying to know that we have Congressmen like you who do care for the farmer.

M. E. Conley, chairman, ASC Committee of Montgomery County, Tex.:

This committee wishes to express appreciation for your help in sustaining provisions of the ACP. We feel the proposed changes would have been most detrimental to the farmers and ranchers of this and all other Texas counties.

John M. Deely, Lee, Mass.:

Thank goodness there are people like you in Congress who have the foresight and fortitude to protect the farmers. My hat is off to you.

William Reckelhoff, Route 3, Huntingburg, Ind.:

I feel that if it had not been for you and a few other good men, the ACP would have been a poor program for many a farmer. Of all farm programs, ACP stands out as the most important. We cannot afford to let the ACP be broken down.

Louis A. Burges, Jasper, Ind.:

In behalf of the farmers of Dubois County, I want to thank you for taking a stand in trying to keep our ACP effective. I have worked in the office of the Dubois County ASC committee for 18 years. The ACP has consistently helped our farmers. Considering the small cost, the results have been amazing.

Our Ambassadors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1957

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, before the Congress closes, I would like to bring to the attention of all who are interested one of the paramount requirements which our United States must meet if she is to protect her people and give leadership to the Free World.

It is of the greatest importance, Mr. Speaker, that we build a Foreign Service second to none, consecrated to the protection of our citizens wherever they may go and to all the implications of such protection.

To this end we must be certain that those who enter our Foreign Service as a career have every opportunity to be made aware of the far-reaching responsibilities they assume and be given the training and the knowledge and the pay that will keep them alert and eager to do their best.

We now have an increasingly good Foreign Service Institute which not only prepares new men and women, but gives refresher courses all along the way that prepare them for top posts. This institute deserves to have Members of Congress make themselves thoroughly aware of the courses available and the work done.

Considered as an outstanding, satisfying career as such, it is interesting to note that the career ambassador has been on the increase, as he should be. The records show that under the Roosevelt administration 51 percent of the American ambassadors were career officers. Under Secretary of State Herter recently testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that today 68 percent of our ambassadors serving abroad are career men. This reportedly is as high as the percentage has ever been since the establishment of the career service.

Of the 16 noncareer ambassadors nominated this year, only 3 were without previous Government experience. These 3 had broad executive experience in business; while of the other 13, 3 had previously served as ambassadors and 10 had held other high Government positions.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have really begun to build.

Republican Support of Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1957

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I noticed last night that one of the syndicated columnists, Doris Fleeson, said:

There are Republicans, too, who can take credit, but any veteran of the Congressional galleries will certify that there have consistently been more Democrats favoring civil-rights legislation through the years than Republicans by a fairly wide margin. The number in Congress who have a passionate conviction about the issue is another story entirely.

It has been brought to my attention that other columnists are using this same line to the effect that Democrats favor civil-rights legislation more than the Republicans.

In order to set the facts straight and to inform the public of the erroneousness of the statements of Miss Fleeson and others, the record proves that it is the Republican Party that actually supports civil rights.

In this year's civil-rights legislation in the Senate, all 18 votes cast against the

measure were Democrat votes. In the House of Representatives, 168 Republicans voted for the civil-rights bill and only 19 against. The Democrats voted 118 in favor and 107 against. In other words, the Democrats were practically evenly split down the middle on the civil-rights issue whereas the Republicans in the House were about 9 to 1 in favor of civil rights. A review of the previous civil-rights legislation several years ago proves the same story.

On July 23, 1956, last year's civil-rights legislation on H. R. 627 in the House of Representatives, there were 279 votes cast in favor and 126 votes against final passage on this measure. The Republicans voted 168 in favor and 24 against, whereas the Democrat vote was 111 in favor and 102 against this issue. Therefore, the great Republican support of civil rights is most readily discernable.

In spite of all of the ballyhoo of the Democrats and the liberal columnists who support Democrat causes, the truth is that it is the Republican Party that has consistently supported civil rights through the years. In the period from 1933 through 1952 when the Democrats controlled the Nation, of the 19 important Senate votes on civil rights, the Democrat majority voted against civil rights in every single case with the exception of two. On two of these 19 occasions, not a single Democrat voted favorably, and on two occasions, only one Democrat joined the Republican majority in sponsoring and being for civil rights.

In this same period from 1933 to 1952 in the House of Representatives, the Democrats failed in seven out of 14 votes to cast a majority in favor of civil-rights legislation.

The Republican record in the Senate during this same period shows that the majority of Republicans voted in favor of civil rights in every single case with the exception of one. In three of these votes, the Republicans were 100 percent in favor of civil rights. In 14 major votes in the House during this period, the Republicans supported civil rights on every single vote with the percentages varying from 68 to 100 percent.

The following table during this period from 1933 to 1952 should be noted:

Percent-favorable votes of each party's Members present and voting on civil-rights issues, 1933–52

ANTIDISCRIMINATION (INCLUDING FEPC)

Date of vote	Republican	Democrat
SENATE		
	Percent	*Percent*
Jan. 17, 1946	93	61
Feb. 9, 1946	76	44
Apr. 21, 1949	78	7
Do	83	7
May 3, 1949	48	0
May 31, 1949	90	47
May 19, 1950	85	42
June 21, 1950	87	39
July 12, 1950	85	45
HOUSE		
Feb. 21, 1946	94	51
Apr. 4, 1949	68	47
Feb. 22, 1950	68	48
Feb. 23, 1950	75	46
June 6, 1951	80	51

Percent-favorable votes of each party's Members present and voting on civil-rights issues, 1933–52—Continued

ANTIPOLL TAX

Date of vote	Republican	Democrat
SENATE		
	Percent	*Percent*
Aug. 25, 1942	100	47
Nov. 23, 1942	57	42
May 15, 1944	58	35
July 31, 1946	68	47
Jan. 18, 1950	53	0
HOUSE		
Oct. 13, 1942	97	61
May 25, 1943	91	49
June 12, 1945	87	57
July 21, 1947	100	47
Do	94	43
July 26, 1949	82	60
Do	83	62

ANTILYNCHING

Date of vote	Republican	Democrat
SENATE		
	Percent	*Percent*
July 26, 1937	83	39
July 31, 1937	100	34
Jan. 6, 1938	100	69
Feb. 21, 1938	71	18
Jan. 18, 1950	56	2
HOUSE		
Apr. 15, 1937	99	61
Jan. 10, 1940	95	47

Apparently, the Democrat Party and certain segments of the press use the "big lie" technique assuming that if you tell a lie often enough, the public will begin to believe it. The review of the facts should disprove the false claims of Democrat support of civil rights.

Achievements in Agriculture—Progress in Brucellosis Eradication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1957

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, officials of the Department of Agriculture say that they are within touching distance of eradicating brucellosis—one of our most costly diseases of cattle.

Excellent progress against this disease has been made since the end of World War II, and particularly since 1954, when the Congress provided additional funds for this current campaign. My own State of Wisconsin has been the leader in this important program.

Sometimes called Bang's disease or contagious abortion, brucellosis costs our farmers at least $50 million a year.

The progress of the eradication campaign can be measured in the rapid increase of counties that have been rated modified-certified brucellosis-free—in other words, containing less than 1 percent infected cattle and less than 5 percent infected herds. In September 1954, at the beginning of the accelerated campaign, 341 counties including 3 States—North Carolina, New Hampshire, and Maine—were modified-certified free. Now as of March 31, 657 counties, including 3 more States—Washington, Wisconsin, and Delaware—have this status. By June 30, the Department of Agriculture estimates that the total number of modified-free counties will have grown to nearly a thousand. Although in New York State only two counties are modified-certified brucellosis free, good progress is reported and many other counties are expected to gain this status in the near future. We in Wisconsin are proud of the fact that we were the first State to be certified under this program.

Much of the success of the campaign is due to the close working relationships that exist between the research and the regulatory people in the Department's Agricultural Research Service. Many years of scientific study and especially the development of an effective vaccine and of accurate, rapid methods of testing for the disease, form the foundation for this eradication effort. It is to the credit of Department organization that regulatory officials have been able to apply research findings with such practical and beneficial results.

The Wilderness Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1957

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 1957, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] received unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, an article from the Christian Science Monitor of July 22, 1957, entitled "Forest Service Opposes Sealed Wilds." At this time, I would like to point out for the benefit of my colleagues several misunderstandings of the purposes of the Wilderness bill and one outright misstatement of fact which are included in this article.

In the eighth paragraph, the author of the article, Mr. Roscoe Fleming, writes:

> Under the conservationists' bill as it is framed, the Wilderness Council it would set up could lessen, add to, create, or abolish any wilderness area, and the order would become effective unless either House of Congress vetoed it within 120 days.

This statement would seem to have no basis in fact. Quoting from Dr. Richard McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service, in his statement on S. 1176, the Wilderness bill, before the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, June 19, 1957, we find the following:

> The Wilderness Council would have no administrative responsibilities but would act as a repository for information, sponsor and coordinate surveys of wilderness needs, advise with governmental officials, report annually to Congress, and transmit to the Congress proposed changes in wilderness boundaries.

Quoting directly from section 3 (a) of the bill itself, we find:

The council shall have no administrative jurisdiction over any unit in the system nor over any agency that does have such jurisdiction.

I feel this is an obvious misunderstanding on the part of Mr. Fleming and hope it may be corrected in future coverage of this bill.

As far as "freezing" all present wilderness areas into law is concerned, as referred to by Mr. Fleming in paragraph two, this is an expressed viewpoint of the Department of Agriculture. It is, of course, the purpose of this bill to ensure the preservation as wilderness of the present areas so designated. As such this is the preservation of status quo. The bill, however, provides a procedure for making changes—additions, modifications, or eliminations. These changes would be made in the same way as at present. The only difference under this legislation is that before such changes become effective, Congress would have a 120 day period during which a majority vote of either house could reject the decision. The only situation when such a vote could be secured on such short notice would be a case of clear violation of sound policy. Thus, this safeguard against an unwise decision of a future Secretary of the Agriculture should not be interpreted as a freezing of the status quo.

Regarding Mr. Fleming's reference to the Wilderness Council as being composed of a "minority of Federal officials and a majority of conservationists," it should be pointed out that amendments have already been proposed to the wilderness bill which would add the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to the Council and reduce the number of citizen members from 6 to 3—thus giving the Council a composition of 5 Federal land administrators and 3 citizen members. So constituted, the Council could effectively carry on the functions for which it was designated, yet not threaten either to outvote or override the land administrators.

In an attempt to clarify the intent of the bill with respect to what the Forest Service has termed an interposition of another layer of authority between the Executive and the Congress, an amendment has been proposed which will provide that reports of proposed changes in wilderness areas shall be submitted directly to Congress by the Secretary of Agriculture. Copies only of such reports will go to the secretary of the Council, as a matter of information.

Regarding the Department of Agriculture's substitute bill, which would apply only to national forests, the Bureau of the Budget has advised: "Congress may not wish to deal with the problems of preservation of national wilderness assets except in a general and uniform statute applicable to all affected agencies." Therefore, our opportunity would seem to be one of integrating the suggested provisions of the substitute bill into the general statute. If this can be acceptably done, the objective we are aiming for will have been achieved—the preservation of a portion of America always wild.

I certainly hope this may clarify some of the misunderstanding of the wilderness bill set forth in Mr. Fleming's article. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Liquor Drinking on Planes a Threat to Air Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1957

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my statement before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in support of the basic principles of S. 4 and S. 593, which ban the consumption or the serving of alcoholic beverages aboard commercial and service airliners as a safety measure for commercial air safety.

The statement follows:

LIQUOR DRINKING ON PLANES A THREAT TO AIR SAFETY

(Statement of Congressman THOMAS J. LANE before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, supporting basic principles of S. 4. and S. 593 August 15, 1957)

Mr. Chairman, by serving or permitting the consumption of alcoholic beverages on aircraft while they are airborne, the commercial airlines and the Department of Defense are asking for trouble. By giving in to the demands of a few, they are jeopardizing the safety of all.

We have the testimony of passengers who have been annoyed and frightened by the offensive and irresponsible actions of those who insist on having their own way as a result of drinking liquor on a plane while it is in flight.

The people best qualified to give an objective opinion because theirs is the responsibility of coping with the problem, are opposed to the servicing and consumption of intoxicating beverages aboard aircraft.

The pilots, stewards, and stewardesses are not theorizing about this. They have had the harrowing experience of trying to control and even subdue passengers who are not in full possession of their faculties. The human discipline that is essential to safety in air travel is seriously weakened when any individual is encouraged or permitted to drink any kind of intoxicating beverages that make his actions unpredictable.

Due to military secrecy, we have no way of knowing how many accidents or fatal crashes can be traced to this cause. No matter how few they may be, we feel that the ban proposed in the legislation under discussion, should be applied to military as well as commercial aircraft, as a further precaution.

The present policy on many commercial airlines, of serving liquor to passengers, is difficult to understand in view of their otherwise excellent record in living up to the highest standards of mechanical and operational efficiency and safety. The serving of liquor adds an unnecessary and worrisome burden to the responsibilities of the crew. It hardly inspires confidence in the majority of the passengers when they observe that the airlines, in effect, offer this special service to those who want cocktails in the sky.

This easygoing policy could precipitate a major disaster. It is our duty to anticipate and prevent such dangers by proper legislation. This is not a question of a person's right to drink or not, as he may desire. Safety is the most important factor in air travel and it must be paramount over the minor wishes or inclinations of the few.

We had hoped that the airlines in particular, and of their own volition, would realize the chances they are taking, and would abandon this custom.

Two years ago, on August 21, 1955, I served notice that; "unless the airlines cooperate by discontinuing the practice at once" or the CAB takes action, I would introduce a bill making it a Federal offense to serve alcohol in the air.

That warning has been disregarded.

Since then, the pilots, stewards, and stewardesses, have had to put up with a number of distressing incidents that have accentuated the need for legislation to prevent the service or consumption of firewater on commercial aircraft, and military planes.

Even many people who take a drink themselves, acknowledge that a line must be drawn here, in the interest of public safety.

Where air travel is concerned, there is no such thing as being too careful. An unruly passenger in a plane is a far greater menace to the safety of others than he would be on a bus, a train, or a ship. Is sobriety too much of a sacrifice to ask of a person aboard a plane, as his contribution to the safety of all?

My correspondence indicates overwhelming support for legislation to outlaw the serving or consumption of alcoholic beverages aboard commercial passenger aircraft and military aircraft.

Public opinion insists on this reasonable regulation to protect the planes and their passengers.

Civil-Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1957

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to point out that Governor Williams and the AFL–CIO have sold the Negro down the river on the civil-rights issue.

The executive council of the AFL–CIO in reversing its stand, made a deliberate attempt to play for southern votes in the Democratic convention in 1960. Governor Williams has White House fever. He is willing to sacrifice whatever principles he may have once possessed in this regard in a desperate effort to become a candidate for President.

The Governor dragged the AFL–CIO right along with him in the sellout of one of our most basic constitutional guaranties—the right to vote.

Governor Williams has charged that President Eisenhower killed the civil-rights bill. This is ridiculous, and he knows it. It is a desperate effort to wiggle off the hook. The record will show that it was the Democrats—not the Republicans—who voted against an adequate civil-rights bill in the Senate. Only 9 out of 49 Democrats supported the President in this measure compared to 33 Republicans.

What happened to the rest of the Democrats? Apparently, they still want to

use the civil-rights issue for campaign purposes rather than to show concern for equal rights for all of our people.

Seventh District Tour Schedule, 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1957

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, to discuss the problems, interests, and wishes of the people of the Seventh Congressional District, I will meet people at the various post offices in accordance with the following schedules:

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 30

8:30: Trafalgar.
9:30: Nineveh.
10:30: Edinburg.
11:30: Franklin.
1:45: Needham.
2:30: Whiteland.
3:30: Greenwood.
4:30: Bargersville.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 31

9:30: Indian Springs.
10:30: Shoals.
11:30: Loogootee.
1:30: Alfordsville.
2:30: Burns City.
3:30: Crane.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 4

9:00: Oakland City.
10:15: Somerville.
11:00: Mackey.
12:00: Ft. Branch.
1:30: Owensville.
2:45: Haubstadt.
3:45: Buckskin.
5:00: Princeton.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 5

8:00: Francisco.
9:00: Patoka.
10:00: Hazleton.
10:30: Decker.
11:30: Vincinnes.
2:00: Monroe City.
3:00: Wheatland.
4:00: Bruceville.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 6

8:30: Emison.
9:30: Oaktown.
10:30: Freelandville.
11:30: Ragsdale.
12:15: Bicknell.
2:00: Edwardsport.
2:45: Westphalia.
3:30: Sandborn.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 8

9:00: Odon.
10:00: Elnora.
11:00: Plainville.
12:00: Washington.
2:00: Montgomery.
3:00: Cannelburg.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 12

9:00: Solsberry.
10:00: Owensburg.
11:00: Koleen.
12:00: Bloomfield.
1:30: Doans.
2:15: Scotland.
3:15: Newberry.
4:00: Switz City.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13

8:30: Worthington.
9:30: Jasonville.
10:30: Coalmont.
11:30: Midland.
12:30: Linton.
2:00: Marco.
3:00: Lyons.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14

9:00: Farmersburg.
10:00: Shelburn.
11:00: Hymera.
12:00: Sullivan.
2:00: Fairbanks.
3:00: Graysville.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 15

9:30: Merom.
10:00: New Lebanon.
11:00: Paxton.
12:00: Carlisle.
2:00: Pleasantville.
3:00: Dugger.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 18

8:30: Harmony.
9:00: Knightsville.
10:30: Carbon.
11:00: Brazil.
1:30: Staunton.
2:30: Cory.
3:30: Poland.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 19

9:30: Bowling Green.
10:30: Center Point.
11:30: Clay City.
1:30: Coal City.
2:30: Patricksburg.
3:30: Spencer.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 21

9:00: Freedom.
10:00: Gosport.
11:00: Quincy.
1:30: Eminence.
2:30: Hall.
3:30: Monrovia.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 22

8:30: Harrodsburg.
9:30: Smithville.
10:15: Clear Creek.
11:15: Stanford.
12:15: Bloomington.
2:30: Unionville.
3:30: Ellettsville.
4:30: Stinesville.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 25

9:00: Morgantown.
10:00: Centerton.
11:00: Brooklyn.
12:00: Mooresville.
2:30: Paragon.
3:30: Martinsville.

Ohio and Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1957

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, having long been an advocate of an enlightened world-trade policy and representing a district in the State of Ohio that is keenly aware of the importance of foreign trade, I was pleased to submit an article for the October 1957 issue of the GOP Trunklines publication.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the article, as follows:

SOME OF THE BENEFITS OF FOREIGN TRADE

On the very day I received an invitation to contribute a brief article to Trunkline on the role of Ohio in foreign trade, I was writing our Ambassador in Tunisia about the recent shipment of roadbuilding equipment which left Cleveland a few weeks ago destined for north Africa. You may have read in the local papers about these trucks and other machinery which were manufactured by the Euclid division of General Motors.

We Ohioans should be very proud of our expanding export industry. One sees the products of Ohio's mills and factories no matter where one travels.

How delighted I was during my trip to Africa in 1955 to see Euclid trucks, manufactured by this very company, at work in the Bomi Hills mine in Liberia. This mine, in turn ships 20,000 tons of the highest grade iron ore to Cleveland mills each month for turning into countless steel products.

In my own 22d Congressional District it is difficult to gather figures which indicate the great extent to which we are dependent upon export business. We produce paint, enamels, automobile and airplane parts, and many other items which go into making a complete machine. Moreover, there is concentrated in the State of Ohio, almost one-third of the entire machine-tool industry of the United States, the backbone of any peacetime industrial or wartime armament program. All of this points up the growing importance of reciprocal trade to hundreds of business and industrial firms in Ohio.

A good indication of our dependence upon foreign trade is shown in a recent Ohio industrial study by the United States Department of Commerce. It showed that about 30 percent of Ohio workers are in industries whose export sales on a national basis are more than 20 times as large as the corresponding United States imports; and another 40 percent of Ohio's workers hold jobs in industries which sell to foreign markets from 4 to 20 times as much as is imported to this country in comparable goods.

But the maximum effects on Ohio will be in years to come when the great St. Lawrence Seaway will be bringing new markets to our doors and new products to our people. The seaway may transform the whole Great Lakes area into another coastline and those of us who look toward the future see that our best interests lie in an enlightened world-trade policy.

As Republicans we can feel great pride in the accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration in the field of foreign trade. The administration has effected measures and programs that have resulted in the greatest expansion of peacetime world trade in history. United States commercial exports increased from $12.3 billion in 1953 to $17.3 billion in 1956, and imports rose from $10.9 billion to $12.6 billion during the same period.

The Secretary of Commerce reports that among the Department's activities which have contributed to this increase are the organization of the Bureau of Foreign Commerce in the Department, programs designed to stimulate tourism and United States investment overseas, and the initiation of American participation in international trade fairs abroad. In the past 3 years, the Department estimates that some 30 million people visited United States exhibits at fairs

in 27 countries, including one in Poland which attracted an estimated 1.25 million persons.

Not only does all of this help in maintaining our own prosperity, but it contributes much to carrying abroad to people everywhere the message of what is accomplished under our free way of life.

Freight-Rate Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1957

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that I will be joined by all my colleagues from areas served by the Southern Railway in applauding the position taken by Southern's able and distinguished president, Harry A. DeButts, in reference to the latest freight-rate increase granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Southern's policy in regard to this increase is not to apply it in any situation which, according to Mr. DeButts, "will price us out of the market and reduce our income."

I wish here to quote briefly from Mr. DeButts' statement.

All railroads—

He declared—

need more money, for the rate of return on investment has been discouragingly low in the railroad industry for years. But it is our opinion that higher freight rates simply mean a merry-go-round ride to nowhere for us in today's bitterly competitive transportation business.

Mr. DeButts has put his finger squarely on an important point. It is important to railroads and business in general. Higher and higher prices, whether for transportation, services, commodities, or goods, will lead to an economics of scarcity. Higher and higher freight rates—and they have mounted enormously since World War II—will not produce new business for the railroads. They will not, as Mr. DeButts fears, produce in the end a greater overall income for the railroads for the simple reason that shippers will be forced to use other means of transportation. To raise rates continually and consistently as has been done will result in driving business from the railroads, and placing an ever-increasing burden on the products of our farms, mines, and factories.

There is no doubt whatsoever that rising transportation costs have had a large share in advancing inflation. No increased costs are passed on to the ultimate consumer more quickly than transportation costs.

According to the classic ideas of the economists, competition tends to reduce costs. Yet, as Mr. DeButts points out, competition in the field of transportation is bitter in its intensity. It is a remarkable reversal of economic practices and traditions that the reaction of the railroads is always to seek higher rates in such situations. Everyone knows that railroads do not have command of their costs as may exist in other industries. But there is a question of simple prudence. Is it prudent to follow a course which inevitably, through increases in charges, will mean less and less business? Less and less business through the imposition of higher and higher charges has never been the American way. American industry has grown great and has become the envy of the world by following precisely the opposite theory.

I hope Mr. DeButts' voice is not one crying in the wilderness. I hope that his voice will be heard and his conclusions and judgment studied not only in the railroad business but in all industry.

We are treading on dangerous ground. Through inflation we may lose many of the gains we have made in the past. The security of millions of families is put in doubt. A continuation of the present trend will lead us all to an economic bust.

Achievements in Agriculture—The Broiler Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1957

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, the broiler business was a farm fringe operation. Today, it is a booming industry, supplying the market with more than a billion birds a year and representing a gross income to farmers of more than three-quarters of a billion dollars.

To a large degree, this near-revolution is the result of widespread and rapid application by farmers and the feed industry of poultry research findings from the United States Department of Agriculture, the State agricultural experiment stations, and industry.

Many scientific factors have contributed to the modern broiler farm. Scientists have bred hardy, fast-growing birds. They developed better feeds containing vitamins, minerals, and antibiotics; found ways of controlling many of the worst poultry diseases, and developed better buildings and equipment. They have improved marketing methods so that high-quality birds move rapidly from farm to consumer.

For example, today's broiler producer can turn out a 3-pound bird in 10 weeks with a little more than 8 pounds of feed. Twenty years ago it took him 12 weeks and more than 12 pounds of feed. In other words, scientists have trimmed off 2 weeks and nearly 4 pounds of feed.

Now, Federal and State poultry scientists are saying that broiler efficiency is sure to improve even more in the years immediately ahead. They are predicting that 3-pound broilers will be produced in less than 8 weeks and with less than 6 pounds of feed.

Creation of a Commission To Study the Utilization of Those Areas of the Radiofrequency Spectrum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1957

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on June 20 of this year I introduced House Joint Resolution 381 proposing the creation of a Commission To Study the Utilization of Those Areas of the Radiofrequency Spectrum which are assigned to the Federal Government. An identical proposal had been introduced previously by Senator POTTER.

The three Commission members would be experts in the communications field, but they would not be officers or employees of the Federal Government. The obvious purpose of this study would be to allow persons outside of the Federal Government, but competent in the field, to see how well the frequencies reserved for Government use are being utilized. It is not uncommon in matters of great public interest to establish a study group composed of private individuals; our Government has not been and should not become a closed-door operation.

The Commission, in addition, would make some assessments about the future requirements for Government use of radio frequencies. The rapid changes in armament have brought about startling innovations in the fields of communications and electronics. New uses for the airwaves have been found, and many of these uses are important to our Defense Establishment. We have heard of the ever-increasing crowding of the airlanes, but the increasing demands of airwaves are perhaps even more of a problem. It is not a matter to be considered lightly, and this resolution was put forth with very serious purposes.

The resolution was referred to the Commitee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which requested reports from several agencies of the executive branch. The Bureau of the Budget, in replying to this request for comment, reported adversely on the bill and endorsed the views set forth in a letter from the Office of Defense Mobilization to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on Senate Joint Resolution 106, Senator POTTER's resolution.

The Director of Defense Mobilization states that such an undertaking would require the work of many experts over an extended period of time, pointing out that a recent study of only a portion of the spectrum required the efforts of more than 50 experts for an estimated equivalent of 2½ man-years. He did not say that because this report was classified the public was merely informed that the Government could not release any of the spectrum space it is currently in possession of. Furthermore, the Commission would be expected to make use of the

results of any such investigations completed by Government agencies. The resolution states specifically that—

The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Federal Government any information (including information which has been classified for security purposes) it deems necessary or desirable to enable it to carry out its functions.

It would use such information as base for its further investigations.

The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, in the letter referred to above, states—

The classified report which resulted from the study pointed out that in addition to national security requirements, the programs for guided missiles, radar networks, earth satellites, and other defense necessities will continue to cause an ever-increasing demand for radio frequencies.

It is in this field that we are trying to provide some light.

I became interested in this inquiry partly because of recurring reports that the Military Establishment is going to request the use of frequencies in the area between 50 and 90 megacycles. Such use might infringe on the frequencies of five VHF television channels. Channel 2 is 54 to 60 megacycles; channel 3 is 60 to 66 megacycles; channel 4 is 66 to 72 megacycles; channel 5 is 76 to 82 megacycles; channel 6 is 82 to 88 megacycles. It is apparently the contention of at least some military engineers that defense requirements may bump television out of these frequencies.

This is a matter of great public concern. Should the hundreds of stations on these channels be forced to move, where would they go? If space were found for them in the UHF frequencies, it would greatly alter and impair their service, and cause further bumping and jostling of other stations. What about the millions of Americans who have television sets designed to receive these frequencies, and in some cases receive service only on these frequencies? Television is here to stay as much as the cold war; adequate service is a public demand which must be considered and met.

In addition to the VHF television frequencies, the public has a great interest in many of the uses of other radio frequencies, and the future problems and use of them are of significant and national interest. I do not suggest that the Government officials charged with responsibilities in this field are unaware or unmindful of this national interest. I do suggest that an independent study of the field is called for, whether it be by the Commission I have proposed or by some other means.

If the Congress passes this resolution, it would not of course be with any intention of hindering defense efforts or hampering nondefense communications use of radio frequencies. The members of the Commission, appointed by the President, could surely be expected to be men dedicated to our national interest. The purpose of the study would be merely to let someone from the outside peer in, for it is easy to become so engrossed in our own labors that we lose perspective and fail to comprehend the broader view.

The Federal Communications Commission is empowered to assign radio frequencies to non-Government users, and the President is empowered to assign frequencies to Federal Government users. There is no designated arbiter. Should the President decide that the national interest required him to appropriate other portions of the radio frequency spectrum for the use of the Government, public acceptance would surely be gained more quickly if a study of all available material by competent private persons had been made.

The need for some independent study is apparent to me, and if the Congress decides against the Commission proposed, then some other body or a special committee of the Congress itself should be given the responsibility for it.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1957

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, once again we are faced with the proposition of spending the American taxpayers' money on a program about which the average American is all too familiar. The continuation of our foreign-aid program, which has squandered billions upon billions of dollars with doubtful and haphazard results, is completely without sound justification.

The theme of the foreign-aid program is to fight communism, win friends, and establish world security through foreign aid. The foreign-aid portion of this theme, that is the reckless spending of billions of dollars, certainly stands true, but the remaining portions, that is fighting communism, winning of friends, and establishing security, falls completely short of even the most liberal interpretation. We have only to look at the countries of the world, who are receiving this aid, to see how far we have fallen short in purchasing their friendship and buying freedom from communism. One of the brightest features of the foreign-aid program is the ever-increasing awareness of the American public to the foolhardiness of the idea and the increasing resentment and opposition toward its continuation. I am convinced that by in large the American public understands fully the shortcomings of the program and the complete lack of progress in the attainment of its so-called objective.

The fantastic spending program, which we know as the foreign-aid program, had its beginning prior to World War II in the lend-lease program of 1940. The billion dollar year really began to pick up momentum with lend-lease. The money expended under that program was neither lend nor lease. There had long been extravagance in Federal spending, although it had been restricted to domestic fields. With lend-lease, our spending branched out into the foreign field and, before the program had run its course, the taxpayers were soaked to the tune of $48,674,000,000.

Lend-lease set the trend of American thinking toward extravagant foreign-aid spending, and we have been suffering from that malady ever since. With the expiration of lend-lease in 1946, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was left as the vehicle to funnel American dollars abroad. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was supposed to be a joint project, financed by allied powers, but Uncle Sam paid the tab to the tune of over $2½ billion. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration money was indiscriminately spent all over the world, including Communist-ruled countries, and did much to strengthen the communistic concept. Larger than the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was the real successor to the lend-lease program, namely, the Marshall plan.

This program as it is now known was established in 1948 to administer the gifts and loans that were appropriated to assist the countries of Western Europe in rehabilitating their economies. This was the mission of the European recovery or Marshall plan.

This goal was soon accomplished but then came the Korean war and the signals were changed. Emphasis then was placed upon military assistance and the economic cooperation was transformed into the Mutual Security Agency. Then came the Foreign Operations Administration and the International Cooperation Administration. Present International Cooperation Administration programs incorporate all aid, other than that given for direct military assistance, which comes under the Department of Defense. They included so-called defense support—economic aid to countries to which we are giving substantial military assistance—aid for economic development, and technical cooperation.

Although the programs have had different targets, they have one thing in common. They are based upon the belief that the continued giveaway of taxpayers' dollars can solve the Free World's problems. Indeed, in some quarters the belief is prevalent that, by giving away dollars, we can buy the friendship of foreign peoples. Too often we resort to this easy way out of difficulties which, in fact, can be solved only by a realistic, and clearly stated, consistent, and properly implemented foreign policy.

One cannot buy trustworthy friends with money, regardless of the price. To attempt to do so amounts to plain bribery, which is hardly the way to win friends. Even in those cases where aid may not be looked upon as bribery, it is looked upon as something for nothing, and what is obtained without effort is never valued as much as what has been acquired at some cost.

Certain interests are now working and trying to move heaven and earth to retain the foreign-aid programs for their own benefit. On both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, are using high pressure methods to keep Congress in line to forward foreign aid. We hear of meetings at high levels in

which the leaders of both parties are called in, but we do not hear of any mass meetings of the constituents whom we represent. If the voters of the United States could be sounded out, we would find, I am sure, that 2 out of every 3 are against foreign aid, especially the business interests upon whom taxes fall so hard. Ninety out of every one hundred letters I received mention the fact that we could do away with foreign aid as a means of relieving the tax burden.

Foreign aid started out as wartime cooperation, when we and our allies were fighting the common Nazi enemy. We pooled our resources, recognizing that cooperative effort in wartime is quite different from peacetime lending.

We even went a step further. After hostilities were over, we recognized that economic rehabilitation of the countries that were devastated by the war was part of the phenomenon of war itself. We had been fortunate in that our own fields and factories had not suffered damage, whereas much of Europe had been laid flat. So, we extended our hands to them in humanitarian assistance to help them rebuild their economies. Under the Marshall plan we gave them vast quantities of food, fuel, fertilizer, and industrial equipment for this purpose. The goal was accomplished and, by 1952, notwithstanding the Korean outbreak in 1950, Western Europe was well on the road to recovery.

But, termination of the Marshall plan did not extinguish the concept that the way to solve knotty foreign problems is to make large grants of money. Those advocating direct foreign assistance have become quick to substitute direct military assistance to take the place of economic rehabilitation. Paralleling this was the idea, first incorporated in the so-called point 4 program, that the United States should make substantial grants in order to assist the development of economically backward countries.

I am afraid that we have long since reached the point where the advocates of direct foreign aid are more anxious to give aid, as such, than they are to achieve the ostensible objectives of the aid programs. Vested interests have been created, in the form of a vast bureaucracy, both in Washington and abroad, that have a direct interest in the continuation of aid programs. It is something like a snowball rolling down hill. It picks up larger and larger amounts of snow until it becomes dangerous. The philosophy of foreign aid has been picking up more and more advocates until a powerful pressure-group has been created.

I am afraid that we are disposed to increase our foreign aid appropriation whenever the world situation becomes more tense. If we were to think through the problems first and define our objectives clearly with regard to each country, taking into account the personnel that we have available to accomplish our objectives, we would accomplish more than we do now, by first deciding to appropriate more funds and then, later on, wondering how to spend them advantageously. The real question, in each case should be, not how much but, what why, and how. All too often, I am afraid, we have placed the cart before the horse.

Take the case of Iran, which is one of the greatest examples of waste and extravagance in foreign aid spending.

For a long time the program there was headed by William E. Warne. The story is clear and known to many, since it has been the subject of investigation and publicity. The Administrator of the program went to Iran in 1951, to help build prosperity in that country of 20 million inhabitants. The Iranian economy was at a low ebb due to the expropriation of the British-controlled oil wells there. With the Administrator's arrival there began a furious spending program which has cost American taxpayers some $300 million to date, and which is the equivalent of income taxes paid by more than 700,000 average American families in a year.

One glaring example of wasteful spending was the construction of a beet-sugar refinery before sugar beets were being grown in Iran. To make matters worse, a second refinery was built and much of the machinery bought and stored. A novel twist was added when United States Treasury checks were distributed directly to Iranian ministers. Money was provided the Iranian Government to meet payrolls and, in fact, salaries were raised at about the same time. A staff of more than 400 assistants in 10 regional offices were built up and apparently these staffs lived in the lap of luxury.

One office, with 55 employees, including clerks and office boys, required 53 automobiles and 41 chauffeurs.

Vast sums were spent on farm equipment which could not be used, owing to the nature of the terrain. Millions upon millions of dollars in physical assets were scattered about without rhyme or reason and have since been entirely lost.

Teheran, the capital of Iran, badly needed electric power and sought $500,000 to be used in constructing steam generators. This was logical because Iranian oil could easily provide the necessary fuel. Because of his background the Administrator decided that a public-power-type hydroelectric dam would be more suitable. Accordingly, a terrific spending program was launched to support the construction of a dam on the Karadj River. The population of Teheran, something over 1 million plus, was thus to have an electric supply sufficient to handle a population of an American city of some 15,000. Over 40,000 applications were pending and about the same number of customers were being served. The available electric supply was totally inadequate to take care of the requirements. Beyond home use for electricity many industrial plants required electric power which, in turn, would improve the economy of the area.

Under the foreign-aid program Teheran received $2¼ million for the construction of a model cotton mill but, unfortunately, the mill had no power to turn its wheels.

In an effort to solve this pressing problem Iran had planned to build steam-driven oil-powered generators which could be constructed with the $500,000 sought from the foreign-aid program, combined with their own funds. The dam which the Administrator proposed had first come up for consideration in the 1920's and would span a narrow mountain stream which practically dried up in the summer and became a torrent during the spring flood season. The original idea was abandoned as impractical, and inadequate to supply the country's needs for electricity.

A French company began some work on the dam which was halted in 1951. The initial pledge toward construction of the dam was $1,400,000. One estimate toward the total cost amounted to $17,300,000 while another estimated the cost amounted to $28 million.

Work began immediately on the dam and continued until June 1955. Considerable controversy was raised about the merits of the dam and one estimate reached the figure of $90 million. It was finally agreed that the dam was too expensive and work on the dam has ceased. About all that exists is an uncompleted stretch of road through the mountains, a construction camp, complete with swimming pool, which cost $3,500,000, but no dam.

The Iranians got around the problem, however, because they decided that the money was not forthcoming from the foreign-aid program so they built the necessary steam generators themselves.

In the period immediately following World War II, few argued against the principle involved, which was to extend a helping hand to destitute and war-ravaged peoples, even though some of the methods for distributing the aid were questionable. The theme, in the beginning, was to combat communism by combating poverty. The logical approach to this objective was to strengthen those nations by building prosperous economies. If their economies eventually got on their feet and could do for themselves, that would be fine, but unfortunately that has not been the case.

Today our national debt is around $270 billion, a sum which is almost twice the combined debts of all the other principal nations of the world. Some $64 billion can be attributed to grants and loans to foreign governments in the postwar period. If to this are added the amounts granted during the war period 1940–45, in the form of lend-lease raised to cover $113 billion. Statistics, and other grants-in-aid, the total is inconclusive as they may be, show that about $3 billion of our taxpayers' dollars have been used by foreign governments to reduce their own national debts. This same $3 billion has been added to our national debt.

Some of the proponents of foreign aid giveaway programs like to point out that our economy is bolstered by foreign aid in that our own products and services are bought with the money. Since we give away the money that is used to purchase our products and services, is not this a rather absurd way to promote trade? Our Nation has grown and prospered through the self-interest of private enterprise and industry. Let us keep it that way. Now, let us take a look at a few of the recipient nations to see how the program has failed to work.

Consider France. Since 1947, we have given more than nine billion dollars in aid to France, which is second only to England as far as benefits under the foreign-aid program are concerned. Today everyone is aware of France's resentment of the United States and of France's response to a communism which can be noted most clearly in the results of her national elections. The average citizen of France is indifferent toward our giveaway program, because they feel that they do not personally receive any of the money. They feel that aid has been funneled through the hands of a favored few.

In Greece, the United States has spent over $1.3 billion, plus military assistance. Yet, the feeling there toward the United States is certainly not a friendly one. Fairly recently, Greek voters gave strong support to a Communist-backed ticket.

In Italy, even the strongest proponents of foreign aid are conceding the obvious fact that communism remains an important factor. Reports from southern Italy, where vast sums of our taxpayers' dollars have been squandered, indicate that if anything, more persons are becoming Communist than anti-Communist.

In Yugoslavia, where more than $700 million of our taxpayers' dollars have been spent, plus military aid, the Nation has its own brand of communism. By no stretch of the imagination can anyone concede that we have made progress in that nation.

In Egypt, over $45 million has been spent for economic and technical aid, yet few Egyptians appear to be aware of the fact. Developments there clearly show that the United States does not rank very high in the Egyptians' estimation.

There is continuing argument that American generosity is merely building a host of ingrates all around the globe. For example, India, which has received millions of dollars in American aid for its village improvement program, seems more friendly to the Soviet Union than to the United States. Krishna Menon, its delegate to the United Nations, and now to become its defense minister, is a glaring example. In votes and statements during the past 5 years, at least 23 times he supported the Communist Party line against the United States and the majority of the Free World; 4 times he abstained—including the vote on our request for an important investigation of Communist charges of bacteriological warfare in Korea; twice only he opposed the Soviet. Within the last few months he called the Soviet terror in Hungary "just a civil conflict" and refused either to condemn the Soviet or—presumably until instructed otherwise—to call for removal of military pressure.

Turkey continues to demand all sorts of industrial equipment and nonwar supplies. This would be fine for Turkey, which is burdened by a large Army, but why should our taxpayers be called upon to finance Turkey's whole modernization program?

Finally, let us take a look at Great Britain, to whom our taxpayers have contributed vast sums. It is no secret that the average Britisher looks with unfriendly eyes upon us. He seems to feel that we owe Britain the aid it has received and that Britain should not be required to make any effort to repay.

There is an expression to the effect that some people cannot see a tree because of the forest, and this certainly applies to the manner in which our foreign aid program is being handled. What more fertile place could the Communist forces seek to plant their seeds of discontent than in the politically and economically unstable Latin American Republics? These nations, our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere, have suffered historically from political strife and the hand of dictatorship. Would it not be wise, since we have foreign aid hanging over us, at least to try to make the most of its intentions and apply more than we have so far applied toward the improvement of our neighbors who are literally in our own front yard, in preference to helping those on the other side of the world?

The $673 million that we have made available to the Latin American Republics since the close of World War II is small in comparison with the $49,095,000,000 that we have given to other areas. To be precise, it accounts for only 1.4 percent of the total.

Yet, we and the Latin American Republics have common interests which make that part of the world especially important to us. Latin America tends to be politically unstable and provides enticing targets for dictatorship and communism. It certainly would be in our self-interest to enhance our prestige throughout the Western Hemisphere. If ever we should be called upon to enforce the Monroe Doctrine it would be essential that the ties which bind together all the Republics of the Western Hemisphere be as strong as possible. We have not done as much as we could to keep the good neighbor policy alive and vigorous.

There is danger that we overlook the composition of our existing foreign aid programs. Although, prior to 1951, the bulk of all aid was economic, the bulk of it today is military. Of the almost $5 billion included in the aid program submitted to Congress last year for fiscal 1957, approximately $3 billion was for direct military assistance. Another $1.1 billion was for defense support, or economic assistance to countries receiving substantial military assistance. Inasmuch as the purpose of defense support is military, it is logical to consider that portion of economic assistance as military also.

Thus, more than four-fifths of all aid recommended for fiscal 1957 was either directly, or indirectly, military.

Much as I believe in military preparedness, I cannot help but doubt whether this policy is wise, even though it might cost more if we were to provide for military defense exclusively with our own defense establishment. With the world as unstable as it is, there is the ever-present danger that some day we, ourselves, may have to face the very guns, and other military equipment that we are giving so liberally throughout the world.

I am not a military expert and I do not intend to pose as one. But, I am of the firm opinion that we need to reexamine our military assistance programs in the light of the new weapons that are being developed so rapidly. We need to rethink this matter through, particularly since the United Kingdom only recently decided to rely almost exclusively upon new weapons systems. I hope that the Military Affairs Committees, of this House and of the Senate, are giving this problem the careful and mature consideration that it deserves. Since it is more economical to support Korean and Nationalist Chinese troops than it is to support American troops in the field, it may be that we are jumping to the conclusion that we should rely too exclusively upon traditional military thinking.

I have never noticed that our military leaders are disposed to change their traditional manner of thinking between wars. Neither have I noticed any disposition on their part to think in terms of true economy.

The people of the United States have a right to expect that the dollars they are spending for military purposes are being spent just as efficiently as the dollars they are spending for other functions of government, including economic foreign aid. Let us stop military foreign aid, at least for the time being, at least until we know what kind of weapons will really be useful.

The question uppermost in the minds of our taxpayers today is why continue this burdensome program. I for one, am opposed to its continuation in anything like its present scale. There are ample funds appropriated, but as yet unspent, to carry the aid program on through an adjustment period. We would gain immeasurably from an economic standpoint, as well as from a moral standpoint if for the time being at least we stopped with the billions already appropriated but not yet spent. Each of us could then feel a measure of relief in reduced taxes. Each of us could see a better chance of a balanced budget and there would be more money for development and improvement within the United States. I cannot see where there would be dire and earth-shaking confusion if we should discontinue much of our foreign-aid program. Let us cease thinking in terms of buying friends.

Airways Must Be Made Safer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY G. HASKELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1957

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] yesterday inserted a speech in the RECORD which attempted to justify the serious cuts in our air-safety program recommended by the Appropriations Committee, of which he is a member, and approved by the Congress this year. The

gentleman's speech attacked remarks which I made on this subject on August 1, 2 weeks ago.

The speech made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] contains several factual errors and his conclusions that our air-safety program has not been hurt by Congressional reductions in radar and other essential control equipment requested by the Civil Aeronautics Administration are so out of line with the facts that it is necessary for me to comment further today.

One of the main points of the gentleman's speech is that I have charged that our airways are unsafe. I have never said that because it is a generalization that I am not competent to make.

I do say that our airways are not nearly safe enough; that we must make them safer at once or we run the risk of a series of air tragedies as our air traffic increases in both volume and speed; and that we are avoiding disastrous tragedies right now only through the skills of extremely competent, dedicated traffic-control personnel in the CAA, and experienced, quick-thinking pilots who are working under unbelievably difficult conditions.

These convictions of mine are based on the following facts, many of which have been unknown by the general public and by Congress until this year. I believe these facts show clearly the seriousness of the air safety problem we face.

First. It is a fact that almost 10,000 people were aboard just half of the aircraft involved in these 783 near-collisions reported by pilots between all types of aircraft in the 7 months from September 1956 through March 1957.

Second. It is a fact that there were three hair-raising near-collisions during July involving 163 persons aboard three commercial airliners. In each incident passengers were seriously injured by the violence of the evasive action taken to avoid a crash.

Third. It is a fact that every Government official in a responsible position recognizes the seriousness of this situation and believes that our air traffic problems must be solved with all possible speed.

Fourth. It is a fact that the Civil Aeronautics Administration has presented to Congress a well-designed Federal Airway Plan specifying the minimum equipment that they must have to handle the Nation's mushrooming air traffic. In each of the past 2 years there have been Congressional cuts in this program which can only be classified as serious and damaging to our air safety program.

Therefore, I feel that it is necessary to take up point by point the speech made by the gentleman from Ohio yesterday.

First, the gentleman from Ohio has made a mistake in how much money has been cut from the CAA's budget. He states that the CAA budget was cut by $45,229,475, when actually the budget was finally cut by $53,730,475, a difference of $8,501,000.

Actually his own committee voted to cut the budget by $82,224,340, and if action on the part of the House and the Senate as a whole had not taken place afterward, the budget would not have survived as it did.

Second, the gentleman from Ohio said the Appropriations Subcommittee believes "the assurance of maximum safety in flight must be the primary consideration of Congress under this program"—the CAA's program.

These commendable words have not been followed when the actual appropriations were decided. The Appropriations Committee this year cut the CAA's long-range radar program by 52 percent. These radar units, which number 11, were designed to help provide safety for planes flying between two airports, were denied by Congress. In the areas which would have been covered by these units, there were 105 near-collisions reported by pilots in a 7-month period.

The Congress refused to provide money for airport surveillance radar units at 8 cities out of 23 requested. It is interesting to note that all 23 units were denied in the 1957 appropriations, requested last year. This 35-percent reduction in air-safety equipment means that eight American cities—Detroit, Mich.; Greenville, S. C.; Harrisburg, Pa.; Mobile, Ala.; Providence, R. I.; Richmond, Va.; Roanoke, Va.; and Tulsa, Okla.—will have to wait another year to improve their air-traffic situation.

These deep cuts can hardly be used to support a claim that the Congress has provided for maximum air safety.

Third, the gentleman from Ohio inferred that because the CAA has "sizable balances of unobligated and unexpended" funds, that the CAA can't use any more money.

The gentleman knows full well as a member of the Appropriations Committee that these unobligated funds are earmarked for installation of radar and other air-safety equipment which cannot be used until previously ordered equipment is delivered. And to any businessman it would seem poor budgeting not to set aside funds, called in Government, unobligated funds to be able to install equipment to be delivered.

To repeat, the radar units which were purchased last year for delivery this year have to be installed before they can be used. That is what probably 90 percent of these unobligated funds are for.

Fourth, the gentleman from Ohio used a statement out of context from the 1957 budget hearings to indicate that the CAA could not use any more money.

Not only does this statement refer to last year's budget but it also completely ignores the fact that, when the late Mr. Lowen, Administrator of the CAA last year, said he had requested all the money he needed, the fact is Mr. Lowen, whose diligent efforts brought about the present Federal airways plan, was new in his job and he soon came back to the Congress for additional funds of $54 million in order to speed up this badly needed airways program. Incidentally, that request was cut by 35 percent.

Fifth, the gentleman from Ohio cannot shift the blame, in the minds of the public, from the Congress to the CAA for denying 11 long-range radar units at certain specific locations in the country.

Of course, the locations of this radar equipment are determined by the CAA, but the gentleman from Ohio knows that Congress and Congress alone denied these 11 radar units. If it had not been these 11 locations determined on a priority basis, previously identified in my speech of August 1, it would have been 11 other cities.

Sixth, the gentleman from Ohio said that increased appropriations will not permit the CAA to control additional airspace all over the country, and cites the Grand Canyon crash as an example of an incident that could not have been prevented.

The fact is that the CAA has been provided appropriations which will enable them to control all airspace in the country over 15,000 feet.

We, of course, will never prevent all near collisions and accidents. However, what I have been urging is more and better equipment right now so that we can materially reduce these near collisions.

Seventh, the gentleman from Ohio said he emphatically and categorically denies that budget cuts made by the Congress have hurt our air-safety program. I say emphatically and categorically that our air-safety program has been hurt by these reductions.

The Nation's air-safety program is and must be planned by the CAA, the experts in this field. When the long-range radar budget is cut 52 percent, the airport-radar program cut 35 percent, and the overall budget cut 12 percent, it means clearly that our air-safety program has been hurt, and hurt seriously.

Eighth, the gentleman said he has the utmost confidence in James Pyle, the Administrator of CAA. I share this view completely. I believe that Jimmy Pyle and his associates are doing everything they can to provide safer and more efficient air-traffic control. But they can only work with the tools Congress gives them.

Ninth, the gentleman from Ohio said that I did not express my views before his committee, and that I did not offer amendments to increase the appropriations for the CAA.

That is correct. When this budget was discussed and acted upon, I had been in Congress only a few months. I, and I am sure many other Members of this body, must lean heavily on the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee. As our study began to reveal additional facts in respect to the cuts administered by the Appropriations Committee we became increasingly alarmed at the possible damage to our air-safety program.

As soon as these were collated, I presented them to the Members of the House. Apparently, a number of other Members and the public at large were equally in the dark, judging from the many dozens of telephone calls requesting information which came to me after my speech of August 1.

Tenth, the gentleman from Ohio said, "charges are now made that our airways are unsafe." As I said before, this

charge was never made. The point was made that our airways need to be much safer than they are, and that is what I think must be accomplished.

The objectives of the gentleman from Ohio and mine are identical, and as a matter of fact the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to give the CAA a substantial budget increase. However, in my belief, they simply have not gone far enough to get the very necessary job done.

I have confidence in the future that the Appropriations Committee and the Congress as a whole working toward these same objectives will be successful in providing safe air travel for the people of this country. A great step toward these objectives has been taken by the signing into law yesterday of the new Airways Modernization Board.

On Polish Provinces East of the Oder-Neisse Line and Economic, Historical, Legal, and Political Aspects Involved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1957

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on the 16th of May of this year, Mr. REECE of Tennessee submitted to the House a lengthy statement concerning the situation in east-central Europe. He stated that he had given a great deal of attention and time to studying this situation in its economic, historical, legal, and political aspects. In his quest for truth, however, it seems that the learned gentleman from Tennessee has been led into error by false allegations, openly proclaimed or surreptitiously whispered by the stanch militants of German revisionist propaganda. As a result the picture presented was a distorted one, strongly biased in its general tendency, far removed from reality and dangerously misleading in its conclusions.

In view of the paramount importance of the present Polish-German frontier which awaits the final confirmation on the part of the Western Powers, it would seem appropriate to call your attention to a number of outstanding facts and figures. Factual evidence, corroborated by the lessons of history, may help us to grasp the true nature of this intricate problem and to set it in proper perspective.

GENERAL REVIEW

In his opening remarks the gentleman from Tennessee said that "12 years ago one of the greatest tragedies in history took place in central-eastern Europe." Here he should have reached back in his memory to the source of the tragedy which started 6 years earlier. On September 1, 1939, Nazi Germany invaded Poland in violation of fundamental principles of international law. In the Judgment of the International Military Tribunal for the Trial of the German Major War Criminals "the war initiated by Germany against Poland on the 1st of September 1939, was most plainly an aggressive war, which was due to develop in due course into a war which embraced almost the whole world, and resulted in the commission of countless crimes, both against the laws and customs of war, and against humanity."

The Polish nation, undeterred by the overwhelming superiority of the invading armies, accepted the open challenge and fought with courage and determination to defend its sacred right to independent existence. Poles proved true to their tradition as a freedom-loving people; they confirmed by their example the profound maxim of the great German jurist Rudolph von Jhering, quoted by Mr. REECE:

> The surest test of character is a man's or a people's reaction when facing the violation of right.

The 1939 autumn campaign in Poland was not yet finished, and the German armies had not yet been able to overcome the heroic defense of Warsaw, the capital of Poland, when, on September 28, a pact of friendship was concluded between Germany and Soviet Russia. While the shattered Polish divisions were still fighting fiercely, the two exclusively interested powers—as the German-Soviet declaration ran—divided between them the territory of Poland, as they had done 150 years before at the time of the partitions of Poland. After dividing the country the two powers, acting in collusion, set to work methodically to break the spirit of the Polish nation, to weaken its strength, and to destroy the foundations of its centuries-old culture.

Hundreds of thousands of Poles were exiled from the Soviet-occupied eastern provinces to Siberia and central Asia. At the same time the Germans proceeded with ruthless brutality to expel the Polish population from the western parts of Poland and to settle German colonists in their place.

The Germans carried out their devilish work of destruction with a cruelty unmitigated by any considerations of humanity. The process of mass extermination assumed the character of premeditated genocide. Over 6 million Poles and Jews perished as victims of German mass executions, gas chambers, and concentration camps. Over 2 million Poles were deported as slave labor for German industry and agriculture. Warsaw, the ancient capital of Poland, was obliterated in a wanton excess of German fury. Art treasures and historical monuments went down in flames to satisfy the German lust for revenge. For 5 long years terror ruled supreme in that part of Europe.

All these crimes belong to recorded history of our time, but history is easily forgotten. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] remembers reading in his schooldays "of wars in the ancient age of barbarism, when cities were sacked, people were slaughtered or driven into slavery." He does not seem to remember the untold horrors of the Nazi New Order in Europe. For him the tragedy of Central-Eastern Europe started at the end of the war which was launched by Hitler and fought to the bitter end by the German people.

DIVIDED GERMANY

Lack of proper perspective is bound to obscure political issues. The learned gentleman from Tennessee claims that "the problem of a divided Europe is almost entirely the problem of a divided Germany." This is a misleading oversimplification. The problem of a divided Europe goes much deeper and much further. Europe presents a delicate pattern, closely interwoven, varied and colorful; its organic unity was formed by centuries of common history. Beyond the present eastern frontiers of Germany there stretch wide areas, still underdeveloped but rich in natural resources and full of promise. These regions are inhabited by millions of people who have grown under the dominating influence of western civilization. Pressed against their will into the Soviet orbit, they are longing to be free and to be able to develop their resources in friendly cooperation with the Western Powers, and in particular with the United States. They belong to Europe and form an integral part of it. To ignore their fate is to ignore the true nature of the problem of Europe.

Divided Germany is undoubtedly one of the big problems of our day. But it is only part of a still bigger dilemma which is awaiting a bold and constructive solution. The whole future of Europe, and—maybe—the future of our Western World depends on it. The two problems: the reunification of Germany and the liberation of Central-Eastern Europe are closely interrelated. Such is the compelling logic of the situation, confirmed and amply demonstrated by recent developments. Were Germany reunited and Central-Eastern Europe left under Soviet domination, the European problem would remain unsolved. It is, therefore, neither politically wise nor morally just to separate the Germany problem from the whole problem of Eastern Europe, still less to give it a definite priority over the needs and sufferings of our true friends to whom we owe considerably more.

FROM TEHERAN TO POTSDAM

In his further remarks the gentleman from Tennessee attempted to sap the legal foundations of the present Polish-German frontier. He contended that "Poland's right to administer the area of Germany which it now occupies arises from a unilateral act of the Soviet Union, the conquering occupant, permitting it to occupy this area until a peace treaty eventually determines the status thereof." I beg to disagree with this statement which is not borne out by the evidence of historic facts.

It appears that the first agreement regarding the extension of the Polish territory to the west was reached during the Teheran Conference of the Big Three, November 1943.

The British Prime Minister, Mr. Winston Churchill, referred to this agreement in a memorable speech in the House of Commons on February 22, 1944. He revealed that he had agreed with Stalin upon the need for Poland to obtain compensation at the expense of

Germany both in the north and in the west. He added that there would be no question of the Atlantic Charter applying to Germany as a matter of right and barring territorial transferences or adjustments in enemy countries.

It is clear in the light of successive developments that at Teheran President Roosevelt, Mr. Churchill, and Marshal Stalin went beyond a general recognition of Poland's right to territorial accessions. On October 13, 1944, during a conference in the Kremlin, attended by Mr. Churchill, Mr. Eden, Marshal Stalin, Mr. Molotov, the then Polish Prime Minister Mr. Mikolajczyk, and the Ambassador of United States of America, Mr. Harriman as American observer, the British Foreign Secretary declared:

It had been said at Tehran that the new Poland's frontier in the west would go as far to the Oder as the Poles would wish it.

Mr. Churchill and Mr. Molotov firmly assented.

Three weeks later this declaration was formally confirmed by Sir Alexander Cadogan, at that time Permanent Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. In his letter of November 2, 1944, addressed to Mr. T. Romer, Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs, Sir Alexander wrote:

The Prime Minister, after consultation with the Cabinet, has now directed me to give you the following replies:

You asked in the first place whether, even in the event of the United States Government finding themselves unable to agree to the changes in the western frontier of Poland foreshadowed in the recent conversations in Moscow, His Majesty's Government would still advocate these changes at the peace settlement. The answer of His Majesty's Government to this question is in the affirmative.

Secondly, you inquired whether His Majesty's Government were definitely in favor of advancing the Polish frontier up to the line of the Oder to include the port of Stettin. The answer is that His Majesty's Government do consider that Poland should have the right to extend her territory to this extent.

President Roosevelt returned to the subject after his reelection in November 1944. In his letter, addressed to the Polish Prime Minister, Mr. Mikolajczyk, on November 17, the President wrote:

In regard to the future frontiers of Poland, if mutual agreement on this subject, including the proposed compensation for Poland from Germany, is reached between the Polish, Soviet, and British Governments, this Government would offer no objections.

On the transfer of population President Roosevelt told the Polish Prime Minister:

If the Polish Government and people desire, in connection with the new frontiers of the Polish state, to bring about the transfer to and from the territory of Poland of national minorities, the United States Government will raise no objections and as far as practicable will facilitate such transfer.

Mr. Churchill reiterated his former statements in his review of the general situation he made in the House of Commons on December 15, 1944. The British Prime Minister was very outspoken on the subject of the transfers of populations. He said:

The transference of several millions of people would have to be effected from the east to the west or north, as well as the expulsion of the Germans—because that is what is proposed: the total expulsion of the Germans from the area to be acquired by Poland in the west and the north. For expulsion is the method which, so far as we have been able to see, will be the most satisfactory.

At the issue of the Yalta Conference, February 1945, the chief representatives of the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union recognized, once again, in a joint declaration that "Poland must receive substantial accessions of territory in the north and west."

At the Conference at Potsdam, July 1945, the three heads of Government—President Truman, who succeeded Roosevelt; Mr. Attlee, who succeeded Churchill; and Marshal Stalin—agreed that—we quote the text of the official protocol:

Pending the final determination of Poland's western frontier, the former German territories east of the line running from the Baltic Sea immediately west of Swinemunde and thence along the Oder River to the confluence of the Western Neisse River and along the Western Neisse to the Czechoslovak frontier, including that portion of East Prussia not placed under the administration of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in accordance with the understanding reached at this conference and including the area of the former free city of Danzig, shall be under the administration of the Polish State and for such purpose should not be considered as part of the Soviet Zone of occupation in Germany.

The protocol of the Potsdam Conference contained two important provisions. The first said that "the final delimitation of the western frontier of Poland should await the peace settlement." The second dealt with the transfer of the German population. It said:

The conference reached the following agreement on the removal of Germans from Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary:

"The three Governments having considered the question in all its aspects, recognize that the transfer to Germany of German populations or elements thereof, remaining in Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary will have to be undertaken. They agree that any transfers that take place should be effected in an orderly and human manner."

There is nothing in the protocol to substantiate the opinion, advanced by Mr. REECE as to the unilateral character of the Potsdam decisions. The text of the protocol, clear and precise, does not lend support to the allegation that the Oder-Neisse line was only meant as a temporary arrangement. Were it so, the Great Powers would not have recognized that "the transfer to Germany of German populations will have to be undertaken." Military authorities may—in some exceptional cases—remove the inhabitants of a strip of territory, engulfed in military operations. But no responsible head of Government would dream of removing the whole German population from a province, which it was intended to maintain within the limits of Germany.

FOOD BASKET OF GERMANY

The gentleman from Tennessee claims that "the part east of the Oder-Neisse line was known as a food basket of the German people." This clever definition which has found wide currency in the West does not correspond to the hard economic facts. It is true that the territories in question covered nearly 25 percent or one-fourth of "the effective agricultural land of Germany"—as Mr. REECE puts it. But the surpluses in basic agricultural produce, which they exported to the western Provinces of Germany, were relatively small:

A study of interregional trade in prewar Germany reveals Western Germany as more self-sufficient than is popularly supposed and the "separated areas" as rather more dependent upon Western Germany than Western Germany upon them." (Germany's Eastern Neighbours by Elisabeth Wiskemann. Issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, London 1956, p. 171.)

In the period between the two wars, the "German East" was in a state of permanent economic crisis. Successive German governments mobilized huge sums of money in order to forestall the steady decline of agriculture and to arrest the flight of the population to the West. Large subsidies, lavishly distributed among east-German landowners poured from Berlin in a steady flow. During the period of 15 years, 1922–37, they reached RM2,600,000,000—over $1 billion prewar value.

German economists of the prewar period investigated the whole situation with German thoroughness. One of the most prominent among them, Prof. Wilhelm Volz of the University of Leipzig, whose opinions the gentleman from Tennessee now tries to disparage, got to the roots of the trouble. As a German patriot, Professor Volz was deeply alarmed by the decline of the eastern Provinces of the Reich. As a man of great scientific integrity, he did not shirk from presenting his conclusions, however unpopular these might have seemed at the time.

If one still hears that the German East is the food base (Nahrungsgrundlage) of the German Reich—said Professor Volz—then the contention is a fallacy (Trugschluss). The East might be this, if the rest of the Reich did not satisfy its food demand partly by its own production, partly by overseas imports. The Reich does not need the East. This is a bitter truth, but unfortunately it is a truth. It should at last be said in plain words. (Wilhelm Volz, Die Ostdeutsche Wirtschaft. Eine Witschaftspolitische Untersuchung uber die natürlichen Grundlagen des Deutschen Ostens und seine Stellung in der gesamtdeutschen Wirtschaft. Berlin-Leipzig, 1930, p. 85.).

It is true that in the last years before the Second World War Germany made great efforts in order to achieve the highest possible measure of self-sufficiency. German agriculture was stimulated and forcefully developed by diverse means in order to be able to meet the pressing requirements of war economy. Economic self-sufficiency was inscribed on the Nazi banner. On the eve of the war Germany's self-sufficiency in food, computed on the basis of its caloric value, rose to 83 percent—as against 65 percent in 1928. After having secured such a high measure of independence Germany could now risk the supreme effort: the well filled food basket increased her chance of winning a war of aggression.

This self-supporting economy, tuned to the pressing needs of a powerful war machine, belongs now to the past. In 1945 Western Germany, so happy to live in a free world, set to work with sustained energy which earned her deserved admiration. German economy, rising from the ruins and quickly recovering its strength, seems to have found a new balance of productive forces.

In August 1946 the prominent English economist and social reformer, Lord Beveridge, expressed the view that 70 million Germans could perfectly well live in the territory west of the Oder-Neisse line if the country were more intensely industrialized and if it expanded its foreign trade in order to be able to buy its requirements in foodstuffs.

The economic development of Western Germany has vindicated this opinion. German economy expanded under the powerful stimulus of American aid and of the mass influx of Germans transferred from the east. American dollars, so generously given, and the skilled labor of the industrious newcomers from the east contributed mightily to the process which was so justly called the miracle of German recovery.

Western Germany has to import from abroad a part of her food supplies. She has no difficulty, however, in paying for these imports by exporting her manufactured goods. At the present degree of self-sufficiency in food, estimated at 60 percent, Federal Germany is more secure than is Great Britain, whose own production covers only about 48 percent of its food supply.

The food situation will still improve after the reunification of Germany, which is bound to shift the balance of the German population in relation to its agricultural basis. It is worth recalling that only some 28 percent of the total German population live in the Soviet zone which contains nearly 40 percent of Germany's arable land.

WHAT IS GENOCIDE?

The gentleman from Tennessee has given much attention to the mass transfer of the German population from the eastern territories. He maintains that 10½ million were summarily expelled and, in 1945 and 1946, were forced to leave the land which had been theirs and their ancestors. Of these 10½ million human beings more than 7 million reached west and middle Germany; about 1 million people were able to remain on the soil of their fathers. Mr. REECE forgot to mention that the majority of the last category are people of Polish origin. But, to quote again Mr. REECE:

> Two and two-tenths million human beings is the heavy toll of those who did not survive the process.

The gentleman from Tennessee concluded by saying that—

> Factual evidence that has since been submitted shows that they (viz, the 2.2 million human beings) and the other 7 million were victims of the crime of genocide.

If one wishes to pass a judgment on a crime he must first define the nature of the crime and then indict the guilty criminal. If he fails to do this, his judgment may turn out to be an act of wild injustice.

What is genocide? The matter was debated by the General Assembly of the United Nations which on December 9, 1948, unanimously adopted a convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide. The text of the convention contains a number of clear definitions. It would seem proper to quote here from the official publication of the United Nations.

> Genocide is a new name for an old crime—

We read in the background paper.

> It derives from the Latin words: "genus," a group, and "caedere," to kill. It means the destruction of whole groups of people just because they belong to particular groups. The group may be racial, national, or religious; it may be a particular ethnical or racial group. Its destruction may take the form of massacres, of executions, of subjecting the group to such conditions * * * that it cannot continue to live.
>
> These were all techniques used by the Nazi Government of Germany as part of its deliberate policy. They were used particularly against a racial and religious group—the Jews—and against a national and linguistic group—the Poles." (United Nations, Department of Public Information, Research Section Genocide, Background Paper No. 68.12, November 1951.)

In the light of these definitions it would seem just and fair to examine the whole process of the mass evacuation of the Germans.

On the eve of the final collapse of Nazi Germany the population of the eastern territories, swollen by large numbers of new German settlers—Umsiedler—and Luftkriegevakuirten who had taken refuge from the British and American air bombardments, amounted to nearly 10 million. This huge mass of human beings, kept in complete ignorance of the desperate situation, was taken by surprise. The German military authorities, obeying strict orders from Hitler who refused to accept defeat, entirely neglected an orderly evacuation of civilians. In face of the imminent Soviet advance, millions of people, driven by despair and stricken with fear of a savage Russian retribution, rushed westward and got entangled with the retreating German troops. There followed wild scenes which stagger imagination. The advancing Soviet troops machine-gunned the unending convoys of refugees.

> One ship alone, the *Wilhelm Gustloff*—

I quote the gentleman from Tennessee—

> took more than 6,000 refugees, mostly elderly people, women and children, from East Prussia to their grave.

Mr. REECE was justly indignant about that disaster which he compared to the sinking of the *Titanic*—though he should have been more explicit with regard to the Russians who actually sank the *Wilhelm Gustloff*.

Thousands of innocent people found an untimely death amid the chaos of a disorderly evacuation. Hundreds of thousands were deported to Russia. The fate of many remains unknown. But their disappearance has no connection whatsoever with the removal of the German population, authorized by the Potsdam agreement. It would be utterly unjust to hold the Polish people responsible for the heavy German losses, sustained in the course of military operations or caused by savage Soviet retribution.

TRANSFER OF THE POPULATION

When Germany capitulated on May 7, 1945, about 4.4 million Germans remained east of the Oder-Neisse line. The mass exodus of the German population continued and at the date of the Polish Census—February 14, 1946—there were 2,288,000 Germans within the present limits of Poland. By the end of 1947 a further 2,171,000 had been transferred to Germany.

The mass transfer of the German population was carried out in most difficult conditions. The country, utterly disorganized, devastated by the retreating Germans and then stripped bare by the advancing Russians, had to face tremendous difficulties. Food, fuel and medicaments were in short supply; rolling stock—utterly deficient. In the first stage the technical difficulties involved in the mass transfer might have overwhelmed the erratic administration set up by the new Communist regime which had been enforced upon Poland. In some cases there might have occurred individual acts of cruelty or harsh treatment, regrettable but comprehensible amid the fresh ruins and smouldering ashes of the Nazi gas chambers. All these incidents and transient difficulties may have cost some lives: they do not justify, in the least, wild accusations leveled against the Polish people.

ECONOMIC FACTS

Poland, extending to the west in accordance with the Potsdam Three Powers decisions, entered a desert. In 1945 the territories to the east of the Oder-Neisse line presented a picture of ruin and desolation. Once prosperous towns suffered heavily during the last months of war, many towns, which had served as German strong-points, were practically obliterated. In Gogów—Glogau—and Kostrzyn—Küstrin—95 percent of all buildings were destroyed or damaged; in Koobrzeg—Kolberg—Gubin and Nysa the degree of destruction reached 80 percent; in Brzeg—Brieg—70 percent; in Elblag and Legnica 60 percent; in Wrocaw—Breslau—and Szczecin—Stettin—over 50 percent. It was generally the center of the town, with its historic churches and buildings that suffered most. On the nights of August 16–17 and August 20–21, 1944, Szczecin was the target of two heavy air raids by RAF Lancaster bombers. On March 12, 1945, Swinouiscie—Swinemünde—was bombed by USAF Flying Fortresses. In addition all the towns in these areas suffered badly from ruthless Soviet dismantling of industrial plants, from pillage by Soviet soldiers and sometimes from a senseless destruction by hand grenades and fire after all fighting had ceased. The old town of Gdansk—Danzig—was thus transformed into a heap of charred ruins.

The situation of the agriculture was no better. In the countryside, out of the total number of 434,000 houses, barns, stables, and other buildings, 123,000—28 percent—were destroyed or heavily dam-

aged. At the end of 1945 the total number of horses in these areas shrank to 10 percent of the prewar figures; the number of cattle fell to 7 percent and the pig population to 4 percent. As the chemical industry was destroyed by war or dismantled by the Soviet authorities, there was a general lack of nitrogenous and phosphatic fertilizers. The loss of Polish Kalusz potash salts, annexed by Soviet Russia, seriously hampered a rapid restoration of agricultural production.

Capital was deficient, agricultural machines and tractors in short supply. After 6 long years of a devastating war Poles had to rebuild the appalling ruins out of their meagre resources. On specific orders from Moscow the Warsaw Communist Government was forced to refuse the benefits of American aid, which had been generously offered to Europe within the framework of the Marshall plan.

Skilled labor and managerial experience were lacking. During the whole period of their most ruthless occupation the Germans were busy exterminating the best among the Poles of all classes of the population. In the Katyn Forest and in other, still unknown localities of Russia, the henchmen of Stalin murdered another 10,000 or so.

To complete the picture we should add the impact of a wrong policy, stubbornly followed by the Communist regime. The new settlers, coming from other Provinces of Poland, had to work in most precarious conditions. Many Polish farmers were forced, against their will, to join the collective farms. Early in 1955 the Polish Communist press published a number of articles which condemned harsh treatment of peasants and complained of the exorbitant taxation to which they were subjected. Trybuna Ludu, a Warsaw newspaper, on February 26, 1955, carried an article which attributed peasant desertion of the land in the county of Niedzica in the county of Olsztyn precisely to these things.

And, in spite of all these difficulties which might have seemed unsuperable, Poles rushed in large masses to the western Provinces. They filled the empty desert, cultivated wasteland, rebuilt destroyed buildings, and repopulated deserted towns.

On January 1, 1957, the recovered territories had a population of 7.3 million. The dynamic race which settled in these areas expanded rapidly: Its natural increase which reached the level of 27.5 per thousand stands far above the high average in Poland—19.1 per thousand in 1952–56. Towns are throbbing with life. Out of a total of 63 towns with 10,000 inhabitants or over, 28 towns had a population higher than in 1939.

In spite of heavy errors of Communist policy, the hard work of the newly settled Poles is beginning to pay handsome dividends. Agriculture is recovering from the acute crisis of the most difficult afterwar period. In the years 1953–55 production of the 4 principal grains in the western Provinces reached 71 percent of the prewar level—3,500,000 metric tons against 4,861,000 in 1934–38; production of sugar beet attained 68 percent of the prewar figure—2,300,000 metric tons against 3,422,000 in 1934–38.

However, the greatest efforts went into the reconstruction and further development of industry. Coal is the basic raw material on which the growing industrialization of Poland is being built up. In Polish Silesia in 1938 coal production amounted to 38.1 million tons, in the prewar German part of Silesia it reached 32.5 million tons, making an aggregate of 70.6 million tons. In 1955 the figure for the now united Silesian coalfield was 94.5 million tons—a rise of 34 percent.

THE COAL PROBLEM

In his further remarks the gentleman from Tennessee recalled the fact that before the war "the hard-coal production of the industrial part of the region, that is, Silesia, went to meet the requirements which Western European countries had in addition to their own production." He assumed that "today the coal from German Upper Silesia would suffice to offset West Europe's present deficiency of hard coal."

I entirely agree on that important point with the learned gentleman. The rich coal basin of Polish Silesia forms an integral part of the European economy. In conditions of political freedom it could make a most valuable contribution to European recovery. But Mr. REECE seems to have forgotten that after the war Poland lost her freedom of choice. Pressed against her will into the Soviet orbit, she had to export very large quantities of coal to meet the exacting demands of her Soviet overlords.

On August 16, 1945, an agreement was signed in Moscow by Mr. V. M. Molotov, then the Soviet People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, and E. Osóbka-Morawski, the so-called Polish Premier. This agreement forced Poland to deliver to the Soviet Union, at the ridiculous price of $1.25 per ton, 8 million metric tons of coal in 1946, 13 million tons in each of the years 1947–50, and 12 million metric tons per annum thereafter until the signature of a German peace treaty. True, in March 1947 the quantities of the coal tribute were reduced by 50 percent; but even so, the "liberator" still extorted from the "liberated" an exorbitantly low price. From 1946 to November 1953, when this tribute ceased, Poland delivered to the Soviet Union about 54 million tons of coal for which it received the ridiculous sum of $67.5 million. If we assume that the average world market price of coal was $16 per ton, we shall have no difficulty in calculating that in this typically colonial transaction Poland was robbed of nearly $800 million.

In the light of my foregoing remarks it is hardly surprising that a delegation from Warsaw wished "to get from this Government a fat loan with which to purchase grains, fats, oils, farm machinery and other equipment." I quote here again the gentleman from Tennessee. I feel I must say that on this matter of vital importance all Poles were unanimous. They all agreed that a broad-minded American aid was urgently needed in order to redress the balance of the Polish national economy which had been badly shaken by 12 years of Communist misrule.

True, the Communists are still at the helm in Warsaw. But millions of Poles, living under Communist control, are trying hard to take full advantage of the new opportunities which they have gained in slightly relaxed conditions. The irresistible pressure of the peasant masses swept away the abhorred collective farms. Life is returning to the countryside. Agricultural production, relieved of the exacting burden of compulsory deliveries of grain, is beginning a process of organic regeneration.

I am glad to add that millions of Poles in their hardly tried country greeted with satisfaction the first installment of the American loan to Poland. They saw in it a most welcome proof that their cause is not forgotten in the West and that their efforts to achieve genuine independence are duly appreciated.

HISTORICAL SURVEY

The historical arguments which the Congressman from Tennessee developed at such length betray false sources of information based on clear political bias. For what is the impression left by his account of the thousand years of German-Polish relations? It is that the Poles and not the Germans were the imperialists through the ages, that it was the Poles who subjugated German lands and not the other way around, that history tells of a Polish expansion to the west in search of living space and not of the German Drang nach Osten—which formula Mr. REECE describes as an "absurdity," "hazy," and "malicious."

To a doctrine which would stand historical truth on its head history itself provides the answer.

Hitler's Germany which began the conquest of Eastern Europe in 1939, occupying first "ancient German" Cracow and then "ancient German" Lwow, was in fact faithfully carrying out an imperialist design whose foundation had been laid 1,000 years earlier by Emperor Henry I. In the years 927 and 928 it was this German ruler who, forcing the Elbe which divided the Slav tribes from the west, established two German marches with the object of subjugating by force and intrigue the territories of the western Slavs who were then entering the European scene. With a break under Otto III, this task has been taken up by Holy Roman Emperors, Margraves of Brandenburg, Teutonic knights, electors and kings of Prussia and rulers of the German Reich.

Two unchanging features of German policy throughout a millenium—territorial acquisitiveness and ready recourse to force—are absent from Polish political history. Polish policy was always defensive. If any idea is strange to Poles it is imperialism. This does not of course mean that other nations were not associated with Poland in the Polish Commonwealth. But this came about through voluntary federal relationships, which are historically of the greatest interest. It was a specifically Polish method, thank to which unions of nations emerged which, according to the German historian Jacob Caro, cannot be matched in European

history. It was the way of charity which, in the words of the rector of Cracow University, Paul Wodkowic, to the Council of Constance—1414—acknowledges the right even of pagans to freedom and land. We read in the Polish-Lithuanian Act of Union of 1413 that this charity which "creates laws, governs countries and establishes towns, will lead the estates of the Republic toward a better end, and he who despises it will lose all." Poland concluded a number of these voluntary relationships based on moral principles of respect for the freedom of the nation and of the individual. In 1466 there was a union between Prussia and Poland, and in 1561 another voluntary union with Courland, while in 1569 the original dynastic union with Lithuania was crowned by a solemn covenant.

These differences in the political background of Germans and Poles, as evidenced by the history of a thousand years, are highly relevant to any consideration of German-Polish relations. Mr. REECE forgets these differences when he discusses the present Polish-German frontier with the result that his historical arguments lack not only substance but plausibility.

These arguments deal with the alleged ancient German character of Pomerania and Silesia, the successes of the Teutonic knights and the role of Prussia in the 18th century partitions of Poland. Let us consider each in turn.

POMERANIA

Mr. REECE does not deny that Slav peoples lived in Pomerania in the 10th century. And in 962 Pomerania is in fact found in the hands of the first historic Polish ruler, Mieszko I. A document of the greatest significance for the proper understanding of Polish history in the 10th century, is the so-called Dagome judex, dating from 990 to 992. It contains the donation of Poland to the Papacy, with detailed descriptions of the country's boundaries, from which it appears that the whole of Pomerania, between the lower Oder and the lower Vistula, belonged at that time to the Polish State. The description in the document begins as follows:

> A primo latere longum mare fine Bruzze usque in locum qui dicitur Russe.

That is, "from the first side along the seacoast of Prussia to the place which is called Ruthenia," and ends with the statement that from Olomuniec the border runs to the land of Militz, that is, between the Oder and the lands of the Milchanians and the Lusatians—which is the present line of the western border of Silesia—and along the line of the Oder to "Schinesghe," identified by both German and Polish scholars with Szczecin—Stettin.

Mr. REECE, however, believes that the Pomeranians fought the Poles who "wanted to subjugate them," but that "all this ended in 1181 at the time of the German Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, when the dukes of Pomerania became princes of the empire." What did happen in 1181? It was indeed the year of the final defeat of the northwestern Slavs, of western Pomerania, by the Germans under Saxon Duke Henry the Lion and Margrave Albrecht. Albrecht established on Slav territory, between the lower Elbe and the lower Oder, the new German duchy called Brandenburg from the Slav town of Branibor which its ruler Przybyslaw was tricked into surrendering.

While Mr. REECE describes as "aggression" the process of integration which went on between Slav and Christian Poland and Slav but pagan Pomerania in the century and a half between 967 and 1130, the forcible German conquest of Slav lands from the Pomeranians is not to be so described. Yet their motives were none other than those which Archbishop Adelgot of Magdeburg was already urging in 1107:

> These pagans (that is, the Pomeranians) are the worst people in the world, but their land is the best, so overflowing with meat, honey, flour, birds that none can be compared with it. Therefore go east, o Saxons, there you can save your souls and win the best land to live in.

Then, as the historian says, the Slavs beyond the Elbe laid down in their graves, and were replaced by German villagers, whose settlers' documents included a routine phrase "ejectis Slavis"—"after the Slavs had been thrown out."

The Congressman from Tennessee would like to give the impression that Pomeranians and Poles, although Slavs, were distinct nations. But apart from the fact that it is impossible to use the term nation in the modern sense in discussing the 10th century, the words of the 12th century chronicler Nestor may also be borne in mind:

> Of the Lachs (i. e., the Poles) some called themselves Lusatians, others Mazovians, others Pomeranians.

This chronicle, an authoritative source on all counts, thus plainly asserts that the Pomeranians were one of the Polish tribes.

It should also be understood that until the 13th century, internal conditions in Pomerania differed in no way from those in other Polish territories. The ducal court, the entire town and country population and the clergy in large proportion were Polish. Afterward, when the dukes in particular succumbed to Germanization, the picture began to change. German elements were reinforced when the victory of the Reformation brought the German Bible to Pomerania. But the native dynasty of Pomeranian dukes, descended from a branch of the Piasts, preserved until its extinction with the death of the last duke, Boguslaw XIV, in the middle of the 17th century, a strong sense of difference from Germans. They perpetuated male family names like Warcislaw, Boguslaw, Barnim, Racibor, and female names like Miroslawa, Dobroslawa, Przybyslawa, and always called themselves dukes of the Slavs, Pomeranians, or Cassubians (dux Slavorum, Pomeranum, Cassubie).

SILESIA

Mr. REECE is of the opinion that Silesia, in particular the region east of the Oder and Neisse—so-called Lower Silesia—was never the homeland of Poles or of any other Slavs but is ancient German land. The name Silesia, on this theory, is derived from the German Syling tribe.

The German chronicler Thietmar, writing in the 10th century, remarked of an area now in Silesia that Sleza Hill—Zobtenberg in German—on the Sleza River—Lohe in German—was the center of a secret Slav pagan cult. After a contemptuous reference to this cult, he added:

> There are as many temples and gods there as there are lands.

Let us pass at once to the 19th century and quote two views expressed by Bismarck on Silesia. When Wilhelm I expressed doubt about his right to take Schlesvig and Holstein from Denmark, Bismarck reassured him with the words:

> Did the Great Elector or Frederick have more right to Prussia and Silesia? All the Hohenzollerns have been aggrandizers of the state.

And to Prince Buelow, who had expressed similar scruples, he said:

> Frederick the Great stole Silesia and nevertheless he is one of the greatest statesmen of all time (v. Buelow Bernhard, Denkwürdigkeiten, vol. 4, p. 10).

Thietmar and Bismarck supply the answer to Mr. REECE. Let us add the evidence provided by excavations near the castle church in Wroclaw begun in 1946 by Prof. Rudolf Jamek, of Wroclaw University. Initial investigations showed the existence of ancient settlements which were Polish beyond doubt. No trace of Scandinavian influence was found, which disposes of yet another German theory that Wroclaw fortress was organized by Vikings.

Mr. REECE emphasized the service performed by German settlers in founding towns in Silesia. But the most recent researches into the history of Polish law make plain that not all founders of towns were German and that such foundations were usually made at places where local markets and craftworkers' settlements had already grown up round a castle or fortress. These investigations have shown that for example 81 out of 95 market centers which existed before the Germans arrived later became towns under German law.

The fact that the Polish King Casimir the Great recognized the Czechs' right to the Silesian duchies in 1335 was not the final historic decision in favor of Germany that Mr. REECE implies, but a politically imposed renunciation. He does not mention that the Polish King simultaneously arranged for ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Wroclaw to be exercised from Gniezno, an arrangement which lasted until 1821.

Finally, Mr. REECE passes over in silence the most important fact of all, which is that the Silesian population, despite 600 years of rule by foreign states and the unparalleled Germanization methods of Prussian governments during 200 years, have preserved not only their religion, language, and customs but their national consciousness.

THE TEUTONIC KNIGHTS AND EAST PRUSSIA

According to Mr. REECE the Teutonic Order took up the conquest and Christianizing of the Baltic Prussians by the direction and with the consent of the

German Emperor and the Pope, proceeding in due course to organize the most modern state of the Middle Ages. Poles, in alliance with Lithuanians, invaded Prussia and inflicted a heavy defeat on the knights at Grünwald. But the knights held on to East Prussia, although the Polish King gained sovereignty over it. Western Prussia, however, was illegally incorporated into Poland by a coup d'etat performed at the Lublin diet of 1569. The links between Poland and East Prussia were finally broken in 1660, when the elector of Brandenburg, heir of the knights, won Prussia's complete independence from Poland.

The facts of history are different. In the first place, there is no mention in Mr. REECE's account of Poland's part in introducing the knights, although they could not have begun their action against the Prussians except by passing through Polish territory with the consent of the Polish ruler. In fact it was the Duke Conrad of Mazovia—of the Piast dynasty—who in 1226 suggested that the knights come to Poland. He did so because at the time Poland was divided into duchies and was struggling to acquire the Cracow throne, and so authority over the whole country, for himself. To this end he wanted relief from the threat of incursions by the pagan Prussians among whom, ever since the murder of St. Adalbert in 997, the Piasts had fostered Christian missionary activity. Conrad's invitation to the knights was an ill-considered move: he had ignored the warning implicit in the King of Hungary's expulsion of the order from Transylvania, whither it had been invited to convert the pagan Kumans, for aggression, exclusiveness and disloyalty in the previous year. When he ejected them the Hungarian King complained that to him they had been "like fire in the chest, a mouse in the wallet, and a snake in the bosom."

The hiring of the knights to repel pagan attacks was not unusual in the Christian world at the time and certainly did not affect Poland s sovereignty. When he granted the order property in the district of Chelm, Conrad could not foresee that the knights, contrary to all law and their own undertakings, would transform their endowment into a separate state, not only independent of Poland but actively hostile toward her. The well-known German historian Roepel remarked that Conrad would improbably have divested himself of his sovereign rights over the Chelm lands or over the Prussian lands which were to be occupied by the knights. Subsequent historians maintain that the document from Conrad produced by the knights in self-justification was in fact forged.

Towns and the modern methods of which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] speaks approvingly were introduced into the Baltic countries by the knights at the cost of the physical and national extermination of the indigeneous inhabitants, Prussians, Latvians, and Samogitians. Baptism at the hands of the order involved in practice extinction of the national individuality of the converted. Toward the end of the 14th century, the Lithuanians, taught by historic evidence of these missionary methods, sought refuge in union with Poland. The great scholar A. Brueckner has contrasted German methods with those employed by Poland in the work of Christianization:

> The Poles were pioneers of Christianity and culture among the Prussians; and if this natural course had not suddenly ceased with the introduction of the knights, the Prussians would have become Christian as the Lithuanians did, that is, without losing their national character in the process (Brueckner A. Archiv fuer Slavische Philologie, XX, 1898, p. 481).

Laudatory terms, so lavishly used by the gentleman from Tennessee with regard to the Teutonic knights, do not stand the test of history.

The truth of history is that wherever they were active, the knight's name was synonymous with violence, robbery, murder, and Germanization, an object of universal hatred.

When in 1410, Ladislas Jagiello, King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania, defeated the knights at Grunwald he was acting in defense of two countries which had united a quarter of a century earlier in face of the aggression of the order, whose presence on the Baltic ceased to have any justification after the conversion of Lithuania. In 1409, the archbishop of Gniezno, Michael Kurowski, warned the grand master of the order that aggression by the knights against Lithuania must provoke a Polish reaction, and was told in reply:

> I consequently prefer to strike at the head rather than at the members, and I will move against Poland, a country populous and cultivated, rather than against the Lithuanian forest wildernesses.

Mr. REECE admits that the gentry and the Prussian townsmen—the so-called League of Lizards—were already in revolt against the oppression of the order in 1454, when they sent a mission to the Polish king to ask for the return to Poland of the lands seized by the knights. But it is not true that West Prussia, which was joined to Poland by a personal union in 1466, was somehow illegally incorporated into Poland in 1569. In that year the Sejm in Lublin extended Polish law to West Prussia—leaving the area its separate treasury and courts—and Prussian deputies and senators present endorsed the reform.

Mr. REECE, who regards East Prussia as German land, and Poland's historic and legal claims to it as absurd, who mocks the Poles' use of the expression "regained territories," says that in the partition of Poland in 1772, Prussia "merely regained the lands conquered by Poland in the 15th and 16th centuries."

GERMANY'S PART IN THE PARTITIONS OF POLAND

Discussing the first partition—which took place at the instigation of Frederick II—Mr. REECE claims that in "regaining" these lands from Poland, Prussia was only "repairing the partitioning of Prussia in 1466." And yet the fact, not concealed by Mr. REECE, is that the knights began to conquer the land of the Prussians, who were Balts and not Germans, in 1230. At the Peace of Torun—1466—Poland received back Pomerania, which had never been German, but had been taken from King Ladislas the Short in 1308 by the knights, who by then controlled Danzig and other Pomeranian towns, having put their populations to the sword. At the same time East Prussia became a fief of Poland—the Polish king was henceforth known as "lord and heir of Prussia"—also in accordance with historic tradition, for the Prussians had owed allegiance and paid tribute to Poland since the 10th century. So it becomes understandable that in the 16th century a Polish envoy, Dantyszek, was able to convince Charles V that Prussia semper subfuisse regno Poloniae—Prussia was always subject to Poland.

The subsequent partitions, in 1793 and 1795, which gave Prussia Polish territory as far as Warsaw, are justified by Mr. REECE on the grounds that "it was largely a question of preventing Russia from grabbing all of it." The well-known American Historian, Prof. R. H. Lord, puts forward quite different Prussian motives. He suggests that Frederick William was not afraid of Russia's growing preponderance in Poland; on the contrary, he regarded it as advantageous to Prussia.

> He determined—

Says Professor Lord—

> without any real necessity or compulsion whatever, to exploit the situation in order to satisfy his long-repressed covetousness for Polish territory. (R. H. Lord, The Second Partition of Poland, Cambridge, 1915, p. 496.)

Against Mr. REECE's comments on the Poles, "political gluttony" and "dreams of aggrandizement" may be set the considered views of Professor Lord on Prussian policy in Poland:

> This policy—

He says—

> was essentially one of territorial and selfish aggrandizement. The great * * * was the acquisition of new territories in any quarter—Lusatia, Swedish Pomerania, Dantzic, Great Poland, or the whole left bank of the Vistula; acquisitions by any means. * * * This aggressive policy was not dictated, of course, by any ideas about Prussia's German Mission or the duty of recovering lands of German nationality. Its basis was simply the conviction that this Prussian Monarchy must take on flesh and bulk, and acquire a defensible frontier. (R. H. Lord, The Second Partition of Poland, Cambridge, 1915, pp. 492–3.)

It would be difficult to find a more telling answer.

PLEBISCITES AND VOTES

After a survey of history, reaching back into the Middle Ages, the gentleman from Tennessee discussed at some length the results of the plebiscites which took place after the First World War. He stated that the Treaty of Versailles "imposed these plebiscites upon several regions of East Germany." It would seem more appropriate to say that these plebiscites were imposed upon Poland. Carried out in most unfavorable conditions, they vitiated in many cases the genuine feelings of the Polish population of the territories concerned.

It is worth recalling that in the peace proposals, submitted to the German delegation on May 7, 1919, it was intended

to transfer the whole of Upper Silesia to Poland. The German delegation in its counterproposals presented on the 29th of May, very strongly objected to this paragraph of the draft treaty.

Only with Upper Silesia—

Stated the German memorandum—

can Germany fulfill the obligations arising from the war, but without it never.

When the German counterproposals had been examined, the British Prime Minister Mr. Lloyd George advised that a plebiscite should be held in Upper Silesia. President Wilson, rather reluctantly and after some hesitation gave his assent. He stated, however, that "the people in Upper Silesia were entirely dominated by a small number of magnates and capitalists," and that his experts "did not believe that a free plebiscite was possible in these conditions"—The Paris Peace Conference, volume VI, pages 147 and the following.

The cautious judgment of the President and of his American advisers was fully vindicated by the event. German big landowners and industrial magnates exerted a very strong pressure on the working people of Upper Silesia. Coertion and intimidation reinforced the dominant influence of the German Catholic hierarchy, headed by the Archbishop of Breslau—Wroclaw—Cardinal Bertram. At the plebiscite, held on March 20, 1921, many Poles cast their vote under duress. For many of those 479,000 who voted for Poland the vote was an act of self-abnegation and great moral courage.

The plebiscite in East Prussia was carried out at a very critical moment—July 1920—when the Red army stood at the gates of Warsaw. The population stricken with terror voted under the threat of imminent danger. Fear is sometimes the worst adviser. Before Poland, engaged in deadly struggle, won the decisive battle on the Vistula, the vote was cast. That part of East Prussia was safe for Germany, as a springboard for a future invasion of Poland.

SOUND POLISH VOICES

Contradicted by history and by factual evidence, the gentleman from Tennessee patiently pursued his search for acts or declarations which might help to invalidate the present frontier on the Oder-Neisse line. In this laborious pursuit, he was however ill-advised to quote the historic protest of the Polish Government in exile against the decisions of the Yalta Conference. That government, headed by the veteran Socialist leader Tomasz Arciszewski, in 1944 lodged a solemn protest against the seizure by Russia of the eastern Provinces of Poland and against the subjection of the whole country to an ill-disguised Soviet domination. In this protest, which was intended as an appeal to the conscience of the Free World, there is not a single word about the present Western frontiers of Poland. In no circumstances could this declaration of the Polish Government be made to serve the purposes of those who are trying to impugn these frontiers.

The gentleman from Tennessee was no better advised in quoting an opinion, falsely attributed to General Anders, the gallant Polish military leader. It appears that the general most emphatically denies having expressed such views. In a letter to Congressman REECE, which has since been made public, General Anders stated:

To enforce your point of view you quoted an opinion which was falsely described as the text of an interview which I allegedly gave on December 14, 1946. This opinion ascribed to me was, it is true, published at that date in Die Tat. It was completely untrue and the editors of Die Tat were immediately informed of the fact, while the Polish Press in the free world at once published my official denial. For instance the Polish dailies in London: Dziennik Polski, Dziennik Zolnierza, and Slowo Polskie on January 1, 1947, gave the statement on the utter falsity of this alleged interview. The same was printed by the weekly Orzel Bialy at that time.

Moreover, the editor of Die Tat in a letter dated as recently as July 6, 1955, has expressed his regret for the incident.

General Anders is very outspoken on the subject of the present Polish-German frontier. He says in his letter:

For my part, during all these years, in public appearances, radio speeches, and press publications I have repeatedly emphasized my conviction of the intrinsic justice and inviolability of the present Polish western frontiers.

LOOKING FORWARD

There is not much, indeed, I would wish to add. To my mind the position is clear. Poles in Poland, and Poles living in the Free World speak with one voice. They do not admit the possibility of a peaceful revision of the present western frontiers. And after all their ordeals and tribulations they will not be deluded by the alluring words we have heard here from the honorable gentleman.

Mr. REECE said:

The argument is sometimes advanced that the newly settled Poles * * * have struck roots in the German provinces and can no longer just be turned out. Of course, there has never been any suggestion of that kind by any group of German expellees.

I believe that the Poles understand the meaning of these words. Since the overwhelming majority of German refugees have settled for good within the limits of the Federal German Republic, there are relatively few Germans who would like to return to the former eastern Provinces of the Reich. The hard labor of the millions of Poles who are living and toiling there would be badly needed if German revisionists had their way. Thus, the new cloak of noble humanitarianism—"stay, where you are"—covers the old German expansion, eager to conquer both land and people.

I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee that the present situation is fraught with dangers. The very fact that the Soviet Union, alone among the big powers, did recognize the present western frontiers of Poland is bound to increase Poland's dependence on Russia. If the Western Powers would join in an explicit recognition of that frontier, they would greatly assist the Polish nation, anxious to secure genuine independence and would earn the deep gratitude of many peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

I would wish to strike a note of warning. It is true that words cannot shift frontiers. But careless talk here might only nourish dangerous illusions in Germany. It could embolden the extremists among the Germans and distil the heady spirit of German nationalism which has cost the world so much.

Let us not try to undermine a territorial settlement which has come to stay. Let us not discourage millions of people who are deeply attached to it. They are our friends, as they still believe in freedom and democracy. Driven to despair by a lack of understanding on our part, they could fall victims of bitter disillusionment and that vital part of the old Continent of Europe would be lost forever.

Let us face the future with courage and imagination. One day the waves of the Soviet flood will recede to the East. A new pattern of things will emerge in central-eastern Europe. Let us hope it may bring a better and happier world, based on the foundation of four freedoms: freedom of expression, freedom of belief, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

SENATE

FRIDAY, AUGUST 16, 1957

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. W. Louis Quinn, assistant pastor, St. Matthew's Cathedral, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

We ask Thee, Almighty God, so to enlighten and move the minds and hearts of those who deliberate here today that the good of all our fellow citizens will be the result.

May all speak justly, yet charitably; with courage of conviction, yet with a readiness to be informed; always mindful of the tremendous responsibility that is theirs, and always worthy of the trust that has been given them.

During these troublesome and difficult times, let this country of ours shine forth to all nations not only as a beacon of hope but as an example of the peace and harmony that exist when the rights Thou hast given to every individual are acknowledged and respected.

May Thy blessing be with us always. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 15, 1957, was approved, and its reading 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. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.