Mr. SALTONSTALL reported favorably three groups of nominations for appointment in the Air Force.

On request of Mr. MANSEN, and by unanimous consent, said nominations were considered as follows:

David P. Anderson et al., which were received by the Senate on February 2, 1960, and appear in the executive proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date; and

The nominations of James Y. Adams et al., which were received by the Senate on March 2, 1960, and appear in the executive proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date; and

The nominations of Jack E. Adams et al., which were received by the Senate March 31, 1960, and appear in the executive proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date.

IN THE AIR FORCE

JUDGEE ADVOCATE GENERAL, U.S. AIR FORCE

Maj. Gen. Albert Meldrum Kuhefeld, 884A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, for appointment as the Judge Advocate General, U.S. Air Force, for a period of 4 years beginning April 1, 1960, in the grade of major general in the Regular Air Force. (This nomination is made under the provisions of section 8072, title 10, United States Code.)

RETIRED LIST

The following officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8693, title 10, United States Code:

Lt. Gen. Glenn O. Barcus, 87A
Lt. Gen. Richard C. Lindsay, 479A
Lt. Gen. Alfred R. Smith, 824A

The following groups of nominations for appointment in the Air Force were favorably reported by the Senate:

On request of Mr. MANSEN, and by unanimous consent, said nominations were considered and confirmed:

The nominations of William H. Abbott et al., for promotion in the Regular Air Force which were received on January 14, 1960, and appear in the Senate proceedings of that date in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The nominations of Wesley W. Bosear et al., for promotion in the Regular Air Force which were received on February 18, 1960, and which appear in the Senate proceedings on that date in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The nominations of Arthur H. Ahrens, Jr. et al., for promotion in the Regular Air Force which were received on March 18, 1960, and which appear in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date; and

The nominations of Phillip W. Andrews et al., for promotion in the Regular Air Force, which were received on April 11, 1960, which appear in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Vice Adm. Charles W. Wallborn, Jr., U.S. Navy, for appointment as U.S. naval repre­ sentative, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, as senior Navy member pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 711.

Vice Adm. Theron L. Curtis, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 2223.

Vice Adm. James F. Combs, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 2223.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 2223, the following-named officers for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving:

John J. Benedict, USMC.
Edward W. Sheddler, USMC.
Thomas A. Wornum, USMC.
John J. Connell, USMC.
Wallace M. Greene, Jr., USMC.

The following-named officers of the Navy for appointment to the grade of vice admiral were placed on the retired list in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

Vice Adm. Stuart H. Ingerson, U.S. Navy.

The nominations of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate considered and confirmed the said nominations on April 6, 1960.

The nominations of James B. Glennon et al., for appointment or promotion in the Navy which were received on January 6, 1960, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the Senate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date; and

The nominations of Andrew C. J. Harnett et al., for appointment in the Navy and the Marine Corps, which were received on April 1, 1960, and which appear in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date; and

The nominations of Dean A. Albroich et al., which were received on April 6, 1960, and which appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Carl Erland Ericson, Knox United Presbyterian Church, Falls Church, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, as we convene with Thee, we give thanks for this day of splendor and opportunity, and for all who labor here in responsible freedom. Grant them courage to resist tyranny, and the wisdom to know when they are right are wrong.

In this place, where liberty is made into history, may the powerful find that democracy is not to be perverted, the rich that stewardship is national virtue, the poor that Thy good may transform charity, and may all the people come to take refuge here against injustice and discrimination.

As righteousness exalts a nation, grant us the strength to turn away from sin, the humility to see error in ourselves, and the grace to forgive it in others— that we may be Thy children.

Help us to see that the less we give ourselves to Thee, the more we contribute to our own despair. Teach us that leniency tomorrow is born of failing faith. Thy will be done.

May these who are public servants have confidence without arrogance, that all the people of the world see Thy will in our national purpose.

May Thy love and peace come to the sick and the lonely; Thy leading hand to the uncertain and distraught.

And no matter what our condition or state, we thank Thee for tomorrow as for today, that both can be spent with Thee. In the name of Him in whom we are reconciled, even Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

KING OF NEPAL VISIT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time today to make a statement Thursday, April 28, 1960, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Majesty the King of Nepal.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 10324) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 503 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, the bill H.R. 8601, with the Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendments be, and the same are hereby agreed to.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown], and pending that myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution requires no explanation. When it is passed, the civil rights bill, with Senate amendments, will be cleared for the President. The Senate amendments, however, do require some
explanation, and consequently I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] 15 minutes.

Mr. Celler. Mr. Speaker, I arise in support of House Resolution 658. This legislation is not the first time the people of this country have spoken out in support of civil rights. In fact it is a tradition that there are Members here today who, for opposite reasons, are far from satisfied with the legislation we are about to vote upon. I, too, am not entirely satisfied with the resolution. I have considered the circumstances, I believe it would be a futile gesture to send this legislation to a conference. To the opponents of the legislation I say that this bill is a moderate one. To the supporters of the legislation I say that this bill is meaningless and can be effective.

The Celler Civil Rights Act of 1957 was a historic advance because it breached the barrier to civil rights legislation as it stood for 82 years. This was a first step and experience has shown that the breach of this barrier has been neither complete and, undoubtedly, we shall demand more with increasing years. The bill which has risen from 1957 to my bill demands the enactment into law of the legislation before us now.

We must understand that it is not light work to change the fundamental patterns of the United States. This is a matter of conduct of Government and our Nation. The task of changing deeply entrenched patterns of racial segregation demands the full resources of our Government and our Nation. The task is a heavy one and is made and aggravated by the instances and incidents of disorder and violence in the field of desegregation, by the enactment of States' statutes designed to impede and obstruct the carrying out of Federal court orders in the field of desegregation, and particularly in the field of voting.

From the experience of the Attorney General in enforcing the Civil Rights Act of 1957 and the activities of the Civil Rights Commission, it is clear that means of more effective enforcement of our constitutionally guaranteed rights, and in particular the right to vote, is necessary. I am firmly convinced that the legislation before us will provide such means and an effective means, too, provided that those who will be responsible for its administration and enforcement of this legislation carry out that responsibility. Some may say this is small relief, but remember a small key can sometimes open a big door. Assuring the ballot to the Negro gives him a shield and a sword, a shield to forfend wicked officials and a sword to fight for his unalienable rights—life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

The enactment of this legislation will be a challenge to the Attorney General of the United States to proceed forcefully and effectively to provide and guarantee the rights to which this bill would have authorized the Commission to hire personnel without regard to the civil service classification laws.

In title V, education of children of military personnel, the Senate eliminated the House provision whereby the Commissioner of Education could negotiate for the leasing of school buildings which had been constructed with Federal aid when the local educational agencies are unable to provide facilities for the children of the members of the Armed Forces.

In the title involving referees, the Senate added a provision requiring that voting referees take the same oath of office as is now required for other responsible Federal officials. On the other hand, the Senate eliminated the section requiring that the proceeding before the referee shall be held at such times and places as the court shall direct. Finally, the Senate added a proviso to that portion of this title relating to provisional voting for an applicant who has filed his application twenty or more days prior to an election. The Senate added the proviso that such applicant be allowed to vote provisionally when he is qualified to vote under the State law.

The other changes made by the Senate in the House version are merely technical and in no way affect the substance of the House version.

In conclusion, I shall maintain ceaseless vigilance and unmistakable zeal in this onward march for full civil rights for all. Complete civil rights may not come tomorrow. They may not be achieved the day after. But come they must. Patience and courage are essential—above all patience. Remember with patience mulberry leaves finally become satin.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Colmer. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCormack. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names: [Roll No. 53]

Alexander
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Bayh
Mont.
Auchincloss
Barden
Brock
Branch
Cooley
Dent
Dorovian
Durham
Furton
Fish

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. Brown of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Haney. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some misunderstanding as to the situation under which we find ourselves at the present time. House Resolution 503 is a very short one, and I believe I should read it in its entirety. The resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, the bill H.R. 8601 with its Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendments be, and the same are hereby agreed to.

Now, in simple language, that means that when we adopt this resolution, we will be agreeing to the Senate amendments to the House bill, H.R. 8601, which was the original House measure on civil rights. In other words if we will agree to those amendments, when that vote is taken, or if the resolution is approved, the bill H.R. 8601 as amended in the Senate will then be on its way to the White House for the President's consideration.
Mr. Speaker, when I opened the debate in the House on March 10 on this measure, I believe I predicted then that the final result would be such that perhaps neither the opponents or proponents of the measure would be entirely satisfied with its contents. Yet, this bill, containing, as it does, the features of the original McCulloch bill, which was made in order as an amendment by the Committee on Rules, which sets up the voting rights protection as the main feature of the bill, I believe that which I said in March is still true; that if you give to all qualified citizens the right to vote, they, in turn, can and will cure many of the practices to which they now object.

This measure, of course, carries other important provisions, but above all else it does protect the right of all qualified citizens to vote, regardless of race, color, or creed. It is, therefore, in my opinion, as good a compromise bill as could be put through the Congress of the United States, and, on the whole, it is a good measure. I hope this resolution will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck], the minority leader.

MR. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this is a memorable day in the Congress of the United States.

We have taken a decisive step toward protecting and furthering the civil rights of all our citizens.

I congratulate the Members of the House on their expeditious and intelligent handling of the bill, first as reported by our own Judiciary Committee and, again as returned to this body by the Senate.

I congratulate the distinguished Members of the other body for their success in securing reasonably prompt action on this bill.

Naturally, the bill does not satisfy everyone. For some it goes too far. For others it does not go far enough.

But I believe this bill, basically right, is the wish of the American people in this year 1960. Every fair-minded person will have to recognize, I think, that we have achieved real progress toward the great goal of insuring full civil rights for all of our people.

Having this in mind, I want to summarize briefly what it seems to me we are accomplishing with enactment of H.R. 8601.

First of all, it affords meaningful protection of the right to vote.

Title VI—the Federal voting referee provision—may well be called the heart of the Civil Rights Act of 1960.

Certainly the right to vote is a basic civil right. By providing Federal machinery to affirmatively assist persons who have been denied the franchise by racially discriminatory State action, we are really reaching the grass roots of civil rights.

The second indispensable shield for the protection of voting rights is provided by title III.

That title requires the retention of State voting records for 23 months after a Federal election and the handing over of such records upon the demand of the Attorney General.

This provision realistically recognizes that voting records are important evidence in most voting rights cases and that only Federal law can overcome the reluctance of some State officials to make such records available.

But H.R. 8601 is not merely a voting bill. Let me review briefly the other aspects of this constructive piece of legislation.

In title I, the bill provides criminal sanctions against persons who obstruct or attempt to obstruct rights or duties under Federal court orders.

The significant contribution of this title is that it will be available to punish those who take the law into their hands either to prevent a school board from opening its school to Negroes or to interfere directly with Negroes ordered admitted to a public school pursuant to a court decree.

The other body has seen fit to broaden the scope of this title beyond the specific categories of school desegregation orders so that it applies to obstruction of any type of Federal court decree.

Title II penalizes interstate flight to avoid prosecution for damaging or attempting to damage any building by fire or explosive, as well as interstate transportation of explosives for illegal use and the use of threats or false information concerning bombings.

Although broadened by the other body to include damage to all types of structures, this title retains a specific reference to religious and educational institutions.

Obviously, a major aim of this legislation is to eradicate the hate bombings which have centered largely on schools, churches, and synagogues.

I am confident that the title will be successful in damaging or arresting this type of crime.

Title IV amends the powers of the Civil Rights Commission by permitting each member to administer oaths or take statements of witnesses under affirmation.

Title V implements the obligation of the Federal Government to the members of the Armed Forces. It allows the Commissioner of Education to provide educational facilities for children of military personnel living off base as well as on.

As we know, it is a real possibility that schools in some areas will close to avoid compliance with desegregation orders.

Our off-base military children, white and Negro, would suffer irreparably unless the Federal Government could provide for them the facilities of school desegregation.

This, in substance, is the Civil Rights Act of 1960.

In conjunction with the Civil Rights Act of 1957, it provides the tools for combating many existing evils.

Let me add that faith that these tools will be used effectively, with fairness to all concerned.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I dislike again to strike a note of discord here when so many, having made their record on this bill, seem to be so happy about it. I happen to be one of those old-fashioned constitutional Democrats who is very unhappy about it.

A lot of effort has been made on this side to call it the Democratic bill, on that side a Republican bill. I foresee that in the future there may be those of you who live long enough to regret that you had anything to do with it.

It is said that this is a moderate bill. Many of my Southern colleagues take comfort in that thought. I see nothing moderate about it. To me it is a very vicious bill. I am not talking about black people or white people; I am talking about the institutions of America, its history, its electoral system. This strikes at the very foundation of our system of government.

Someone wants to call it the Celler-McCulloch bill. Somebody else wants to call it the Democratic bill; the Republican bill, the McCain bill, the Republican bill.

Why not call it just what it is? The 1960 election bill, a bid for the minority bloc vote. And that is what it is.

We all recognize it. The NAACP, the politicians, everybody recognizes it. It is a vicious attack, I repeat, upon the fundamental structure of our country. It is going to result in more and more legislation, more and more discord. You are setting back the good progressive relations that have been going forward under an evolutionary system between the races.

Yes, it may be amendable to a section of the country but, I repeat, you will live to rue the day that you had any part to play in this infamous thing. Frankly, I do not think either party is going to get what it wants.

The Republican bill is the NAACP, the politicians, everybody recognizes it. It is a vicious attack, I repeat, upon the fundamental structure of our country. It is going to result in more and more legislation, more and more discord. You are setting back the good progressive relations that have been going forward under an evolutionary system between the races.

Yes, it may be amendable to a section of the country but, I repeat, you will live to rue the day that you had any part to play in this infamous thing. Frankly, I do not think either party is going to get what it wants.
implications upon them, the country as a whole, and its cherished institutions. In brief, these are some of the evil effects of this legislation: 

First. It removes one of the basic foundation stones of States sovereignty, local control of election machinery. 

Second. It is another significant step in the continuous drive for centralization of authority in an all-powerful Federal Government with the resultant loss of individual liberties. 

Third. The bill admittedly gives Negro voting rights and privileges over white citizens. This definitely illustrates the evil of attempting to enact legislation for the benefit of a minority group. 

Fourth. For obvious political reasons, the proponents wrote into the bill on the floor of the House the so-called referee plan which goes further into the field of Negro voting rights than anything passed by the Congress in the dark days of the Reconstruction Period. 

The Federal supervision of Negro voting rights in that period only applied to elections of Federal officers. This would apply to all elections from constable to Governor. 

Fifth. It unquestionably violates article I of the Constitution providing for federal supervisors to enforce Federal laws as other provisions of that immortal document. It particularly violates the 10th amendment which reserves all powers of government not specifically delegated to the Federal Government to the States, or the people. 

Sixth. It, most unfortunately, destroys the good brotherly relations existing between the races, particularly in the South where so much orderly and evolutionary progress was being made by the Negro race under the guiding hand of his white brother. 

Seventh. Of less importance, but of significance, the final passage of the bill will widen the breach between the so-called Northern and Southern divisions of the United States. Thus, the so-called liberal Democratic bloc loses the preliminary skirmish, but lose the 1960 political battle. 

Finally, those of us who believe in conservative government here in the House have given our dedicated best efforts to prevent this deadly assault upon the priceless heritage bequeathed us by the Founding Fathers. We can now only hope that the day will be hastened when its evils will become so manifest in its operation that a wiser and less politically minded Congress will repeal it. 

Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCulloch), the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary. 

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I arise to support House Resolution 503, to make in order the House agreement to the Senate amendments to the civil rights bill. 

I am pleased, indeed, to have introduced both the original administration bill on civil rights and the bill which, in substance, became the Federal voting referee section of the final legislation which passed today. 

This is a happy occasion for me, and, I am sure, for most of my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, particularly the distinguished chairman, and of whom have worked diligently and so effectively in finally bringing to the House this significant legislation. 

Of course, the Members of this body are familiar with the contents of the civil rights bill as it left the House. Therefore, I will not elaborate upon the bill except, later, to remark on the extent to which the amendments of the other body have altered or changed the bill. 

The Rules Committee has reported for our consideration a House resolution which will be productive of the results desired by the great majority of this House, namely, the speedy passage of a good civil rights bill. 

At this point, I must add that I would not support the resolution if I thought the amendments had a crippling effect on any of the provisions of the civil rights bill passed by the House. Many members of the House amendments are not all to my liking. But they have not altered the fundamental structure of the bill or its effectiveness as a workable civil rights measure. In particular, the voting rights sections, the heart of the bill, have not been altered beyond a minor degree. 

Title III, Federal election records, has been amended so as to require State officials to preserve election records for a period of 22 months instead of 2 years and to permit the inspection and copying of the records only at the principal office of the Custodian of the election records, instead of also at the office of the U.S. attorney. This very essential provision makes possible the discovery and use in court of evidence of voting violations. 

Title VI, the voting referee provision, has been altered only in three respects. None of these alter the effectiveness of the title. Judicial measure to enforce the voting rights of Negroes when their rights have not been permitted to vote because of their race or color. 

The first amendment in this title merely requires the voting referee to subscribe to the oath of office required by 5 United States Code, section 16. The second amendment, which I think is an improvement, requires the court to fix the time and places for the ex parte proceedings before the voting referee. 

The third amendment adds a provision to the provisional voting clause to require that an applicant "shall be qualified to vote under this title." The primary reason for this change was to clarify that applicants who had not attempted to register within the time prescribed, are privileged to be entitled to a provisional voting order. Thus, the amendment merely accords to the interpretation of the House at the time it adopted the O'Hara amendment. 

For all the reasons, I believe that the voting provisions of the bill have not been changed and that they reflect the will of the great majority of this House. 

Thus, the titles to the bill, titles I, II, IV, and V, have been substantially amended, but none of these amendments have weakened the House version of the bill. 

Title I was amended to apply to all Federal court orders. Title I, as it left the House, was principally limited to school desegregation court orders. 

Title II also has been broadened with the amendments which provide penalties for interstate flight to avoid prosecution for damaging or attempting to damage by fire or explosion any structure or building, as well as penalties for the illegal use or possession, in interstate commerce, of explosives, and the communication of threats or false information concerning attempts to damage or destroy any building or other property. 

Title IV and title V have also been amended. Title IV gives the members of the Civil Rights Commission the authority to administer oaths or take depositions under their own supervision. The original version of this title, it is to be remembered, became part of the amendment to the Mutual Security Act during the 1st session of the 88th Congress which determined the life of the Civil Rights Commission to 2 years. 

Title V, education of children of members of the Armed Forces, was first amended in the House so as to deprive the Federal Government of the right to take possession of local schools closed because of a desegregation dispute. Therefore, the amendment of the other body deleting the right to negotiate for the use of such schools takes away little, if any, Federal authority. As amended, it retains the important provision which permits the Commissioner of Education to arrange for the education of children of members of the Armed Forces who live off the base, as well as those who live on the base. 

Title VI, the Federal voting referee provision as amended, provides a truly effective judicial tool, which will enable the Attorney General to secure the right to register and vote for all those qualified citizens, who, because of their race or color, have been deprived of their elective franchise, the very cornerstone of representative government. 

The bill, as amended, I am happy to say, is in every respect a moderate, yet effective measure in the field of civil rights. The Congress has searched for and found the golden mean. 

If this legislation be properly used and not abused, it may well be the beginning of a new era. This can be one of our finest hours. 

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Poff). 

Mr. Poff. Mr. Speaker, I rise in the balance, the civil rights bill passed in the other body, while still materially defective, represents a substantial technical improvement in the version which passed
the House. This evaluation is based on a purely legal analysis. That analysis, section by section, is as follows:

**TITLE I**

The so-called obstruction of mail provision was deleted. Of this could be no doubt about the meaning of that phrase, the other body was careful to add the proviso “that no person may be convicted under this section unless there is evidence independent of the presumption that this section has been violated.” Parenthetically, I must add that it is regrettable that similar language was not incorporated in title VI, the so-called voting referee plan.

**TITLE III**

The other body made a salutary amendment of title III. As the bill passed the House, the custodian of voting records could be compelled to produce the same in the office of the U.S. attorney. Under the amendment, these records are subject to examination only at the office of the Custodian. The period of preservation was reduced from 24 months to 22 months.

**TITLE IV**

The only change made in title IV was the deletion of the clause which permitted the Civil Rights Commission to hire employees without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws.

**TITLE V**

During the House debate, title V was amended to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to consult and negotiate with State educational agencies when the operation of school buildings had been discontinued by State acts. The purpose of that amendment was to withhold the Commissioner’s right to seize a specific school building if other nearby school buildings were operational and available for use by children of members of the Armed Forces. In the other body, this amendment was deleted. In my judgment, this was a mistake. By every yardstick of orderly procedure and economic practice, the House version was preferable.

**TITLE VI**

The other body made several amendments to title VI, the voting referee plan.

First. Voting referees are required to subscribe to an oath of office. No one can legitimately consider this amendment objectionable. Indeed, it is commendable.

Second. The U.S. district court is required to fix a time and place certain for the conduct of referee proceedings. So far as it went, this amendment represented an improvement.

Third. An amendment was added which provides that an applicant for registration will not be allowed to vote provisionally unless found “to be qualified under State law.” This language, considered vague by many, has the practical effect of eliminating federal probate voting as authorized in the House version. In other words, if the court is required to make a decision about the applicant’s qualifications, there will no longer be any reason why he should be permitted to vote provisionally. If the judge finds that he is qualified, his right to vote will be absolute and not provisional.

It should be noted that the other body made no attempt to provide with respect to the ex parte proceeding before the referee or with respect to the irrebuttable presumption. As currently written, the bill makes available to a citizen who was never a party to the original suit an arbitrary presumption which, so far as his individual case is concerned, is based on no evidence and which is subject to no rebuttal by the defendant registrant. Accordingly, the constitutional question of due process is still unresolved and can now be plentifully raised in the State courts. Undoubtedly, this constitutional question will be tested in the courts as soon as the plan is invoked.

In summary, while the bill has been amended by the other body, it is still legally defective in several material aspects. Even if it were wholly without legal defects, and even if we are to assume that the Federal Government has the naked power to so legislate, whether, as a matter of policy, the Federal Government ought to exercise its power is distinctly another question. It cannot be gainsaid that this legislation represents another invasion and usurpation of the sovereignty of the several States. In this regard, it must be remembered that the abuses of the past that gave rise to the intended victims, are not the only States to which this usurpation extends. The Enforcement Acts of 1870 and 1871 were aimed at the Southern States. Yet, New York, New Jersey, and New York, which 24 years later, and motivated by the sorry experience which her people had endured under the operation of the initial Act, initiated the movement to repeal what proved to be unwise and unworthy laws. History may repeat itself.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

May I ask the gentleman from Missouri if he will request permission for all Members to extend their remarks before we finish.

Mr. BOLLING. I will do that later on.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Wier.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, now that the civil rights resolution is finally before us here in the House for a vote, I find myself confronted with the task of voting this plan. This comes as a result of my best evaluation upon this resolution. But at least I am very, very much dismayed as to how so many Members of the Congress could spend so many, many days on behalf of so many, many citizens of this Nation and then come up with so little. Possibly this bill might serve as lip service device in a campaign, but in reality this bill does not serve the intended purpose. I am very keenly disappointed that the bill comes here in what I term a rather inadequate condition. At least if I would hate to be a candidate for President of the United States and have to campaign on this legislation as one of my accomplishments. It is not just going to be explained away as easily as that.

I yield back the balance of my time, because I know the committee is short on time, but I wanted to express my disappointment with this bill.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O’HARA].
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 13 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of clarifying the effect of the Senate amendment to the provisional voting portion of H.R. 8601, when title VI of H.R. 8601 was under consideration by this House, I offered an amendment which is in part provided:

In the case of any application filed 20 or more days prior to an election where it is determined by the court that the voter needs to vote provisionally, the court shall issue an order authorizing the applicant to vote provisionally.

The amendment was thoroughly discussed and explained by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], the able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Roossen], a member of the committee, and myself prior to its adoption by the House.

Nevertheless, when H.R. 8601 was before the Senate, a majority of the Members of that body insisted that it was necessary for the House to look into this paragraph of language to reinforce the legislative history in the House.

Both the majority leader, the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Dirksen, and Mr. O'Hara, who offered the successful Senate amendment to the provisional voting paragraph, and the majority leader, the Senator from Texas, Mr. Johnson, stated during the debate that it was their intention to make the bill conform to the legislative history made in the House of Representatives.

The majority leader said that:

The Senate, if it adopts this amendment, is doing no more today than what those Members of the House—

Referring to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Roossen], and myself—

said the O'hara amendment provided at the time.

However, two questions have arisen concerning the meaning of the provisional voting paragraph, as amended by the Senate.

The first has to do with the time within which a person seeking an order permitting him to vote provisionally must have attempted to register with the local officials and the time within which he must have applied to the Federal court.

The fear had been expressed that the provisional voting section, as it passed the House, might require the courts to permit provisional voting by applicants who had not even attempted to register with the local officials within the time permitted by State law.

To clarify this point, I may briefly restate the intention of the membership of this House with regard thereto.

Before an order providing for provisional voting may be entered, it must appear that the applicant has attempted to register with the local election officials within the time prescribed by State law.

If he has, and then presents himself to the Federal court 20 or more days prior to the election to which the provisional voting order will apply, and appears otherwise qualified, the court shall issue such order. If he has, and then presents himself to the Federal court less than 20 days prior to the election in which he seeks to vote provisionally, the court, in its discretion, may issue an order permitting him to vote provisionally.

In short, the 20-day period referred to in the provisional voting paragraph of title VI applies to the time of application to the Federal court. The time of application to local officials is still determined by State law.

The second major question arising from the Senate amendment to the provisional voting section is that it has to do with the method by which the qualifications of the applicant for an order entitling him to vote provisionally shall be determined.

Provisional voting is provided in cases in which a final determination of the applicant's qualifications has not yet been made. If a final determination of his qualifications has been made, he is entitled to an order authorizing him to vote unconditionally, and there is no need for an order permitting him to vote provisionally. It is, therefore, clear that the Senate amendment to the House amendment to provide that applicants could vote provisionally only if their qualifications had already been finally determined.

Such an interpretation leads to a patently ridiculous result and is totally unsupported by the record made in the Senate.

The purpose of the Senate amendment was to assure that the court is not required to approve provisional voting whether or not the applicant appears to possess the necessary qualifications for voting under State law.

The proviso makes it clear that the court is expected to examine any application it receives before it issues an order permitting the applicant to vote provisionally.

Lines 4 through 7 on page 18 provide: "The proviso to this amendment under oath "shall be prima facie evidence as to his age, residence, and prior efforts to register or otherwise qualify to vote."

From the applicant's sworn statement as to his age, residence, and any prior efforts to register, the court can readily determine whether or not the applicant appears to possess the necessary qualifications under State law. The court then should issue an order entitling an applicant to vote provisionally, unless it appears from an examination of these documents that, under State law, he is not qualified.

The foregoing interpretation of the provisional voting portions of title VI is in accord both with the intention of those who offered and supported the provisional voting amendment in the House and with the expressed intent of those who offered and supported the proviso inserted therein by the Senate.

Mr. McCulloch. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCulloch. I would like to state for the Record that the remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan are in accord with my understanding of the intention of the provisional voting portion of H.R. 8601, and it is in accordance with my understanding of the effect of the language added thereto by the Dirksen amendment in the other body.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

I should like to direct a question to the gentleman from Michigan. [Mr. O'HARA]. The gentleman from Michigan stated that under the provisional voting paragraph of title VI, as amended by the Senate, an applicant for an order authorizing him to vote provisionally must have attempted to register with the local officials within the time permitted by State law. Did the gentleman from Michigan, when he said this, assume that a Federal court finding of a pattern of practice of discrimination in voting had been made a reasonable time prior to the closing of registration under State law?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. That is correct. I assumed that the finding of a pattern or practice had preceded the closing of registration under State law.

Mr. LINDSAY. If the gentleman will yield, I believe that the gentleman from Michigan contemplated that before the Federal court must have attempted to register within the time permitted by State law even when registration had been closed. If the court finds the pattern or practice of discrimination?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. When a court finds a pattern or practice of discrimination it has also, in effect, found that it would have been futile for the applicant to have attempted to register at any time prior thereto, and, if registration has closed, the applicant has had no opportunity to meet any such requirement after the finding of a pattern or practice of discrimination.

Since this is a suit in equity, equitable doctrines should apply, including the rule that persons asking relief need not have attempted a clearly futile act as a condition precedent to receiving relief. This principle was recognized during the Senate debate. I believe that the court should and would examine the circumstances in each case and not exact a requirement of prior application to the local officials the time permitted by State law under the fact situation described by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Celler. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Celler. I think the interpretation that the gentleman from Michigan has placed upon the provisional voting portion of H.R. 8601 is highly important, and also important is the colloquy between the gentleman who now has the floor and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], because it would be the criteria that will govern the courts in their interpretation of these sections.
the time within which an applicant appears before the referee to seek redress. And I suggest to the gentleman from New York that it is in accordance with my understanding of the statute.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that the House will accept the Senate amendments to this bill, and that we will take a step forward in our fight for equal rights for all Americans.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow in which to extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I shall support this legislation for civil rights. The right to vote is a sacred right of all Americans and should be denied to none.

I regret that this bill has neglected two important fields, one being that of the Negro American soldier to vote. The privilege is denied to thousands. In this case both colored and white citizens are foreclosed from exercising their franchise.

The other area of neglect is the citizen of the District of Columbia. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, I offered an amendment to grant these rights to the disfranchised citizen of our Federal city. It was rejected by the gentleman from Michigan. I regret that the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee claimed a constitutional amendment was required to grant these rights. I claimed, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress of the United States is a constitutional authority. I still maintain that position.

I am pleased that hearings have been held on the constitutional amendment. I shall support it if it comes to the floor.

I fear, however, a long and costly road ahead for the constitutional amendment.

I claim we could pass proper legislation now to give citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote for-elected President and Vice President, and representation in the Congress.

I think this should be done now. I would support representation with full powers in the House and have the bill go to the Senate and permit them to include a member of their body with such powers and rights as they might legislate. Why deny the rights to vote this year, a presidential year, to those now disfranchised in the District?

Mr. Speaker, I practiced law 30 years before coming to the Congress. The question of law as to the powers of Congress over the Capital City has fascinated me. I have studied the legal and constitutional questions of that subject and am convinced what I advocate can be done. I submit to the House and to the Judicial Committee a memorandum of law I have prepared. Under unanimous consent I include it in the Record.

MEMORANDUM

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether Congress, without a constitutional amendment, has the right to grant citizenship to the District of Columbia the right to vote in national elections and to have representation in the Congress of the United States.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Article I, section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution of the United States provides that Congress shall have the power to "exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States."

In 1787, at the Constitutional Convention, and in 1789, Maryland and Virginia ceded territory to the Federal Government and Congress, by acts which were approved on March 1, 1789. July 15, 1789, established the District of Columbia, which was finally proclaimed to be the national capital after the national elections of 1800. Jurisdiction was exercised in the District of Columbia in the United States on the first Monday of December 1800 (United States v. Hamilton, 1 Cr. C. & C. 305, 1801).

The city of Washington was made a municipality by act of Congress in 1802. That act provided for a form of government and diy of franchise, which was established when Congress established a territorial form of government for the District of Columbia. This form of government lasted for approximately 3 years, after which a temporary commission form of government was installed; by act of Congress in 1878, the present commission form of government was established in the District of Columbia. Under this present form of government, all legislative powers with respect to District affairs are retained by Congress, while an executive board of three commissioners appointed by the President is vested with ordinance power.

District citizens voted in the national elections of 1802, 1806, and 1808, but have not participated in the House of Representatives or in the election of 1800. Under the territorial form of government established by the act of 1801, Washington was represented in the House of Representatives; this act was superseded, however, by the act of 1878, and in consequence the District lost its last vestige of any form of national representation.

APPLICABLE LAW AND ARGUMENT

I. Status of the District of Columbia as to "State.

A. The Hepburn case: The Members of the House of Representatives are chosen by the citizens of each State (art. I, sec. 2, of the Constitution). Members of the House of Representatives are elected by the people of the respective States (amendment 17 of the Constitution of the United States), and the President and Vice President of the United States are chosen by electors who are appointed by the legislatures of the several States (art. II, sec. 1). In the absence of a constitutional amendment to grant citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote in national elections and to have representation in the Congress argue that because Representatives, Senators, and the President and Vice President are chosen, by the people of the several States, citizens of the District of Columbia cannot exercise these rights because they are not citizens of a "State" within the meaning of that term in the Constitution. This view rests squarely on the decision of Hepburn v. Ellzey (2 Cr. 445 (1823)); and it is well settled.

In the Hepburn case the Supreme Court of the United States was confronted with the situation whether citizens of the District of Columbia could maintain an action in the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. The question before the Court was whether Congress which limited the jurisdiction of the circuit courts to cases between a citizen of the State in which the suit is brought and a person not a citizen of that State, limited their jurisdiction to a citizen of the State, or to a person who is a citizen of the United States, or to a person who is an American citizen. The Court held that Congress did not have the power under the Constitution to limit the jurisdiction of the circuit courts to cases between citizens of the United States, and it declared that the Circuit Court had jurisdiction to entertain the cases brought by citizens of the District of Columbia in the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

In Hepburn v. Ellzey the Supreme Court held that Congress might not discriminate against citizens of the District of Columbia even though it is a Federal city, and that the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Columbia did have jurisdiction of the case, and the Circuit Court held that the Circuit Court had jurisdiction.

B. The National Mutual Insurance Company case: In the case of Texas v. White (488 U.S. 564 (1989)), the Supreme Court determined that a judgment of the Supreme Court of Texas was not a judgment of a "State" under the Constitution and therefore could not be enforced in a Federal Court for the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia, however, is not a State, but is a Federal City, and the decision of the Supreme Court in the Texas v. White case was interpreted as applying to the District of Columbia as a Federal City.

C. The United States v. Eichman (369 U.S. 130 (1962)): The decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in the case of United States v. Eichman (369 U.S. 130 (1962)) was reviewed by the United States Supreme Court in the case of United States v. Eichman (369 U.S. 130 (1962)). The Court held that the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in the case of United States v. Eichman (369 U.S. 130 (1962)) was not a decision of a "State" under the Constitution, and therefore could not be enforced in a Federal Court for the District of Columbia.
of the privilege accorded to all other American citizens, as well as aliens, of going into the courts of the Union to have their rights enforced or their legal rights affirmed. Indeed, in the language of the court in Hepburn v. Ellzey, supra, we well say: "It is extraordinary that the courts of the United States, which are open to aliens, and to the citizens of every State in the Union, should be closed upon them. But so long as this ruling remains in force, the judgment of this court must be governed by it."

Much more recently, and far more significantly, Mr. Justice Rutledge with whom Mr. Justice Murphy concurred, in National Mutual Insurance Co. v. Tidewater Transfer Co., Inc. (387 U.S. 583, 86 S. Ct. 1178 (1966)), taking exception to the decision of Chief Justice Marshall in Hepburn v. Ellzey, supra, stated:

"Marshall's view of the 1789 act, Heredia in his later dictum, Corporation of New Or­leans v. Winter (1 Wheat. 91, 94, 4 L. Ed. 44); cf. Sere v. Pitol (6 Cranch 332, 336, 3 L. Ed., 248), has been firmly adhered to in judicial interpretation of later congressional grants of jurisdiction. And, by accretion, the rule of the Hepburn decision, as accreted upon, has been thoroughly considered determination that, within the meaning of ar­ticle III, sec. 2, 'the District of Columbia is not for Maryland or Virginia a State or citizens thereof are not citizens of any State within the ar­ticle's meanings.'

"However, nothing but naked precedent, the great age of the Hepburn ruling, and the prestige of Marshall's name, supports such a result. It is true that where any­one could be found who now would write into the Constitution such an unjust and discriminatory provision as the District had been excised from the Federal courts. All of the reasons set forth for allowing District citizens a fur­ther access to Federal courts, point to the conclusion that they should enter freely and fully as other citizens and even aliens do.

"Precedent of course is not lightly to be disregarded, even in the greater fluidity of decision which the process of constitutional adjudication now permits.

"And Marshall's sponsorship in such mat­tters always is weighty. But when long ex­perience has disclosed the fallacy of a rul­ing ingrafted upon the Constitution, and the court has recurred to the Constitution for relief, the court must examine the provisions of the Constitution, and give due weight to the meaning of the words as they have been applied over the years to its several provisions."

"The D.C. Circuit has repeatedly, with this case, and otherwise, in which this Court has said call for reexamination of prior decisions. If the court in the case of the court in the case is in this one, the court in the case in the case in the case.

"The Hepburn decision was made before­time, through later decisions here, had de­stroyed its basic premise and at the beginning of Marshall's judicial career, when he had hardly started his great work of expounding the Constitution. The very brevity of the opinion and its groundings, especially in their ambiguity, show that the master hand, which had drafted the instrument, refrained from an examination of the use of that word in the charter to determine 'whether or not it is a State in the sense of that instrument.' 3 Cranch 445, at page 452, 2 L. Ed. 332. "When the Hepburn decision was not used in this limited sense (as designating a member of the Union) in the articles respecting the several departments, and which was also employed in that which respects the judi­cial department, it must be understood as retaining the sense originally given to it (ibid.)."

In National Mutual Insurance Co. v. Tidewater Transfer Co., Inc. (387 U.S. 583, 86 S. Ct. 1178 (1969)), in whose territory or the privilege of a jury trial in criminal cases (Callan v. Wilson, 127 U.S. 540, 550, 8 S. Ct. 1301 (1888)). To the contrary, every­thing in the Constitution, its history, and its several departments, does not authorize a denial to citizens of the District of Columbia of a State in the sense of that instrument. Thus, in Domes v. Bidwell (182 U.S. 344, 260-261, 21 S. Ct. 770 (1901)), Mr. Justice Bradley said:

"This District had been a part of the States of Maryland and Virginia. It had been sub­ject to the Constitution, and was a part of the Union of States. The District had never been annexed to it irrevocably. There are steps which can never be taken backward. The tie that connects the United States to the Constitution could not be dissolved, without at least the consent of the Federal and State governments to a formal separa-
tions. The mere cession of the District of Columbia to the Federal Government relinquished the authority of the States, but it did not take it out of the United States or withdraw it from the jurisdiction of the Federal courts. Neither party had ever consented to that con
duction of the cession. If, before the Dis
tic was created, it would have been a fanciful con-ception that the Federal Congress might have executed its power in this manner. The people should be less fortified by the
confidence that the District of Columbia was a corporate body of shareholders, and without any power to exercise its plenary power, may grant suffrages to citizens of the District of Columbia and infer that the constitutional amendment is not necessary.
I am sure, based upon the authority I have cited, no court would disturb legis-
alation passed to grant the rights I propose. In fact, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the courts have suggested we act.
Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in its final form the Civil Rights Act of 1960 is a discriminating act, that in the broadest conceivable conception of the problem, seriously restricts the opportunities for creative exec-
utive leadership, and undertakes the force and majesty of the law.
This legislation rests on a question-
able magic-wand theory that the exercise of voting rights will prove to be the "open sesame" of all other civil rights. The truth of the matter, however, is that our human relations problems touch most facets of our national life and if one accepts the premise that our country cannot afford a double standard in its foreign relations, the issue should be addressed to the total issue and be designed to encourage action to-
ward moderate solutions of all the main problems.
The issues and solutions in our human relations crisis are closely interrelated and it is plain that action— and suc-
ces—in any area affects and influences the struggle to enlarge human rights in other areas. For instance, who would deny that the example set in professional and amateur sports during the last dec-
dennium has not had immeasurable influence on the course of events in housing, edu-
cation, and the use of public facilities?
If in truth our laws not only compel obedience to certain standards but enforce them by a State, then the struggle to enlarge human rights in any area, whether in Federal-mentality, or to empower a Federal court within the District to run its process to sum-
maries and appeals, if any, of the State's courts.
No reason has been advanced why a special statutory court for cases of District citizens could not be authorized to proceed elsewhere in the United States.
be limited by the final, narrow dimensions of the bill. It is also easy to predict from our experience with the 1957 act that the voting rights provisions of this legislation will be the subject of lawsuits and further State legislation designed to make voting more difficult.

The conditions we face in the area of human relations will yield only as moderate opinion is strengthened, and as public opinion is reinforced by the enactment of wisely conceived laws. We need to put an end to this whole problem rather than to put our faith in the pious assumption that all will be well once the millennium of universal suffrage is reached.

Mr. HEMPHELL. Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Senate has made some minor amendments to the so-called civil rights bill of 1969 does not remove from this legislation the dangers it threatens to American freedoms.

It provides a threat to the ballot box of America. It is an unconstitutional theft of the right of the State to control its own personnel in un-American and I predict it will work irreparable harm to our present system of free elections. Once we lose free elections we lose the American way. Look at what is happening in Korea and look at Cuba. You say it cannot happen here. We saw bayonets at Little Rock and many years there were bayonets at elections in my own State. We do not want those days to come again.

We do not need any civil rights legislation this year. We need racial peace, open and honest lines of communication, and a concerted effort to stop the trend toward hatred, mistrust, and turmoil that this and other legislation of a political nature have spurned on. Some will be led to believe that this legislation enabled the seeds of outbreaks; others will shudder with the realization that an ambitious district attorney or Attorney General can use this legislation as a vehicle of havoc and trouble, a grab for power.

People who have not been discriminated against have been told they were discriminated against. People have been called second-class citizens who are not second-class citizens. None of this has helped racial relations, rather it has widened the breach. The continued emphasis on the subject of race relations, aborted and colored by the political objectives, has inspired a constant turmoil in race relations. The papers are full of it every day.

Third. That provisional voting section and the author of the Senate amendment, clearly demonstrates a contrary intent. In response to a question propounded by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Luns)avv], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Up{6]a] in substance replied that, in order to vote provisionally, it was not necessary that the applicant had previously attempted to register and had failed to register.

He based his answer on the theory that, inasmuch as the court had already found that a practice or pattern of racial discrimination existed, it would have been futile for him to make application for registration before the State registrar, and since a court of equity does not deny relief because the petitioner failed to perform a futile act, the court forced the provisional voting order even though he had never made timely application before the registrar.

Not only is such reasoning inconsistent with the legislative intent reflected in the debate in the House before it is manifestly in conflict with the substantive language and procedural provisions of title VI.

Beginning on line 10, page 16 of the bill, I read in pertinent part as follows:

"If the court finds such pattern or practice, any person of such race * * * shall * * * be entitled in * * * order to an order declaring him qualified to vote, upon proof that in any election or elections (1) he is qualified under State law to vote, and (2) he has since such finding by the court been (a) deprived of * * * the opportunity to register to vote * * * or otherwise to qualify to vote.

I emphasize the words "since such finding by the court." This plainly means that all applicants for a voting order from the court must have previously made an effort to register or otherwise qualify to vote, which application must have been made subsequent to the court's finding of discrimination in the original suit. This is the condition precedent to the right to an unconditional voting order; surely the requirement would be no less for the right to a provisional voting order.

In summary, according both to the unequivocal language of the bill and the express purpose of the author of the provisional voting section and the author of the Senate amendment, what Congress intends is:

First. That an application for a voting order cannot be granted unless the applicant has previously been denied the right to register.

Second. That a voting order cannot be granted unless such registration application was received and subsequent to the court's finding that practice or pattern of racial discrimination existed.

Third. That provisional voting section does not amend valid State registration laws.

Fourth. That provisional voting order cannot be granted unless (a) the court has found the existence of a practice or pattern of racial discrimination; (b) the applicant has not previously thereto made application for and been refused registration, and (c) the applicant is "qualified to vote under law.

If, as has been suggested, this has the practical effect of eliminating provisional voting, then it must necessarily be construed that Congress so intended.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, passing this bill today marks an important step on the path of assuring equality for all our citizens in step with the Constitution. The subject has taken many years to achieve this sense the most distinguished Members of this body because it represents a social change of great magnitude to those who believe that we should hold the clock still in that as, well as we can try to do so, and I welcome an advance.

We all realize, however, that the true contest for civil rights for all our citizens, regardless of race, color, or creed. This Nation has made progress in this sense the Civil Rights Act of 1960 is a heartening thing, again advising the world that watches us so closely that we mean what we say, and that we are determined to do so in fact, we enforce constitutional rights for all our citizens.

This lesson will mean much in the world. I hope it is especially noted in South Africa, where force and custom was being applied for months and years. Force is not a policy—it is bankruptcy of policy. This Nation was founded on the principle that all men are created equal, wherever they may be born, and it can only be disturbing and painful to see others deprived of their full rights.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill, even with the Senate amendments. I can add nothing to what I said when this matter was before this House earlier this year. I ask only that my colleagues agree. But I did note here. There is no occasion, no need, no demand for legislation of this character. It is destructive of constitutional principles and personal liberty.
The Senate still lies ahead toward our goal of complete equality for all. Some satisfaction can be felt in our victory for equality in one of the fundamentals of our democracy—the voting booth. The voting reform system established after a century to come this far. How to go in guaranteeing civil rights to Negroes today is over twice as much as we had visualized when debate opened on this bill. This seems true equality. I, for one, pledge my untiring efforts for the benefit of those Negroes who have been denied their civil voting rights for almost a century.

I think probably the greatest one gain to come from this bill is the moral support which will be given to those who seek to have their voting rights established, as well as to we who have been interested in helping them obtain those rights. I personally shall continue to work for decent treatment for those people who have suffered so long. If these rights must come inch by inch, at least we will realize that as Americans they are worth working for. If we can take the experience of the Senate especially during the present session, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution. Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yea's and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The yeas and nays were ordered. The question was taken; and there were—yeas 286, nays 95, answered", not voting 45, as follows: [Roll No. 53]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Speaker, for one, pledge my untiring efforts for the benefit of those Negroes who have been denied their civil voting rights for almost a century.

I think probably the greatest one gain to come from this bill is the moral support which will be given to those who seek to have their voting rights established, as well as to we who have been interested in helping them obtain those rights. I personally shall continue to work for decent treatment for those people who have suffered so long. If these rights must come inch by inch, at least we will realize that as Americans they are worth working for.
So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.
Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Johnson against.
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.
Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Burleson against.
Mr. Brock for, with Mr. Young against.
Mr. Moulter for, with Mr. Pincher against.
Mr. Starnes for, with Mr. Nitze against.
Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Cooley against.
Mr. McCormack for, with Mr. Meader against.
Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Barden against.
Mr. Hayes for, with Mr. Mitchell against.

Until further notice:
Mr. Dent with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Nordblad.
Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Moyle.
Mr. Oliver with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Anderson of Montana with Mr. Jackson.
Mr. Mack with Mr. Derouin.
Mr. McGovern with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Anderson of Minnesota.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Latourette.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Hargis with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Johnson of Arizona with Withrow.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Rogers). If present he would have voted "no." Therefore I wish to change my vote from "yea" to "present."

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. S. Goree). If present she would have voted "yea." I wish to change my vote from "no" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

RECOMPUTING OF RETIRED PAY
Mr. THORNBERY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I present the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 505) for printing in the Record:

Resolution. That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to more than the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11951) to provide for the retirement pay and the repayment contract of the Secretary of the Interior to deliver water to the lands in the third division of the Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of this resolution would take care of an emergency situation that has developed on the Riverton Federal reclamation project in Wyoming. The legislation is designed to provide for the Secretary of the Interior to deliver water to the lands of the third division of the project during the 1860 irrigation season. Information from the farmers on the project and from the Department indicates the water deliveries are needed immediately. The Secretary cannot deliver water to a portion of the project lands because the 10-year development period provided under reclamation law has expired and the repayment contract between the irrigation district and the Department has not been executed.

The third division of the Riverton project is a relatively small public lands project comprising approximately 8,000 acres. The lands were opened to entry May 20, 1958, and the 10-year development period was established to provide for organization of a district and the negotiation and execution of a repayment contract. The petition for organization of the district was finally filed in May of 1957 but litigation followed and there was a year and a half delay before the formation of the district was completed on October 17, 1958. Since that time, negotiations have been carried on between the Bureau of Reclamation and the district, but it has not been possible to conclude all the required steps leading to the execution of the repayment contract. We have been advised by the Department of the Interior that all necessary legal steps have been completed to be completed in the near future. However, since several steps remain to be taken and approval by the Congress of final repayment arrangements will be necessary, the resolution may not be voted on for water deliveries this year and 1961.

Although my committee is displeased that this situation requiring enactment of this resolution has developed before, we believe the contract should have been completed within the allowed time, the committee agrees that water deliveries must be continued to all lands in the project, not only from the standpoint of the welfare of the farmers on the project but also in the interest of protecting the Federal Government's investment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL)?

There was no objection.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960
Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1550) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 11510, with Mr. Muns in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read through section 1 ending on line 4. Are there amendments to this section?

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, today in my district by the little city of Deer Park, and the city of Pasadena, is a beautiful green plain with a beautiful monument marking a hallowed piece of ground in the State of Texas. Today there are bands playing and children laughing and playing on that ground, speeches are being made and the names of Stephen Austin, Davy Crockett, and other great Texas patriots, being mentioned with reverence.

One hundred and twenty-four years ago today the scene was quite different. It was a swamp on the banks of a lazy, sluggish bayou. In that swamp were encamped 1,600 Mexican soldiers under the
Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman mentioned that for the 20 in training now at Johns Hopkins the U.S. Government is paying $80,000. They are asking for authority to train 43 at Johns Hopkins next year, which would cost $4,000 apiece, $40 a month for tuition, resulting in a figure of $172,000 rather than the $80,000 the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. GARY. There is a similar contract with another university, Boston College, I believe.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. GARY. For a similar number.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

In addition, they have broken up the so-called technical aid program so that it is now in several different categories. They started a $20 million program of special assistance which at the admittance is purely and simply technical aid, but because of the commodity portion amounting to more than 10 percent of the total, they decided to take it out of the technical assistance account.

There are seven of those technical aid programs, which branch off in different directions; but I can assure you that the subcommittee will certainly endeavor to bring to the floor matters which will be brought to the floor, and I am sure there are many others in the House who did not expect the Committee on Foreign Affairs to do anything but what they have done, and that is, give the administration practically every dime requested for the foreign handout program. I will be on hand to help the Appropriations Committee cut it down.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MORGAN, Mr. Chairman, I cannot get too excited about the bill we have before us, and I am sure there are many others in the House who did not expect the Committee on Foreign Affairs to do anything but what they have done, and that is, give the administration practically every dime requested for the foreign handout program. I will be on hand to help the Appropriations Committee cut it down.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot get too excited about the bill we have before us, and I am sure there are many others in the House who did not expect the Committee on Foreign Affairs to do anything but what they have done, and that is, give the administration practically every dime requested for the foreign handout program. I will be on hand to help the Appropriations Committee cut it down.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot get too excited about the bill we have before us, and I am sure there are many others in the House who did not expect the Committee on Foreign Affairs to do anything but what they have done, and that is, give the administration practically every dime requested for the foreign handout program. I will be on hand to help the Appropriations Committee cut it down.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. JUDD. Many, many times I used procedures that I thought would save the patient's life or relieve his disease or suffering. Sometimes I was disappointed. Those particular failures failed; but I did not abandon the patient. I kept on trying. I continued to search for a better technique or procedure that would save his life.

Mr. GROSS. Just a moment.

Mr. JUDD. And if the patient died, the undertaker took care of him. Who is going to take care of this corpse known as the taxpayer of the United States if you continue your errant ways in respect to this kind of spending?

Mr. JUDD. If you were to knock this program out, you would not save anything for the taxpayers. You would increase the overall tax burden on them, to pay for the far greater cost of enlarged armed forces of our own.

Mr. GROSS. That is your opinion, and it is not supported by a single fact. Mr. JUDD. I think I am a better friend of the taxpayers than my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is that? I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. I said I think that in supporting this program I am a better friend of the taxpayers and saving them more money now than is my distinguished colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. That, again, is the gentleman's opinion. Of course, the gentleman from Minnesota and the rest of those who apologize for this program say, "Oh, yes, sometime in the dim, distant future—we do not know when, but sometime in the dim, distant future—we will correct all of the waste and inefficiency that has been going on from the time this baby was born."

Well, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. JUDD. Is the gentleman happy about the progress that is being made in the various field programs? Is he not a little disappointed with respect to some of the efforts we have made and are making to solve our farm problems?

Mr. GROSS. At least, whatever the deficiencies of those programs, we have been spending the money in this country.

Mr. JUDD. Of course, 80 percent of the money in this program is spent in this country, in the first instance.

Mr. GROSS. I repeat that Americans are getting some benefit from the farm program, and I do not accept the statement that Congress, for instance, the foreign handout program is spent in this country.

Mr. JUDD. I am sure that the gentleman, representing a farming district in Iowa, will not give up on efforts to get a better program, but I do not think that he has been disappointed in the existing one.

Mr. GROSS. And I do not think Public Law 480 has any solution to the farm problem, either, which the gentleman thinks it is, but I do not.

Mr. JUDD. And to the extent that it is not, we will have to find other and better solutions.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman had a great deal of time during general debate yesterday and I did not have any success in obtaining time.

Mr. BOLTON. The gentleman was not here yesterday. I needed him then.

Mr. GROSS. I was here when the gentleman worked back 21 minutes of time.

Mr. BOLTON. I looked for the gentleman, because I promised that I would, but the gentleman was not here on the floor.

Mr. GROSS. Well, we will not argue about that more than we did yesterday when the gentlewoman from Ohio said that this is a $1,300 million bill when the entire program will cost more than $4 billion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. COOK. Mr. Chairman, I object. Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves that the Committee do now rise and the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized in support of his preferential motion.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania why this exception of $100 million on page 3. The language in the bill reads as follows:

The Fund shall not allocate or commit funds aggregating in excess of $100,000 for use in any country under this title unless (1) an application for such funds has been received for use in such country which is supported in whole or in part by engineering, financial, or other data to indicate reasonably (A) the manner in which it is proposed to use such funds—

Why do you except $100,000?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman first said $100 million.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I mean $100,000. I cannot always keep up with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on figures.

Mr. MORGAN. This is for preliminary engineering studies. You cannot start a project and submit a program unless you have some engineering studies, Mr. GROSS. It says nothing about limiting it to $100,000 for engineering studies.

Mr. MORGAN. In excess of $100,000.

Mr. GROSS. It does not say anything about limiting any project under the Development Loan Fund to $100,000 for engineering services. This pertains to a project involving millions of dollars and the gentleman does not say anything about it.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; a project.

Mr. GROSS. It does not say anything about engineering or management or anything else. But why leave it at $100,000? That could grow into several million dollars in view of the number of projects going on all over the world.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Hager) is the author of this language and the author of the amount, $100,000.

Mr. GROSS. I hope that an amendment will be adopted removing the $100,000 exception and provide that no project can be started regardless of the amount involved without proper planning.

I should like to ask the gentleman how many supergrades are in this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Four.

Mr. GROSS. Why?

Mr. MORGAN. The administration asked for eight. The committee cut it down to four. Last year, if I remember, the gentleman remembers, the committee in the Inspector General-Comptroller. The committee felt that two of these supergrades should be for the new agency, the Comptroller-General, so we raised it to ten to go to the Office of the Coordinator and one to the TCA.

Mr. GROSS. Congress gave this outfit 10 supergrades last year; did it not?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. And now you want four this year.

Mr. MORGAN. You remember, the year before they cut it back from 50 to 35. That was in 1958.

Mr. GROSS. There must have been good justification for it or we would not have been able to make a cut in this gloved bill. I do not know why you should want 4 additional supergrades in this year, in view of the fact that you obtained 10 last year, and I shall offer an amendment at the proper time, if no one else does, to eliminate that request.

Earlier, when the State Department bill was before the House, I will say to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Passman), I mentioned the Milton Eisenhower-Johns Hopkins operation in connection with the Foreign Service Training Institute, or whatever it is.

I pointed out at that time that they have one year in an engineering, it is three, 15,000 dollars a year for a-year instructors for some 20 students.

Mr. PASSMAN. If the gentleman will yield, their salaries have been raised since that time. This fact was brought out in our subcommittee hearings.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad the gentleman from Louisiana called the attention of the House to some of the operations that are going on around here. I assume there is no authorization in this bill for the military assistance training school over in Arlington, Virginia, or in the American Research Institute where the American Research Institute is paying a retired general $14,000 a year. In addition to the $6,000 a year he is drawing as a retirement pay.

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Chairman, will he yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, and compliment him on the fine statement he made yesterday in opposition to this bill.

Mr. PILCHER. Speaking about that $14,000, there is a statement here where the Development Loan Fund has earmarked millions of dollars and the project has not yet been devised. In other words, the money has been earmarked but they have not yet even decided on a project.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Here is some unclassified information I obtained from...
the security outfit a few days ago. If you get the classified information, I do not know whether you could carry it around or not, but this is a list of the Operation Admin Loan Fund officers. I recall a couple of years ago that I raised a question concerning $5-million loan to Yugoslavia to purchase diesel locomotives. I asked at that time whether the locomotives would be bought in this country and I was assured they would be. Now I find in this record that they are being purchased abroad, $5 million worth, and the CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was intensely interested in the debate that has been going on here particularly in the field of educational development in the area of education. We have built or are presently building nine similar contracts with the University of Oklahoma. Agricultural cooperation administration negotiated an agricultural contract between Cornell University and the University of the Philippines. The technical cooperation administration negotiated an educational contract between the State of Sao Paulo, one of the most active of industrial areas, lacked trained lower-level executives, and is now working with which to promote industrial growth. At the request of the Ministry of Education, a training within industry program was instituted which involved (1) job instruction training, (2) job methods training, (3) job safety training, (4) conference on management, and (5) business relations within industry. About 30,000 foremen and supervisors were trained in these courses. This program is being continued both in 1958 and 1959.

As a followup on this training a newer program is now being organized in the same area for skilled technicians.

The Brazilian Air Corps had developed an aviation engineering college at Sao Jose de Campos. Brazil had no aviation industry and a study of the records of graduates indicated that they were absorbed in industries other than aviation. With the assistance of a survey conducted in Brazil by Mr. Chairman.

The textile industry is the second largest industry in Brazil employing over 400,000 workers. The training of technicians has been conducted to determine manpower needs of this industry; and it disclosed an acute shortage of foremen, departmental supervisors, and highly skilled technicians. Again ICA technical assistance aided in organizing a textile institute in Rio, on the junior college level, which is now able to fill this gap in manpower needs. This project was phased out in 1959.

Guatemala: Guatemala has a population reported to be about 80 percent illiterate. The compulsory military training law brings with it about a 20 percent increase per year. With ICA assistance about 40 army officers have been trained in the techniques of training adult education classes in conducting literacy classes for new recruits. About 1,000 men at a time are taken for this training, and the program is being reduced considerably.

Paraguay: As in other developing countries, Paraguay, while agricultural, needs skilled technicians. ICA assisted in the development of a vocational school in Asuncion which is now producing a trained corps of servicemen in a variety of occupations. About 800 students are enrolled; a school was established in 1958 when the city of Asuncion installed a water system for the first time.
There were, however, no plumbers to Paraguay, of these industries, chemical and industrial school established special courses for teachers from approximately an improvement in their quality, and at the vocational agriculture, through the vocational industrial education through the Afghan Institute of Technology; (e) vocational agriculture, the through the vocational agricultural engineers. In the paid program; and (f) a major project in the teaching (b) teacher education through the ... national programs for study in the fields of elementary and secondary education; teacher training (f) vocational industrial education through the Afghani Institute of Technology; (e) vocational agriculture, through the vocational agricultural engineers. In the paid program; and (f) a major project in the teaching (b) teacher education through the... United States, primarily for the Jordanians who have put into practice that which they have learned, under the Jordanian Ministry of Education and the Demonstration... Jordan, which had no organized teacher education program prior to ICA assistance in 1952, now has preserved training facilities for about 500 and has increased its in-service training and summer school programs to approximately 200 to 2,500 annually. This growth has been largely due to the efforts of ICA and the Jordanians who have put into practice that which they have learned, under the auspices of ICA.

Afghanistan is one of the border countries of the free world. While Soviet bloc economic assistance is provided to Afghanistan, it is the only bilateral effort which is presently permitted in the field of education which is of major concern to us, in the battle for men's minds. It already affects (a) higher education through assistance which is being given to the college of agriculture and engineering to assist them in administrative work, and to the affiliated institute of education— and through the quick acceptance of many of the recommendations made late in 1959 by the University of Illinois team which carried out a comprehensive survey of Kabul University; (b) two-year junior-high school training through the Institute of Education and in-service teacher training courses; (c) a large segment of elementary education; (d) vocational industrial education through the Afghan Institute of Technology; (e) vocational agriculture, through the vocational agricultural engineers. In the paid program; and (f) a major project in the teaching of English as the "second language" of the various soviets is an important one. The intensive program of action in education are presently under discussion with Afghan authorities. India: India's effort to develop her economy has already been accomplished through the ICA technical cooperation program. During an initial phase from fiscal year 1953 to 1958, assistance was provided, through contracts with American universities, for developing and strengthening 11 existing engineering and educational institutions. During that phase, which ended in fiscal year 1958, 45 U.S. engineering professors served a total of 67 months in India, and 106 Indians who had been trained in the United States, primarily for the training of teachers, have been back to the work of the... A new national normal school with a capacity of 1,000 students has been erected, and partially equipped. Plans have been made for the construction of (1) a new elementary demonstra... in the cutting edge. At the level of 62 is estimated that there are from 750,000 to 1 million children of elementary school age not attending any schools, in the rural area, the military bases and the new military training facilities. As a means of attacking the problem, assistance has been given with the construction of badly needed buildings and classrooms. From 1955 to 1959, 21,556 elementary school classrooms and 192 secondary school classrooms have been constructed with U.S. assistance. Working drawings for 38 new science laboratories have been made for 16 of these facilities have been completed.

A new national normal school with a capacity of 1,000 students has been erected, and partially equipped. Plans have been made for the construction of (1) a new elementary demonstration school, (2) two new normal schools, and 3) a new faculty building. Five permanent training facilities for the new Phu Tho Vocational School have been completed except for the construction of the interior. The plans for the new faculty building, for the new construction and a new building for the school shops. The preparation of architectural plans and arranging for construction bids is well under way for the Hue Technical School and Nha Trang Apprenticeship School.

Without the necessary instructional materials, teaching and learning are severely handicapped. To meet the urgent need for textbooks USOM assisted with the printing of 1 million and approximately 1 million leaflets, pamphlets, etc., of which 80 percent have been distributed.

Korea: Through higher education the economic development of a country may be greatly accelerated. In Korea, the Seoul National University has been given assistance with 4 of its 12 colleges. Righty-three of the 129 Seoul National University staff members who were trained in the United States for training have returned to the university and are actively engaged in using improved teaching methods and in the development of curricula, and general administration leadership.

The eradication of illiteracy through education is a major concern to many countries in the Far East, including Thailand. In the case of Thailand there is an emergency of providing some training for new teachers, who are greatly in demand.
a series of summer schools has been offered. Through the 1960 school year, 30,000 teachers (graduates from the sixth grade) have received their only training in these courses. As a means of providing more adequately prepared elementary teachers, a national elementary school for training in the southeast of Asia was set up. The aims of the project are to meet the rapidly developing need for well-qualified engineers, especially in the fields of water resources, highways, sanitation, and hydraulic engineering.

Regional projects: A regional approach to the technical assistance in education was introduced in the Far East. Two projects are currently underway: (1) The Southeast Asia regional English project and (2) the SEATO Graduate School of Engineering.

The regional English project aims to increase the number and standards of English-speaking persons in Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam. The four phases of this project include the training of 11,000 teachers in regional centers, 12 nationwide conferences with 1,800 educators participating and 60 workshops and seminars. Another 20,000 teachers received in-service training. A large number of these teachers had only a secondary education.
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be given to existing colleges in tropical Africa and aid in the opening of new schools. Is there anything foolish about that?

I would not wish any confusion incident to a debate on the touchy subject of foreign aid to becloud the soundness of the special African program. We rejoice that lands long closed to Europeans are exercising the liberty of independence and the best help we can extend in doing our share in preparing them for the large responsibilities of self-government is in the field of education.

We have almost missed the boat in tropical Africa. We have been so absorbed in the Far East that we almost forgot there was an entire Africa. Now we are trying to do something sound and constructive into this well and give the results are impressive. In 1947 every man said they would not love us, or trade with us. Is there not the great increase in the United States participation in this world-wide program, there can be no insinuation about the value we will receive from either of those high-standing institutions. We will receive full value and more.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, every year since the foreign aid bill authorization and appropriation have been before this House, I have voted for them. I shall vote for this bill and for the one that will come from the Committee on Appropriations.

In the days when even my friends on my own side of the aisle saw not to support all of this program, I introduced the amendment to give the President his full request for foreign aid. So, Mr. Chairman, as much as any Member in this Chamber I have a right to say now what I shall say.

I am advised that the great Committee of this House today re-inspired by a 6 to 6 vote to report out the distressed areas bill. With many Members on both side of the aisle, with our Republican friends, they have joined with me for several years, my friends on the left and the right, to make that bill law. So this is not partisan. Republicans get just as hungry and just as jobless as Democrats in 50 States. I have in my hand this bill, chapter by chapter.

Economic assistance for the nations of the world, so many hundred million dollars.

Point 4 for the nations of the world, so many hundred million dollars.

Technical aid for the nations of the world, so many hundred million dollars.

The distressed areas bill is nothing more and nothing less than a political 4 bill for the hungry and the jobless in the States of the United States of America. Yet the Committee on Rules says, "Six to six, no rule," and we will be forced to resort to the difficult Calendar day tactic to give this House an opportunity to vote on this measure, but we will overwhelmingly support this re-changing of the House's favor to aid. And I will support it. Now, you bleeding hearts, who all day yesterday and today proclaimed to high heaven and to this membership, Mr. Chairman, and asked to help the distressed areas of the world, I come to you in these 5 minutes, and every one of you who votes for this bill—you are the ones to whom I speak—every one of you who votes for this bill and be a good Samaritan to help these fine people do the job necessary to be done for their security and progress?

We spending certain amounts in responsible universities to train capable and capable and capable personnel, the answer is: We want and need people educated in this program. We do not want the program administered by people who do not understand it. Of course not. We want competent people who have the know-how to do it.

When our people in the executive departments choose a Rhodes Scholar as well as Johns Hopkins University, two excellent and responsible institutions for training purposes for top personnel to carry out the bipartisan program, we must assume our responsibilities is the continuation of this program. We must assume our responsibilities to our friends and allies regardless of party.

Do not today to voices that might sound as if there is a large disagreement among the American people on the worth of this program and I direct the Members to debate with them. There is not. This program passes this House by almost a two-thirds majority practically every Congress. This present bill to continue the mutual security program will go through by a very large majority in this Congress.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. The gentleman said they would not love us, or trade with us. Is there not the great danger that some of the most hated groups in the world if we do not accept our world responsibility for mutual security and progress.

Let me show you what would happen. Shall we pull our troops back of the 38th parallel in Korea, and let the whole country cave in by withdrawing the support for South Korean forces jointly held the line with us? Shall we pull our support from Formosa and let red China endanger and breach our U.S. Western defenses based on the island chain in the western Pacific? Shall we withdraw our support for Greece and Turkey and Pakistan, and let the Middle East fall and head for its destruction? Should we withdraw our support of Israel holding the line with us? Shall we pull our support from the U.S. Economic assistance for the nations of the world, so many hundred million dollars.

The economic assistance for the nations of the world, so many hundred million dollars.

Technical aid for the nations of the world, so many hundred million dollars.

The distressed areas bill is nothing more and nothing less than a political 4 bill for the hungry and the jobless in the States of the United States of America. Yet the Committee on Rules says, "Six to six, no rule," and we will be forced to resort to the difficult Calendar day tactic to give this House an opportunity to vote on this measure, but we will overwhelmingly support this re-changing of the House's favor to aid. And I will support it. Now, you bleeding hearts, who all day yesterday and today proclaimed to high heaven and to this membership, Mr. Chairman, and asked to help the distressed areas of the world, I come to you in these 5 minutes, and every one of you who votes for this bill—you are the ones to whom I speak—every one of you who votes for this bill...
and does not appeal to the Committee on Rules to send the point 4 program for America here, I say, listen: We need one vote. We need one vote in the Committee of the Whole, and the Democrats voted for it. Two Democrats did not vote for it. Four and two are six: six to now. Give me one vote. My friends, in 30 States not a single American is unemployed, and if you do not know what a depressed area is, God forbid you ever find out. If you do not know, I hope you never will. So, on this day, Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of the underprivileged of the world and the distressed areas of the world, and when you and I vote for a point 4 program for the nations of the world, in God's name let us vote at least $200 million out of this $2 billion for a point 4 program for your brothers and sisters at home. I will vote for this.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which is a statement of policy, is further amended by adding a statement to the following:

"(f) The sense of the Congress that

(1) the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations; and

(2) the United States secures navigational rights in international waterways.

"It is the sense of the Congress that this Act is not adequate to meet this situation.

The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Committee of the Whole, is authorized, if in his opinion this is necessary for the national security and national defense of the United States, to enter into such agreements as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of Section 2 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and the provisions in Section 2 of the Act of 1954, as amended, which are not inconsistent with this Act.

The sense of the Congress is that the Secretary of State is authorized to enter into such agreements as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of Section 2 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and the provisions in Section 2 of the Act of 1954, as amended, which are not inconsistent with this Act.

The Clerk read as follows:

"ANNUAL AUTHORIZATION FOR MILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR 1961"

"SEC. 101. Section 103(a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to authorizations of appropriations for military assistance, is amended by striking out "1961" and inserting "1959" and inserting "1960".

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENTLEY: On page 2, immediately above line 20, insert the following:

"ANNUAL AUTHORIZATION FOR MILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR 1961"

"SEC. 101. Section 103(a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to authorizations of appropriations for military assistance, is amended by striking out "1961" and inserting "1959" and inserting "1960".

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, last year when the House approved the mutual security legislation for 1959 the authorization for military assistance was retained on an annual basis. The House, in conference with Members of the other body, the House conference accepted a change in the language which in effect gave the House discretion to authorize $1,318 million for military assistance. That is because of the language adopted in the conference report last year. This open end authorization which the House, when the bill was initially passed last year, did not adopt, was adopted subsequently in conference. That open end authorization should be terminated and we should insist that starting next year, when we have the fiscal year 1962 bill before us, we should have the administration go back to the customary practice of requesting annual authorizations.

It is my understanding that one of the reasons that the conference report was accepted on that basis was the belief that the military assistance appropriation would this year be contained in the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense. Because of the action of the House Appropriations Committee that was not the case. So I say that if the House desires to continue for giving this open end authorization, such justification no longer exists, thanks to the action of the House Appropriations Committee.

I respectfully submit that this authorization should be terminated with fiscal 1961, and we should get back to the practice of annual authorizations for fiscal 1962. I think the Members of the House would agree with me that this is the way: to have an annual review both for authorization and appropriation purposes of a sum as large as $2 billion. Which, of course, is the administration's appropriation request for military assistance in this current year.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in objection to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday during my remarks on the bill I had something to say about this very amendment. I should like to say it again.

This new procedure did not originate in the Foreign Affairs Committee or in the House. The mutual security bill passed by the Senate last year contained an authorization of annual appropriations for military assistance and provided a continuing authorization for military assistance. The Senate conference adopted this measure and it is part of the new procedure. The conference was not asked to make a determination, this is part of the new procedure. The conference was not asked to make a determination, this is part of the new procedure.
1960 and such sums as may be necessary for 1961 and 1962. This compromise was accepted by the House and is now contained in the law.

Mr. BENTLEY. If the gentleman will refer to the 1962 date.

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

I still have an open mind as to whether this action of last year is a good idea. One reason for doing as we did was that, Executive reorganization has had to include the military assistance appropriation in the regular military appropriation bill. They said that was because Congress had withheld authorization, which would make this impossible.

Our Appropriations Committee has decided, however, that an Executive recommendation in this respect, and the military assistance appropriation is being handled as part of the mutual security appropriation. I personally favor the way in which the Appropriations Committee is proceeding, although I accepted last year's compromise in good faith and would prefer not to make any change in the authorization procedure during the present Congress.

The gentleman from Michigan next year will have left this great legislative body. Mr. BENTLEY. I value his work on the committee. He has worked very hard on the mutual security bill and was one of the outstanding leaders in helping to eliminate waste and inefficiency in the program.

The gentleman knows that due to this prodding next year we will consider undertaking a comprehensive review of the entire Mutual Security Act. We are here today dealing with the basic act of 1954. Due to the prodding of the gentleman from Michigan, which he followed up by an amendment offered in committee during the markup of the bill requiring that the entire act be rewritten. We are fully aware that few if any are well acquainted any more with all the provisions of the act. I can assure the gentleman that if I am back in Congress next year I will do whatever is necessary to have the rewriting a page by page of the 1954 act. I think it is time for it to be reexamined. I oppose the amendment simply on the ground that next year during the markup of the bill and any subsequent authorization he seeks to eliminate today will be fully considered and taken care of. Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure it is understood that the fact that in these 2 fiscal years no ceiling on military assistance ever appears in the House Military Authorization bill does not mean that the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the House of Representatives thereby lose control over this $2 billion program. No ceiling is legislated annually on appropriations for our own Armed Forces, and that is a $40-billion-a-year program. The Committee on Armed Services does not legislate before these hearings an authorization bill saying that the Committee on Appropriations is authorized to appropriate for our Defense Department not to exceed X billions of dollars. This Committee on Appropriations determines what it believes to be the proper amount and brings it to the House for action. The waiver on military assistance authorizations adopted last year on the initiative of the other body was to try out for 2 years the same mechanism that we have existed previously to avoid any difficulty in providing for our own armed services. If you look through the hearings, you will find that our Committee on Foreign Affairs had extensive discussions this year on the military assistance program. You will find the record of detailed testimony by Secretary of Defense Gates and his staff. It begins on page 69.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. JUDD. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEYER: On page 2, insert between lines 20 and 21 the following:

'Sec. 101. Section 102 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is amended by adding the following new paragraph: 'No part of any appropriation authorized by this Act shall be used to carry out any agreement for cooperation which is required to be submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy under section 123(d) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.'

Renumber section 101 on page 2 as section 102.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to provide that funds authorized under the Mutual Security Act shall not be used to carry out any agreement for cooperation which is required to be submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Basically, it is the same amendment as that offered by Congressman Bentley last year to the Mutual Security Appropriation Act of 1959. The difference is that we have additional information, secured after a great deal of effort, which says that we are not using parts of the military funds under the Mutual Security Act for the implementation of these agreements. Last year we did not have this information, and I will try to bring the story up to date.

For instance, last year when I asked whether any Joint Atomic Energy Commission funds would be used for such a purpose, the Chairman assured me that:

There is no direct appropriation in the bill for that purpose.

This is recorded in the Congressional Record for July 21, 1959.

It seems only reasonable and fair for the House to go along for the additional year with the compromise that was reached last year. Then of necessity we will have to act and will have had further experience on which to base our decision.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if the present funding of this program is retained in the bill, no authorization will be required for the fiscal year 1962.

Mr. JUDD. No authorization will be required.

Mr. BENTLEY. In other words, no new authorization will be required until the year 1962. That is the calendar year.

Mr. JUDD. Yes, the calendar year 1962. This year's mutual security bill and next year's bill will not require authorization by this committee or the Congress. But this committee can take action on the appropriations, if at any time it thinks there is something that requires such action. So, Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. MEYER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORGAN: On page 2, insert between lines 20 and 21 the following:

'Sec. 101. Section 102 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is amended by adding the following new paragraph: 'No part of any appropriation authorized by this Act shall be used to carry out any agreement for cooperation which is required to be submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy under section 123(d) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.'

Renumber section 101 on page 2 as section 102.

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. I gladly yield to my colleague from Michigan.

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

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman was one of the conference last year.

Mr. BENTLEY. Was it not the thinking of the conference that the reason, or at least one of the reasons for adopting this version initiated by the other body, was that the military assistance appropriation was going to be treated as part of the Defense Department appropriations?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; that was one reason.

Mr. BENTLEY. Another reason was the desire to make possible more long-range planning with regard to the foreign components of our national defense, as we do now for the domestic components. It begins on page 69.

Mr. JUDD. It is also subject to the annual scrutiny and review of the legislation. Last year we did not have the military assistance program.

Mr. BENTLEY. How possible is this long-range planning in the field of military assistance as long as the program is subject to the annual scrutiny and review of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. JUDD. It is also subject to the annual scrutiny and review of the Committee on Appropriations, the same as our own Armed Forces are subject to the annual scrutiny and review of the Committee on Armed Services and subject to the annual scrutiny and review of the Joint Committee on Appropriations, which deals with our Armed Forces.

The other body wanted to make this waiver of annual authorizations a permanent arrangement. In the conference we compromised on 2 years. That is enough to give us a fair trial. In 1962, automatically, this matter will come back to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and to the House of Representatives when it considers this legislation, to decide whether to extend the waiver for another period or allow reversion to the previous practice of annual authorizations.
I asked Chairman Morgan of the Foreign Affairs Committee whether mutual security funds would be used for this purpose, when he discussed the Conference Committee Report. He said, "I do not think there is any involvement unless it is involved in military money for the NATO organization." This is recorded in the Congressional Record for July 22, 1959.

When Congressman Bennett of Florida offered an amendment to the Mutual Security Appropriation Act to prevent the use of funds for this purpose, subcommittee chairman Mr. Passman stated:

I can assure the gentleman there are no funds for the purpose against which he places a limitation.

This appears in the Congressional Record dated July 28, 1959.

All these gentlemen were reporting to the best of their knowledge. Therefore the House at that time did not know as much as we now know. Some of the funds actually are being and have been used for that purpose.

What is the reason why I object to such use of these funds? To begin with, my amendment would not stop the sharing of nuclear materials and information authorized under the Atomic Energy Act, but it would prevent the use of mutual security funds for such a purpose.

We also know that the spreading of nuclear knowledge and know-how does not necessarily add to mutual security, but may easily create a situation of mutual mistrust. Mr. Bennett of the nature of the nuclear weapon system, if distributed to additional countries.

Furthermore, the major delivery of nuclear warheads will be by missiles and jet planes which can be increasingly maintained on our home bases rather than in the hands of our allies or friendly powers which at certain times may be our enemies. At other times may not be so friendly. I say that it is risky to give this weapon assistance to other countries.

Furthermore, there is a growing uneasiness among people as to the actual wisdom of our allowing nuclear-sharing agreements to be negotiated, especially without direct congressional debate and approval of the agreements. I say that the vote on the Bennett amendment to the Mutual Security Appropriation Act last year, when 61 stood against it, as compared with 137 for it, is proof in favor of my argument.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MEYER. I would ask the gentleman to consider withdrawing his objection, for that purpose, my special favor, as I do want to explain the issue as thoroughly as I can.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, earlier reports this year of administration plans to share the nuclear warheads themselves caused a good bit of confusion and a storm of protest. I direct your attention to the Congressional Record of February 17, when I spoke on the subject, and to February 9, when the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield] spoke on the subject.

This amendment that I propose at this time would be concrete evidence that the sense of Congress is against extending the nuclear weapons club. This is a road to peace in the world, and will lead to a sense of security because nuclear weapons will be under the control of the United States. I do not believe that the spreading of this material to other countries will add in any way to our strength.

This amendment will present the Congress with a much-needed opportunity to open the mutual security funds and the extent of nuclear sharing to which the United States should be committed. This debate, to a partial extent, took place last year, but I believe that it is currently clearly in the public interest that we have more discussion of the subject.

It is possible to change my amendment, to modify it so that we would make it not only against the actual transfer of the nuclear weapons warheads themselves. This would at least definitely prevent such a transfer which earlier was contemplated by the administration, and even suggested as possible without congressional authorization. However, the latest reports are that President Eisenhower, in a letter to Premier Khrushchev, said:

The United States has no present intention of sharing nuclear weapons with its allies. I think an amendment of this type will reassure our own people and the rest of the world that we are going to try to prevent such a transfer.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Meyers].

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MEYER. I would ask the gentleman to consider withdrawing his objection, for that purpose, my special favor, as I do want to explain the issue as thoroughly as I can.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, earlier reports this year of administration plans to share the nuclear warheads themselves caused a good bit of confusion and a storm of protest. I direct your attention to the Congressional Record of February 17, when I spoke on the subject, and to February 9, when the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield] spoke on the subject.

This amendment that I propose at this time would be concrete evidence that the sense of Congress is against extending the nuclear weapons club. This is a road to peace in the world, and will lead to a sense of security because nuclear weapons will be under the control of the United States. I do not believe that the spreading of this material to other countries will add in any way to our strength.

This amendment will present the Congress with a much-needed opportunity to open the mutual security funds and the extent of nuclear sharing to which the United States should be committed. This debate, to a partial extent, took place last year, but I believe that it is currently clearly in the public interest that we have more discussion of the subject.

It is possible to change my amendment, to modify it so that we would make it not only against the actual transfer of the nuclear weapons warheads themselves. This would at least definitely prevent such a transfer which earlier was contemplated by the administration, and even suggested as possible without congressional authorization. However, the latest reports are that President Eisenhower, in a letter to Premier Khrushchev, said:

The United States has no present intention of sharing nuclear weapons with its allies. I think an amendment of this type will reassure our own people and the rest of the world that we are going to try to prevent such a transfer.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Meyers].

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MEYER. I would ask the gentleman to consider withdrawing his objection, for that purpose, my special favor, as I do want to explain the issue as thoroughly as I can.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.
committee cut it to $750 million. Finally the appropriation was $695 million. Now, this figure in the bill is $49 million less than requested this year. $20 million less than appropriated last year.

This defense support money goes to 12 countries; most of them are right up against the Soviet-Sino border. These are countries that are facing the Communist line. I think a cut of $50 million would do serious damage to 12 of our best friends, and I oppose the amendment.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have got to understand what defense support is, first, before we can vote intelligently on this amendment. From the discussion of numbers, aside from the question of the amount involved, defense support, although it is known and treated as economic aid, actually in effect is not economic aid, because the purpose of defense support is to buy uniforms for the soldiers, to house the soldiers of our allies, to feed the soldiers of our allies in order to make and present an effective fighting force against a common enemy.

Economic assistance, as it is generally known and referred to, is money that is appropriated for special assistance, money for particular projects in a country that we find is needy, like community water development, malaria eradication, medical research, improved education and vocational projects for technical assistance, where it must be given to countries so that they can be taught how to grow products, learn sanitation, operate machines and many other forms of economic assistance. Defense support is an aid to the military. It is not economic assistance in the sense that we intend it or as generally referred to. If you are giving a good, if he has not got a uniform, if he has not got an automobile in which he may be carried to the front, if he has not got some means whereby the fighting instruments can be effectively used?

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I move to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I am sure the gentleman is not implying that defense support funds are used for military hardware or military uniforms.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Defense support does not go for military hardware, that is true, but defense support is used for the purchase of uniforms, food and sustenance for the soldiers for which we contribute money for military assistance.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not true that the maintenance and support of the soldier falls within expenditures from military assistance funds and that the defense support funds are used for the economic support of the recipient countries?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Well, the line is very narrow, I will admit. However, when we talk of aiding the military, it is true that it goes to the country, but that country has got to support those soldiers that it puts on the line for the protection of the free world, and unless it is in a position to call it economic assistance, call it that if you will—but nevertheless, without this additional money in the way of defense support, those soldiers would have hardware and nothing else. And, as I said before, you cannot have a soldier without a uniform, without a truck to take him to the front and various other means for the soldier to become, as I said before, an effective fighting man.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, as the report points out, there are two aspects of the defense support program. One is for specific economic purposes, and the other is for general financial support of the recipient nation. I am sure the gentleman is aware of that statement in the report and I think it ought to be made clear to the Committee that defense support funds do not have so direct a military application.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we need to remember that while defense support is indeed economic assistance, it is economic assistance for a military purpose. There is nothing more of our own national defense in this particular item than in anything else in the bill because this is the economic assistance that enables 12 exceedingly important countries to make the armed forces we believe to be necessary for their and our defense.

Our military planners first sit down with these countries that are strategically located, and they tell them what it costs to provide just the pay, the medical research, improved education and the social welfare of one American soldier. It is $3,859 per year. Members of the Committee will look at page 20 of the report, they will see what it costs to provide just the pay, the allowance, subsistence and clothing of a soldier in the army. It is $1,677 per year. At the other end of the scale is shown the cost of the same items for a soldier on Formosa. It is $167 a year. The military requirement is $59 per month. We do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that our own greatest military shortage is in manpower for conventional forces, I believe that we will not want to take any action that is involved in further reducing these funds.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. PILCHER. Is it not true that when we allocate so many dollars for defense support for X country, they can spend that money for almost anything they want to; they can build roads with that money?

Mr. JUDD. Projects must each be agreed upon individually, but nonproject support can go to support the country's budget; that is correct.

Mr. PILCHER. There is not much difference between defense support and economic aid. They can spend it any way they want to.

Mr. JUDD. Each project is negotiated bilaterally between the United States and the recipient country in terms of need, method and cost, so there is not such latitude as the gentleman suggests.

Mr. Chairman, this item has already been cut $160 million below the request of last year. When we consider that by this type of assistance we are getting 3 million well-trained soldiers strategically located, and that our own greatest military shortage is in manpower for conventional forces, I believe that we will not want to take any action that is involved in further reducing these funds.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.
Mr. ROWALSKI. Would any of these funds be used to support the Korean police force which has been so tragically effective in repressing the people who are demonstrating for their freedom, for their right to vote in a free election?

Mr. Chairman, if it is wise to go on with the Defense Loan Fund, I am pleased to go on with it. I have been kept informed as to the progress which has been made by the Congress with the result that waste­ful practices were allowed to persist. The most serious problem relating to the mutual security program is the quality of its administration, and I am convinced that the best guarantee that the administration of the program will be improved is that Congress do a better job of riding herd on it.

At the same time I am aware that there is a question of executive privilege involved and that nothing we can do in the Congress can modify the Constitu­tion.

I hope that the adoption of this amendment will provide the executive with an additional inducement to make available to the Congress the informa­tion which it desires. At the same time, I must concede that the President will have the final say in this matter until such time as the Supreme Court may be called upon to reach a decision as to the meaning of and limitations on executive privilege.

Mr. HARDY. I appreciate the committee's acceptance of this amendment.

The problem of securing necessary in­formation has been difficult for com­mittees of Congress on both sides of the Hill. One of the major difficulties has been the reluctance on the part of the Administration to provide the type of information which is in the public interest. In the past any discussion of executive privilege at this time would be completely academic because it is not applicable to the amendment I have offered.

The President derives his powers from two sources, the Constitution and the Congress. In this particular case, the powers which he exercises under the de­fense support portion of the act is under the Mutual Security Act do not arise under the Constitu­tion, but flow directly from con­gressional grant. This provision makes the exercise of this power—indeed the very existence of this power—condi­tioned upon complete cooperation by the executive branch with the Congress in the provision of needed information.

Weaker measures were not sufficient to insure the Congress the information it requires for wise performance of its particular duties under the Constitu­tion. To my knowledge, the President goes to the very heart of the issue by providing expressly that during any time when refusal of requested information persists all authority to exercise the powers granted the President by the defense support portion of the act is suspended and becomes effective again only after the information requested is fully given.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re­marks at this point in the Record.

Mr. KRYL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Amendment offered by Mr. KRYL: On page 3, immediately below line 5, insert the fol­lowing:

"(a) In the first sentence of section 121(a), which relates to the authority of the President to furnish defense support, insert, immediately before the period at the end thereof the following proviso: ' Provided, That all financial reports, expenditures of, and other data to indicate reasonably the exercise of this power—indeed the very existence of this power—be made available to the Congress.'"

And reletter the following subsections accordingly.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, the lan­guage of this amendment is similar to other language in the bill, but it is placed in a little different spot. My purpose is to make it unmistakably clear that the President has no authority to construe any operations under this title unless full and complete information is given to the Congress.

Mr. MORGAN. If the gentleman will yield the floor to me, I have been kept informed as to the progress which has been made by the Congress with the result that waste­ful practices were allowed to persist. The most serious problem relating to the mutual security program is the quality of its administration, and I am convinced that the best guarantee that the administration of the program will be a better one of riding herd on it.

In the case of the foreign aid program, only by constantly reexamining this program can these objectives be attained and only by con­stant vigilance on the part of Congress can the Administrators of the program be kept to the course charted out by the Congress itself.

I am happy that the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee have pro­vided that these amendments will be acceptable and I trust that they will be retained in the bill when it finally be­comes a law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentle­man from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Amendment offered by Mr. MORGAN: On page 3, immediately below line 5, insert the fol­lowing:

"(b) In the second sentence of section 123(b), which relates to the authority of the President to furnish defense support, insert the fol­lowing proviso: ' Provided, That the President derives his powers from two sources, the Constitution and the Congress. In this particular case, the powers which he exercises under the de­fense support portion of the act is under the Mutual Security Act do not arise under the Constitu­tion, but flow directly from con­gressional grant. This provision makes the exercise of this power—indeed the very existence of this power—be made available to the Congress.'"

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORGAN: On page 3, immediately below line 5, insert the fol­lowing:

"(a) In the first sentence of section 121(a), which relates to the authority of the President to furnish defense support, insert, immediately before the period at the end thereof the following proviso: ' Provided, That all financial reports, expenditures of, and other data to indicate reasonably the exercise of this power—indeed the very existence of this power—be made available to the Congress.'"

And reletter the following subsections accordingly.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re­marks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. There have been occasions when the Committee and the Administration have disagreed on the manner in which the legislative intent of this amendment was to be interpreted.

The amendment offered by the gentle­man from Connecticut has been called upon to vote on the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Virginia. The amendment was agreed to.
Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there has been a foreign loan or bill before this committee that so impressed me with the memory that Adolf Hitler has not been conjured up as one of the reasons why it was necessary to continue ladling out money all over the world. We have fought two wars since then. The Draft Act was passed, but still we hear about Hitler and the Draft Act.

Reference was made to the distressed-areas bill. I say to you—continue this program—continue the development loan program, all the rest of the soft loans, plus this giveaway program, and you will have more. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], if he has fought two wars since the Draft Act was passed, but still we hear about Hitler and the Draft Act. When the appropriation bill comes up to provide the money for this giveaway program, I have no doubt that we will hear more about Hitler and the Draft Act.

As the chairman of the committee has indicated, the language which this bill contains is a modification of an amendment which I sent to the committee for its consideration. Now I suggested the figure of $100,000, with the idea that there are occasions when some planning funds are needed, which ought not to be completely eliminated. It may be the figure of $100,000 is excessive and I am willing to bring it down to $50,000, but in spite of that fact, I want to keep this thing just as tight as I can and keep it on a businesslike basis, but I still think, within a limited amount of authority excepted from the restrictions of this subsection.

Mr. Chairman, actually there are going to be very, very few cases when an earmarking of as little as $50,000 which will ever be requested. I hope my substitute amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARDY: On page 3, line 22, strike out "or commit" and insert in lieu thereof "reserve, earmark, commit, or otherwise set aside." On page 3, line 24, strike out "(1)". On page 4, line 4, strike out all that follows "unemployed in your districts" and insert in lieu thereof "unemployed in your districts who are mutually concerned. At that time I further want to compliment the foreign countries and they, in turn, buying our securities? As I understand it, they now own some $11 billion of our securities. How silly can we get—giving money to foreign countries or other of the foreign handout program. I repeat, continue to vote for this kind of legislation and you are going to have more unemployed. More of you will be around begging for more funds for distressed areas. Incidentally, how about some of those countries to which we are making gifts and uncollectible loans and which are buying U.S. securities? As I understand it, they now own some $11 billion of our securities. How silly can we get—giving money to foreign countries and they, in turn, buying our securities?

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARDY as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. CARNAHAN: On page 3, line 22, strike out "or commit" and insert in lieu thereof "reserve, earmark, commit, or otherwise set aside." The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, the problem with which this amendment seeks to deal was discussed in considerable detail when members of my Government Operations Subcommittee recently had the privilege of visiting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I want to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN], Doctor MOSAN, for inviting us. I think the kind of cooperation which has been developed between our two committees is likely to be very, very unusual. It is based not only on an analysis of the needs which the mutual security program seeks to fill, but taking into account also the quality of performance. It is our desire to be helpful and I believe that the kind of results now being achieved are those which the Legislative Reorganization Act had hoped for. I like to think of our visit with the Foreign Affairs Committee as a joint discussion of the problems with which we are mutually concerned. At that time I agreed to suggest amendatory language designed to put an end to the abusive practice of "earmarking." I was disappointed to observe the extent to which the committee had altered the language which I later recommended.

The amendment which I am offering now is essentially the same as my original recommendations to the committee, which I believe is paragraph one beginning the words "allocate, reserve, earmark, commit, or otherwise set aside." There was and is a very good reason for including all of these terms. The reason is simply that they have all on occasion been employed by the executive branch to circumvent technical requirements of the statute and to avoid restrictions which Congress has intended. The committee in its action on the amendment rejected several of these terms which I feel must be included in the legislation.

Another alteration of my amendment which I hope will contain permits a broad waiving of the restrictions of this section virtually at Presidential discretion. If the President delegates this authority, as he has delegated so many others, to the Mutual Security Act, then the authority to waive the provisions may be in the hands of the same officials whose commitments and earmarking activities in the past have led to the need for this amendment.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of offering a substitute?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his substitute.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman yields for that purpose he loses the floor; is that not correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HARDY. I yield for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN] as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. CARNAHAN.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARNAHAN as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. HARDY: On page 3, line 22, strike out "or commit" and insert in lieu thereof "reserve, earmark, commit, or otherwise set aside." The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia in the first portion of his amendment merely adds revised wording for the portion that he strikes out. In lieu of the language to be stricken out I add:

The President personally determines with respect to each such allocation, reservation, earmarking, commitment, or set-aside, and it is in his discretion to determine whether such funds pursuant to multilateral plans are.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, this substitute which I am offering follows the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia in the first portion of his amendment. My amendment merely adds revised wording for the portion that he strikes out. In lieu of the language to be stricken out I add:

The President personally determines with respect to each such allocation, reservation, earmarking, commitment, or set-aside, and it is in his discretion to determine whether such funds pursuant to multilateral plans are.

I further want to compliment the gentleman for the very careful and constant work that he and his committee have done in checking on the expenditure of such funds. The amendment adopted in committee was an attempt to arrive at something which would be satisfactory for the committee. I hope the gentleman will like this substitute.

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. I appreciate the genuine cooperation of the gentleman and the
attention which his committee has given to this difficult problem. Frankly, I am not enthusiastic about the language which the gentleman has offered, but it is a big improvement over what was in the bill, and I am disposed to accept it.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that it be considered instead of the language contained in my amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make three observations about the Hardly-Carnahan amendment we are about to vote on. First, the prohibition on advance allocations, reservations, earmarks, commitments, or set-asides by the Fund definitely applies to any formal action by the Fund's Board of Directors which would either bind the Fund or constitute a basis for representing to the Congress that a given sum cannot be used for other purposes. It does not mean that the Fund's staff cannot, or should not as prudent bankers, informally discuss priorities of various projects and programs which the Fund may internally prepare work programs and give special attention to applications from key countries. It should be noted here that just last year the Congress directed in section 922(b) of the act that the Fund "in its operations shall recognize that development loan assistance will be most effective in those countries which show a responsibility for the economic, social, political, and social concerns of their people, demonstrate a clear willingness to take effective self-help measures." Obviously assistance to programs in such countries are to be given priority.

Secondly, the amendment clearly calls for such data on the various types of projects and programs which the Fund finances as is appropriate to a preliminary judgment on the particular project or program.

Thirdly, the amendment does not constitute a limitation on the types of projects and programs which the Fund may finance although the data that the Fund will require on these will vary, depending on the Fund's share in the total financing and the existence of reasonable standards of commitment that may already have been made.

I think it is important that the record be clear on these points. The amendment's purpose is not to put the DLF in a straitjacket, but to make sure that commitments are not made for projects before they have been studied sufficiently to assure that loans made for them will in fact be in accordance with the purposes of the DLF and reasonably certain of accomplishing its declared objectives.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Cars- ham).

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FEIGHAN: Page 3, immediately after line 15, insert the following:

"(d) Section 143, which relates to assistance to Yugoslavia, is amended to read as follows:

SEC. 143. ASSISTANCE TO YUGOSLAVIA.—
No assistance shall be furnished to Yugoslavia under this Act to Yugoslavia after the date of enactment of the Mutual Security Act of 1960."

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will cut off U.S. aid to the Communist dictator Tito. Approval of my amendment will stop the use of U.S. funds to further the cause of the international Communist conspiracy which seeks to destroy the freedom which we enjoy in the United States and to bring all nations under the tyrannical heel of the Kremlin. The present policy of our State Department to assist the Communist regime of Yugoslavia is based on arguments, assertions, and claims which are devoid of any factual basis and totally disregard the basic elements of the foreign policy of the Communist dictator Tito and the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. In my remarks yesterday, which appear on pages 8379 to 8384 of the Record, I analyzed the actions and statements of Tito and the Communist leaders of Yugoslavia, which clearly prove that Tito and the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia are dedicated to the victory of world communism, and they bluntly announce to the world that they stand steadfastly with the leaders of the Kremlin in support of the ultimate victory of world communism.

The only argument advanced for giving any type of aid to Yugoslavia is the same argument that was used to cause Congress to make the first appropriation for assistance to Yugoslavia. That argument was that Tito had broken with the Kremlin and that he represented a new phenomenon called national communism which could be used to break up the power bloc of the Russian Communist Empire. I set me quoting you what Tito himself says in the publication of this specious argument about national communism. I quote:

"I must say that there is no national communism. There is no such term in internationalism. * * * The whole thing is that various countries which are building socialism have different conditions under which the new system is being built. That does not mean that the systems are different, but only that there are differences in the roads which lead to the same Socialist systems. As far as our International obligations as Communists are concerned, I must say that the Communists of Yugoslavia have never failed to fulfill them."

Thus, Tito boasts of the fulfillment of his obligations to the International Communist conspiracy.

On another occasion Tito said:
"I wish to point out that Poland and Yugoslavia—which are much criticized for practicing some national communism, which I consider nonsense—ought to show that they have an answer for any national communism."

Some naïve people believe that Tito is neutral. Tito in his own words refutes this idea.

In June 1956, Tito visited Stalingrad as a guest of the Russian leaders and here is what he said in a public address made in response to the welcoming statement:

Yugoslavia, in time of war, as in time of peace, marches shoulder to shoulder with the people toward the same goal—the goal of the victory of world communism.

As a result of the YUgoslav-Bulgarian conflict, the Kremlin and Tito are in an internationalists. Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, it is with some reluctance that I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Fetherlin). First, it is quite well known that I am in opposition to totalitarian governments, and I certainly am not going to praise Tito or to defend him. I do want to make one clear statement: that the money provided in this bill for Yugoslavia is not to promote Tito or communism. It is to assist the people of Yugoslavia. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to page 61 of the committee report. Section 143 states:

In furnishing assistance to Yugoslavia, the President shall continuously assure Congress to make the first appropriation for assistance to Yugoslavia. That argument was that Tito had broken with the Kremlin and that he represented a new phenomenon called national communism which could be used to break up the power bloc of the Russian Communist Empire. I set me quoting you what Tito himself says in the publication of this specious argument about national communism. I quote:

"I must say that there is no national communism. There is no such term in internationalism. * * * The whole thing is that various countries which are building socialism have different conditions under which the new system is being built. That does not mean that the systems are different, but only that there are differences in the roads which lead to the same Socialist systems. As far as our International obligations as Communists are concerned, I must say that the Communists of Yugoslavia have never failed to fulfill them."

Thus, Tito boasts of the fulfillment of his obligations to the International Communist conspiracy.

On another occasion Tito said:
"I wish to point out that Poland and Yugoslavia—which are much criticized for practicing some national communism, which I consider nonsense—ought to show that they have an answer for any national communism."

Some naïve people believe that Tito is neutral. Tito in his own words refutes this idea.

In June 1956, Tito visited Stalingrad as a guest of the Russian leaders and here is what he said in a public address made in response to the welcoming statement:

Yugoslavia, in time of war, as in time of peace, marches shoulder to shoulder with the people toward the same goal—the goal of the victory of world communism.

As a result of the YUgoslav-Bulgarian conflict, the Kremlin and Tito are in an
the Soviet. All Soviet bloc credits to Yugoslavia were canceled in 1958, and no new Soviet credits are at present anticipated. I wish to point out that there is no military assistance to Yugoslavia.

The program for Yugoslavia constitutes technical assistance and special assistance to be used entirely to procure demonstration equipment, including, necessary to be used toward the completion of that is, to demonstrate our way of life to the people of Yugoslavia.

The technical cooperation program will include such things as industrial production centers, a training research institute in connection with a model coal mine, a highway institute for the training of Yugoslav engineers and technicians, and public health improvement program. No DLF loans are currently contemplated.

It is very difficult for the United States to take any action which will improve the lot of or advance the liberation of the training of Yugoslav engineers and countries.

The United States is not ready to go to war to liberate the satellites and it is not either to the Soviet Union. Incidentally, as I said earlier today, those locomotives are being bought by the Soviet Union; they are part and parcel. And, if there is any question of a showdown, it is patently clear that the Yugoslavs, according to the words of Tito, will go altogether for the Communist conspiracy headed by the Kremlin.

By giving aid to Tito, we are strengthening his tyrannical grip over the people of Yugoslavia. Aid to a Communist regime appears to me to be a strange method of telling the enslaved people that the United States is against communism.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman does not maintain that the programs he has enumerated are provided for in the bill presently considered by this body. I do not say there was little aid given to Yugoslavia in the past. I stated that there is very little aid in this bill for Yugoslavia.

Mr. GROSS. Let me add this: Most of these so-called loans, soft loans, are being made for 20 to 25 years, at 3½ percent interest and they are to be repaid almost altogether in the currency of that country.

If ever paid, it will be in the currency of Yugoslavia. What American taxpayers, who have put up the dollars, will do with the dinars I do not know. Oh, yes; there is more than a little aid going to Yugoslavia.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, would he prefer that Yugoslavia obtain the assistance of this country needs from the Soviet Union? Would he prefer that we discontinue giving aid to Yugoslavia?

Mr. GROSS. I say the gentleman will not stand on the floor of this House and say that when the chips are down, Tito and his Yugoslavia will be on our side.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Not so long ago Yugoslavia was not in accord with the policy of the Soviet Union.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is not going to stand here and say that he would depend upon Tito to fight with the United States if we ever have a war. I know he will not do that.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I would like to bring to the attention of the Members and also my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. Zablocki) that a careful analysis of the foreign policy of the Communist government of Yugoslavia, which is included in my remarks of yesterday, clearly shows that Tito and the Communist government of Yugoslavia have failed to fulfill any of the three requirements for receiving U.S. aid which are required under section 143.

When you talk about giving money or assistance to Yugoslavia to keep them from the camp of the Soviet Union, they are already in the camp of the Soviet Union; they are part and parcel. And, if there is any question of a showdown, it is patently clear that the Yugoslavs, according to the words of Tito, will go altogether for the Communist conspiracy headed by the Kremlin.

Mr. GROSS. There is nothing shown to that effect in this material, and I have no such information.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. We have given some assistance toward an atomic reactor, but they already had a reactor. I wish to point out however, there is no money in this bill for that purpose.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It is my understanding that the reactor which they already have was donated to them by Soviet Russia; is that correct?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I am wondering if under this technical assistance program or any other program that we might provide Yugoslavia, it would be proper for us to ask that some assistance be given to provide religious freedom for the poor minority. I wonder that he would be too much for us to ask of them?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Feighan) there were—yes 30, noes 62.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.
So the amendment was rejected. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROSCOE.

Sec. 203. Title III of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to technical cooperation, is amended, as follows:

(a) In section 304, which relates to author-
ization, strike out "$17,600,000," and substitute "$61,500,000," respectively.

(b) Amend section 306, which relates to multilateral technical cooperation and related programs, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), which relates to contributions to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and related fund, strike out "$85,000,000," and substitute "$30,000,000" and "$161,500,000," respectively.

(2) In subsection (b), which relates to contributions to the technical cooperation program of the Organization of American States, strike out "1960" and substitute "1961," respectively.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chair-
man, I move to strike out the requisite
number of words.

In fiscal 1959, funds in the amount of $931 million are recommended in this bill for two particular economic assistance programs: defense support, and special assistance. This $931 million will take the form of direct gifts and grants to those countries receiving this aid. During the last session, with the active support of the distinguished chairman and members of the Foreign Relations Committee, I submitted an amendment to the mutual security bill aimed at cutting down economic gift and grant assistance in these two categories. A similar amendment was proposed in the Senate by Senator MANSFIELD. This amendment, overwhelmingly adopted by the Congress and now section 503(c) of the Mutual Security Act, directed the President to conduct a continuing country-
by-country study of those countries now receiving this type of aid and to present a report to Congress as soon as possible. The report was to be progressive and terminated. The adoption of this amendment marked the first positive expression of congressional intent that gift and grant aid be cut down.

A report on the continuing study pro-
vided for in section 503(c) was recently submitted to the Congress by Under Secretary Dillon. This report contained some frank predictions as to what we could expect in the way of reductions and termination in gifts and grants. It is encouraging to me and I know to other Members of the House who want to see a reduction in gifts and grants that this tide of waste and ineficiency will not be progressive and terminated. The adoption of this amendment marked the first positive expression of congressional intent that gift and grant aid be cut down. The report contains some frank predictions as to what we could expect in the way of reductions and termination in gifts and grants. It is encouraging to me and I know to other Members of the House who want to see a reduction in gifts and grants that this tide of waste and inefficientness will not be progressively reduced and terminated. The adoption of this amendment marked the first positive expression of congressional intent that gift and grant aid be cut down.

This year, as the result of the detailed
study provided for in section 503(c), we have a $115 million reduction in the funding of these categories of economic assistance for fiscal year 1961 below the amount requested for the same program last year. I am pleased to note that the committee has reduced the funding of these categories by an additional $61.5 million. This reduction may seem slight when we think in terms of the costs of the overall program but at least it represents a start in the right direction.

I hope that those who administer the program will realize that the Congress has and will continue to require that the section 503(c) is administered each year with a determined effort to see that these programs are reduced and eventually eliminated.

I want to thank the chairman of the committee for his fine support in starting us toward getting some savings as a result of this amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I think the Rogers-Mansfield amendment has served a useful purpose. I agree with the gentleman it has contributed to bringing about a reduction in the defense support funds. Heretofore the full report on the implementa-
tion of this amendment has been classified, but last week an unclassified report has been released. It has been a good experience.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I appreciate the remarks of the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the foreign aid program, two schools of thought exist. Under Secretary Dillon has publicly called for its extension for perhaps 50 years. On the other hand, John Hollister, a former administrator of the program, cites the fact that it was established in 1948, and he is really pointing out that we should begin thinking in terms of discontinuing it. Paul Hoffman, another former administrator of economic aid, had this to say:

I believe that the notion that you cannot win friends with economic aid will not hold water. In other words, I don't think you can win friends nor do I think economic aid is an instrument that can be used successfully in this so-called cold war.

This year, assuming that the Presi-
dent's request for funds is approved, the almost $6 billion in previously appro-
riated funds will make a total of almost $10 billion that can be spent during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960. Despite these tremendous expend-
tures, the foreign aid program is still beset by many of the haphazard opera-
tions that have characterized it since the beginning. While progress is being made toward cutting down the program in some areas, waste and inefficiency re-
main large scale in others. Administer-
ing agencies have built themselves into gigantic self-sustaining bureaucracies. The number of 43,000 permanent personnel with an additional 10,000 trainees.

Last fall, a study mission composed of members of our own Foreign Relations Committee completed a 40,000-mile world tour to study the effect of the for-

die aid program in areas which have been receiving our aid. The report of this study is a noticeable example with further examples of lavish, unnecessary spend-
ing. It concluded by calling for an im-
mediate review and reappraisal of the foreign aid program, because it is not "reaching the people." It also cited the pressing need for greater supervision of its farming activities. To these recommenda-
tions I can only add a sincere "amen."

Sooner or later, Mr. Chairman, we are going to have to face up to the fact that a program which is trying but failing is not the program that the American people demand in terms of basic objectives. If it is not reaching the people the fault certainly cannot be attributed to any lack of funds. On the contrary, the present Comptroller General has stated that the weakness of the pro-
gram is too much money rather than too little. We have too often been placed in the ridiculous position of trying to win friends to the democratic way of life among those who have neither the understanding nor the present background to understand democracy.

We no longer limit ourselves to giving help to a country that will strengthen its government in resisting threats of oppres-
sor nations or to some modest aid that might attain some modest improve-
ment in that nation's economy. We un-
dertake, instead, to reshape the whole country—its agriculture, its industry, its schools, even its customs and way of life.

In short, we no longer discipline our-
selelves by hard judgments on what we hope to accomplish or to whether there is a reasonable prospect of accomplish-
ing it. This failure of discipline has given to the foreign aid program un-
attainable objectives, limitless cost, and accounts for practically all its trouble; and it is the responsibility of the delegation of the recipients with their bene-
factors.

If one can see any encouraging trend in our present attitude toward foreign aid, it is the increasing emphasis on loans rather than grants. It seems to me that this is a good beginning toward returning to a sensible policy. With this encouraging start, perhaps we can begin thinking in terms of specific programs rather than a sweeping general pro-
gram; perhaps we can devote our ener-
gies to the accomplishment of our plan in their own way, if we decide their plans are worth helping at all.

But first, we are going to have to abandon the notion that the U.S. Treas-
ury is a perpetual fountain, spouting forth tax dollars to every nation under the sun just because these nations are un-
derdeveloped or in serious financial straits or happen to want some U.S. dol-
ars. The long range objectives of pro-
moting friendship for the United States among the lesser developed nations of the world have too often been at-
tered by the desire to provide them with the same benefits commensurate with the nearly $80 billion we have poured into this program. I intend to oppose again the request for any additional funds for this purpose especially with such large sums remaining unspent and I am hopeful that the Congress will again see fit to substantially reduce the amount of funds we propose to provide.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS. On page 5, immediately following page 8523, insert the following: "(c) Repeal section 308, which..."
relates to the International Development Advisory Board.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the passage of this section without reduction of the amount required with regard to technical cooperation. This is an area which should be approached in light of our real national purpose. This is an area where we assist people, where we lend assistance, where we stand ready to meet our obligations to the rest of mankind. I have listened to the criticism of the opponents of this program on both sides of the aisle, who each year oppose the program. Some conscientiously oppose—others with a meat ax in their hand and lacking the slightest acquaintance with the real need or purpose of the Mutual Security Act try to ridicule it with isolated instances of inefficiency and waste.

Is it not the real intent of all of us to eliminate waste and inefficiency where they appear? But this can never be a reason to condemn the program in toto. It may be a convenient reason for opposition and it is, I think, the real reason for opposing the entire program.

The authorization request for fiscal year 1961 is $172 million. The technical cooperation programs reach people more directly and more immediately than any other form of aid. Critics who argue that our aid does not reach down to the people are in the area where we should be directly concerned. Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE AND OTHER PROGRAMS

Sec. 204. Title IV of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, which relates to special assistance and other programs, is amended as follows:

(a) The program which relates to special assistance, strike out "1950" and "$247,500,000" and substitute "1960" and "$2,300,000,000" at the end thereof the following: "It is the sense of the Congress that so long as it is the policy of the United States to provide for the purchase of armaments by any other nation in the Near East, no part of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used for the purchase of armaments by any other nation in the Near East."

(b) In section 601, which relates to the United Nations Emergency Force, strike out "1950" in the second sentence and substitute "1961".

(c) In section 402, which relates to earmarking of funds, strike out "1960" in the first sentence and substitute "1961".

(d) In section 403, which relates to responsibilities in Germany, strike out "1960" and "$7,500,000" in the first sentence and substitute "1961" and "$4,750,000", respectively.

(e) Insert after section 403 the following new section:

"Sec. 404. Indus Basin Development.

The Congress of the United States welcomes the progress made through the good offices of the World Bank the administration of the Indus Basin and Development toward the development of the Indus Basin through a program of cooperation with any nation of the Palearctic or any other nation of the free world in order to promote economic growth and political stability in the Near East, and affirms the willingness of the United States, pursuant to authorities contained in this and other Acts, to participate in this significant undertaking. In the event that funds appropriated pursuant to this Act are made available to be used by or under the supervision of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in furtherance of the foregoing purposes, such funds may be used in accord with requirements standards, or procedures established by the Bank concerning completion of plans and cost estimates and determination of feasibility, rather than with requirements standards, or procedures concerning such matters set forth in this or any other Act, or under any other provision of law, without regard to the provisions of section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Furthermore, the President, in accordance with his powers under section 401, determines that such provisions cannot be fully satisfied without seriously impeding or impeding the accomplishment of such purposes."

(f) Amend section 405, which relates to migrants, refugees, and escapees, as follows:

(1) In subsection (c), which relates to contributions to the program of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, strike out "$1,000,000" and substitute "$1,500,000", respectively.

(2) In subsection (d), which relates to the establishment of conditions and procedure for selected escapes, strike out "1950" and "$5,200,000" and substitute "1960" and "$3,500,000", respectively.

(3) In section 406, which relates to children's welfare, strike out "1960" and substitute "1961".

(4) In section 407, which relates to Palestine refugees in the Near East, strike out "1960" and "$20,000,000" in the first sentence and substitute "$20,000,000", respectively; and strike out the proviso in the first sentence.

(5) In section 408(c), which relates to ocean freight charges, strike out "1960" and "$3,500,000" and substitute "1961" and "$3,600,000", respectively.

(6) Amend section 411, which relates to administrative and other expenses, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), which relates to certain expenses of administering nonmilitary assistance, strike out "1960" and "$255,000" and substitute "1961" and "$400,000", respectively.

(2) In subsection (c), which relates to administrative and other expenses of the Department of State, strike out "to" after "appropriated" and substitute "for expenses incurred in.".

(3) In section 412, which relates to the President's special education and training fund, the following:

(a) In section 419(a), which relates to atoms for peace, strike out "1960" and "$500,000" and substitute "1961" and "$40,000", respectively.

(b) Add the following new section after section 419:

"Sec. 421. Loans to Small Farmers.—It is the policy of the United States and the purpose of this section to strengthen the economies of underdeveloped nations, and in nations where the economy is essentially rural or based on small villages, to provide assistance designed to improve agricultural methods and techniques, to stimulate and encourage the development of local programs of production and self-help, particularly through loans of foreign currencies to associations of operators of small farms, formed for the purpose of joint action designed to improve agricultural productivity. The maximum unpaid balance of loans made to any association under this section may not exceed $100,000 at any one time; and the aggregate unpaid balance of all loans made under this section may not exceed $100,000 at any one time."

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bentley: On page 5, line 16, strike out all after "that" through the commas on line 16 and strike out "other" on line 16.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want at this time to express my personal appreciation to the chairman of our committee for the very kind remarks he made about my work on the committee earlier in the day, and to say as I have said in the past, that it is with very deep regret I say goodbye to him and to my other colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Affairs at the close of the 1969 year.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is merely for the purposes of strengthening a very desirable portion of this bill.
which was written in by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It was the feeling of the committee that with respect to special assistance, which the committee understood was being used by certain countries in some cases for the purchase of armaments in the Near East, even though special assistance is basically economic assistance, that in view of the unsettled conditions in the Near East, and in view of the fact that not only exports but can be aggravated by unrestricted sales or purchases of armaments in that area, it was felt, as I say, by the committee that special assistance should not be used by any country in the Near East for the purpose of purchasing armaments, but should be limited entirely to economic assistance as, of course, is the intent of the special assistance section. I did feel when this particular language on page 5 was adopted by the committee that some confusion might possibly arise owing to the fact that in one section of the bill, the language from California [Mr. Savin], I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan improves the bill and there is no opposition to it.

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

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORGAN. After a consultation with the author of the language of this section of the bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. Savin], I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan improves the bill and there is no opposition to it.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the author of the amendment, the gentleman from California [Mr. Savin], with whose objectives in writing the bill thoroughly concur, has any comment he would care to make at this time.

Mr. SAUND. I have nothing to add to what my chairman has said.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Bentley].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. George P. Miller: On page 7 of the bill, on line 8, strike out the period within the quote and insert a comma following the following that provided that compensating allowances are made in the administration of other programs to the same area to which the requirements of said section 901(b) are applicable.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, this merely clarifies and makes certain that the language of the so-called fifty-fifty act is fully carried out with respect to the so-called fifty-fifty act. I have taken this up with the chairman and with Dr. Jepsen, and they assure me there is no objection to the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. That is agreeable. I think the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has taken this up with the Senator from Wisconsin and this language is acceptable to them.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, the principle involved in the proposed section 404 of the present bill is adopted in the present section of the bill, the language specifically. It provides in part that the Cargo Preference Act or section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 shall be waived in connection with the Indus Basin project. It goes on to mention in rather fancy language the circumstances under which it shall be waived, but I am left with one very strong conviction and that is the Department's desire to cater not to our own interests but to the interests of those abroad in waiving the Cargo Preference Act. This is at least the third time the Department has come before the committee and told us that this program was going to prove or be a fiasco unless the Cargo Preference Act was waived. Everyone of those decisions was in error, and I have no reason to believe that that which is anticipated now will prove otherwise.

Just for a moment, let us talk about the necessity for granting this authority at this time for a program that is going to run for 10 years. The Department of State has said on two different occasions that it does "foresee need to exercise this authority in the future." Why, then, the request at this time? Surely, if the fate of this monumental project rests on the waiver of the Cargo Preference Act, there is hardly a member of this body who would not set aside that legislation should such an exigency develop. But we have no evidence of this so far. The Department itself doubts that it will ever come to pass.

Moreover, if the witness of the State Department before the Committee knew how his own Department was administering the Merchant Marine Act, he would have been crystal clear to him that the authority to waive cargo preference was absolutely unnecessary. Never has our shipping law been administered in this way, I think. The部,part of the act was going to prove to be a fiasco unless the Cargo Preference Act was waived. Everyone of those decisions was in error, and I have no reason to believe that that which is anticipated now will prove otherwise.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan improves the bill and there is no opposition to it.

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

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORGAN. After a consultation with the author of the language of this section of the bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. Savin], I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan improves the bill and there is no opposition to it.

Mr. BENDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the author of the amendment, the gentleman from California [Mr. Savin], with whose objectives in writing the bill thoroughly concur, has any comment he would care to make at this time.

Mr. SAUND. I have nothing to add to what my chairman has said.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Bentley].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. George P. Miller: On page 236 of part 2 of the Marine Act of 1936 shall be waived in connection with the Indus Basin project.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, section 404 of this bill provides for participation by the United States in the Indus Basin development project, a billion-dollar project, in which the United States would be putting up some $515 million of a total of $845 million being contributed by six countries including the United States. In addition, the World Bank, which will be administering this project, is putting up $103 million, and the two countries in which the project would take place,
namely, India and Pakistan, will also be making some contribution in local currency. Because the funds which will be appropriated for the Indus Basin under this section 901 of the Merchant Marine Act can be administered in the manner as amended, namely, the matter of cargo preference in connection with the shipment of materials deriving from our mutual security assistance programs. Consequently, the proviso of section 494 provides for a waiver of the provisions of section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act as amended, resulting from the exclusion of this program will be compensated for to the extent possible from other similar programs in the same area. Such an amendment is nothing more than putting into language of the waiver authority that which Secretary Dillon has advised the Congress and the industry plans to do as a matter of administration.

We would have preferred, of course, that the waiver provision be removed entirely from this bill. It is appreciated that at this stage matters may have progressed to the point where such a request might be considered unreasonable. However, in the spirit of fairness, therefore, we urge the above action as a second-best, but acceptable, solution.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER. Mr. Chair. will the gentleman yield? Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER. I do want to express my appreciation to the chairman and to Mr. Joroi, and to the members of the committee for the understanding way in which they have received us and for the fact that they have agreed to accept this amendment, which pretty well clears up the situation.

Mr. JUDD. I think it should be said that the reason the committee went along with this waiver of the 50-50 proviso was the fact this is the first big multilateral arrangement that has been possible to work out. It has taken the International Bank 8 years to get the India-Pakistan agreement, and we do not want their efforts or the important work that was involved in it to be used in support of the proposed waiver authority. We favor such multilateral arrangements. We do not want to have the United States bear the whole burden of a project if we can get a group of countries, some of which are in better financial condition than the United States, to go along in multilateral financing. Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Germany, and the United Kingdom are contributing to this project. If we insist upon a certain condition regarding our contribution, Germany or Canada or New Zealand can do the same thing, and smooth administration of the whole thing would be stymied. As long as we can accomplish the merchant marine's objective of assuring that 50 percent of all shipping or cargo is in American bottoms, the end desired is achieved, and a possible foulup of this multilateral program is avoided.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman.

I want to join the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], in expressing appreciation for the cooperation of the committee. We favor the Indus Basin project. We do not want to do anything to hurt the project, but we want to protect our Cargo Preference Act. Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Minnesota mentioned New Zealand. Well, we are getting tons of dress sheds and other materials from New Zealand and Iceland. At the same time, we support wool at approximately 100 percent of parity. This is something that is more of the folly of this entire international program.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman for his cooperation.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr.Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the able gentleman for introducing this amendment. Obviously, it is needed to protect the American merchant marine. I compliment the able chairman and the committee for doing it.

Some fantastic arguments have been used in support of the proposed waiver of the cargo preference law. It is as essential or expedient as giving the funds which the World Bank opposes it. As a matter of fact, the United States is putting up most of the money for the Indus Basin project. The cargo preference statute are to be waived in this kind of a case, it will set a very dangerous precedent. It will also strike a body blow to our merchant marine. I think it should be extended.

The State Department does not claim that a waiver is necessary, but vaguely suggests that the waiver might be desirable in the future. Under Secretary Dillon went beyond this view and stated definitely that the Department did not foresee the need of this authority in the near future.

It is clear, then, that if this adjustment could be made by the Department, a waiver is not needed at this time.

Moreover, the obvious result of such waiver authority might well be construed to relive the Department from its duty to compensate under its own program.

In view of these uncertainties and the threat to the merchant marine, I think that the language such as proposed by the gentleman should definitely be incorporated in this bill. In fact, the best result from a legal, as well as an administrative, standpoint might be by striking out this unnecessary waiver authority.

In doing that matter, of course, we should certainly adopt this amendment, which will specifically require the kind of compensating administration under the law which Congress has provided.

I urge the attention to this amendment because it would merely write into the bill the requirement to do what the State Department has advised us it plans to do anyway.
Let us not put further penalties on our merchant marine. I think it is the overwhelming wish of this Congress to support, sustain, and protect the merchant marine and we should not hesitate to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. George P. Miller].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, by the end of 1960 the political map of Africa will be so changed that it will be difficult for anyone to differentiate between the dependent areas and the independent countries created since World War II. Between now and October there will be at least four more independent African countries—Togo, Congo, Somaliland, and Nigeria. Negotiations now under way may make possible political independence during this year for the Federation of Malia—Senegal and Sudan—and the Malagasy Republic—Madagascar.

Africa, as we see it today, is a land where everything is happening at once—equality and racism, colonialism and nationalism, constitutional struggles, endless quest for economic and social advancement, civil strife, and the conflict between democracy and communism. The swift pace of political developments on the African scene is the pressing need for accelerating the sluggish rate of economic growth and improving living standards. Africa's economic and social structures are not developing at a pace comparable to its political evolution. It is essential that the pace of economic development match, or at least not fall further behind, the rate of political change now sweeping the African Continent.

Very few of the emerging countries are economically viable and their leaders very quickly recognize the importance of economic development and raise the standards of living as necessities to sustain their political independence. Countries are becoming politically independent without adequately trained technical, business, and political leaders and without the basic economic and social institutions and systems which provide the foundation for secure, confident African-led nations.

The forces of international communism are fully aware of the opportunities presented to exploit the nationalist movement which bears their political ends. They have been doing so at an increasing rate, covertly through their usual methods, and overtly through rather massive economic and technical assistance in chosen areas. The record indicates that through and by the stability and good sense of the African people themselves, communism has not gained a significant foothold on the continent.

There is convincing evidence that the Africans who have but recently freed themselves of foreign control will not, except by force, permit themselves to be again alienated from them in every sense of the word. There are many indications that the African people and leaders will be vigilant and uncooperative in rejection of all political subversion masquerading as friendship and assistance.

The United States has great ties with Africa, past and present, and a long-standing tradition of friendship. About one-tenth of the population of Africa has its origin in Africa. We have, therefore, a special interest in events in Africa, an interest, however, which is by no means confined to those of our population who had their origin on that continent and who have contributed so much to our culture and its expression. Our governmental and cultural relations with Africa are of long standing. We can lock forward to the future for a firm understanding and cordial relations between the peoples of the United States and Africa.

Africa is now receiving over $500 million annually from European countries for major development projects. Increasing amounts of technical and economic assistance are being contributed from a number of private organizations. A number of U.S. foundations are making important contributions in a number of fields. The United Nations, through its Economic and Social Commission, and its special fund, is stepping up its assistance to this continent. The Export-Import Bank has already made substantial loans to Africa and has indicated it is prepared to assist in this economic activity. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—IBRD—now has in progress a number of country and regional projects which should lead to more loans to Africa, in addition to those already made.

The total economic aid in this year's program for Africa will be $115 million, more than $23.3 million for technical cooperation. We are hopeful that this amount will be increased in the future when the results in economic development are visible. Both the U.N. and the United States have agreed for a long time to come the principal assistance required by the emerging states is, first, education and training, and, second, development assistance which includes private investment and public financing.

The United States has but lately become involved in providing a share of the educational, technical, and development assistance so urgently needed in Africa. In the cultural exchange field there are now more than 1,700 African students in the United States. Next year our Government hopes to finance 500 education exchanges, 400 of them to bring Africans to this country, 100 for American teachers, professors, and specialists to work in the African Continent. These are good beginnings, but they are not good enough. As the most materially favored nation in the free world, we must accept a larger responsibility in meeting the challenges that have been called upon to play a new and a more positive role in responding to the needs of these countries and in sharing with them our human and material resources.

The peoples of the African Continent are looking to the United States to see how it will respond to their needs and problems. Our answer to their needs shall not be found wanting.

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Wolf: On page 4, immediately below line 7, insert the following:

"(m) Add the following new section at the end of such title:"

"Sec. 422. FOOD AND FIBER FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS. (a) The President is authorized during the ten-year period beginning with the date of enactment of this section upon request by the Secretary General of the United Nations to furnish, without charge, to the United Nations or to any agency thereof, from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, commodities which are surplus, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. In making such commodities available to the United Nations or any of its appropriate agencies, the United States shall enter into agreements with the United Nations or any of its appropriate agencies providing that:

"(1) such commodities shall be used in underdeveloped areas to further (A) industrialization and construction programs including (but not limited to) community development projects, harbors, roads, canals, schools, dams, and the like; (B) education and educational programs including (but not limited to) school lunch and school feeding programs; (C) national food and fiber reserves;"

"(2) the United States shall pay the costs of transportation of such commodities to ports of entry of the United Nations or any of its appropriate agencies;"

"(3) such commodities shall not replace in the countries of the United Nations or any of its appropriate agencies the production of the local community;"

"(4) such commodities shall be used solely for agricultural production in the countries to which exported, and shall not be reexported nor shall such commodities be used to increase commercial exports from the United States;"

"(5) the President through the United Nations mission to the United Nations shall be kept fully informed with respect to the activities made possible by, and uses made of, commodities furnished by the United States under such agreements, and with respect to whether or not the objectives of the United Nations are being carried out through such programs undertaken pursuant to this section;"

"(b) Agreement shall not be entered into under this section which will call for the furnishings in any calendar year of agricultural commodities representing an investment by the Commodity Credit Corporation in excess of $250,000,000."

"(c) The President is authorized to cooperate with the Secretary General of the United Nations in bilateral and multilateral operations with other member nations of the United Nations that wish to further their own economic well-being and the objectives of the United Nations through the contribution, or use of surplus foods and fibers."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. The amendment has great appeal and we understand and laud its objectives. Everyone wishes that it were possible to get more of our bountiful surpluses of food and fiber into the hands of the hungry without disrupting world trade, and so on. But after a careful reading of the
amendment, it seems to me that it is outside the scope of this bill and outside the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

This amendment authorizes the President to furnish without charge commodities to the United Nations, the IMF, the Export-Import Bank, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, an agency which is certainly not under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs—stocks which are surplus as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. It places additional duties on the Secretary of Agriculture which it is not within the authority of this committee to establish.

The amendment raises the question also of just how this proposed relationship with the U.N. would work out. For instance, it says:

The President through the U.S. mission to the U.N. shall be kept fully informed.

That would seem to be almost an order to the Secretary-General and the staff of the U.N. to make information available to our President. I doubt whether this Committee is in a position to pass legislation giving instructions of that sort to the U.N.

So, while everybody approves wholly of the objectives, I reluctantly feel I must make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. Wolf. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. Wolf. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for raising the point of order because I think it is important that this point of order should be raised.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman to address himself to the point of order. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the question of germaneess.

Mr. Judd. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if he would reserve his point of order. We would like to hear what the gentleman from Iowa has to say.

Mr. Judd. That is all right; I will reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not ruled. Does the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. Judd. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. Wolf. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. Wolf. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say before I begin that I am grateful for the cooperation and consideration that has been given to me by the Chair and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and for the consideration and support that has been given me in working out the details of this amendment.

I do not wish to yield until I have completed my statement. I feel my position very strongly. But I would be happy to yield for any questions when finished.

Mr. Chairman, this is a food-for-peace amendment, which is in keeping with the purpose and objective of the Mutual Security Act, to assist in stabilizing economies, to promote the use of the greatest asset of the United States, and to help eliminate famines and hunger in ways that will promote economic development.

This is permissive legislation; this is not mandatory legislation. We are making it possible for the United Nations to act.

I want to state that the President of the United States in his state of the Union message recommended and asked for a food-for-peace program. In fact, after much pressure, he has appointed Mr. Don Faerberg as Food-for-Peace Coordinator.

There is no question that in many of the underdeveloped countries the rate of population growth would make possible be accelerated if the underfed peoples could be assured of adequate diets.

Lack of food and clothing undermines the health, welfare, and morale of people. When adequate supplies of food do not exist, it is impossible for people to divert their productive efforts for any purpose other than the obtaining of sufficient food and fiber. Hence, these community and education improvements cannot take place.

Now, what does this amendment do? Section 422, Food and Fiber for Economic Development Through the United Nations, says that the President is authorized during a 10-year period upon request by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to furnish without charge to the United Nations or to any agency thereof. We are not saying the President must do anything. We are saying if the U.N. requests food and fiber we will make it available.

It is also provided that such commodities shall be used in underdeveloped areas to further industrialization and basic social improvements including schools, bridges, roads, hospitals, clinics, and the like, education and educational programs including, but not limited to, school lunch and school clothing programs, and the national food and fiber reserves.

I would like to accentuate this matter of the schools.

This is one of the areas we are principally interested in so far as underdeveloped countries are concerned. We must develop their school systems, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Judd) for his statement of February 9th in reference to schools and helping the education programs of these people. This will assist these children and adults attending school to get both food and clothing.

Such commodities shall be used solely for domestic consumption in the country to which exported, and shall not be re-exported, nor shall such commodities be used for the commercial export from the United States; also such commodities shall not replace in the countries of use the usual domestic production or imports of the same or similar commodities.

To those who have stated that this will interfere with the balance of trade, let me say that it will not. We are asking the United Nations to help plan this program. We have a surplus and we want them to work with us in getting it to the needy without competition and without harm to the world economic situation which represents the best interests of each.

It is also stated here that the President through the United States mission to the United Nations shall be kept fully informed with respect to the activities made possible by, and uses made of, commodities furnished by the United States under such agreements, and with respect to whether or not the objectives of the United Nations are being carried out through the programs undertaken pursuant to this section.

If we are not satisfied we can withdraw the program. This is permissive legislation, it is not mandatory.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota when he said he was in favor of multilateral organizations and in favor of working with the United Nations as you have just stated. We would like to have the record show the statement that you made a fine statement.

Mr. Judd. The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank you.

On March 25, 1960, I received a letter from Martin Hill, Deputy Under Secretary of the United Nations, after I made several trips up there at my own expense to talk to their leaders and the heads of various departments of the United Nations. I quoted him as follows: "The United Nations is a democratic institution which represents the best interests of each.

We were glad to see that you have taken into account the constitutional and procedural considerations affecting the United Nations which we brought to your attention during your visit here last month. The revised text of the proposal should not, in our opinion, raise any difficulties on such grounds.

Why the U.N., rather than on a strict bilateral basis?

Today many of the underdeveloped nations of the world look to the United Nations as their protector, as their hope for peace and security, and the United Nations because they owe a large degree of their sovereignty and independence to the United Nations.

By proposing an expanded economic industrial development program for the United Nations which will have as one of its basic features part of our agricultural resources we will have done much to prove our hope that people all over the world may live in dignity free from want. Furthermore, we will be showing the world that we hold the United Nations as a great instrument for peace and security in this world.

During the debate last year my colleague the gentleman from Utah (Mr. King) made an excellent statement which I would like to read in part:

"If a nation is uterus, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. This is one of the very rare occasions in which the liberal and conservative may join hands firmly and sincerely in support of legislation which represents the best interests of each.

The surplus-reduction program proposed in this amendment promises to alleviate one
of the most perplexing and distressing problems in the American economy, the problem of our vast and growing agricultural surplus.

It also promises to alleviate the most pressing social problem on the globe. This problem is starvation.

The United States has a moral obligation to help the world. The problem of hunger in the world is a moral problem. It is not a problem of economics, but of morality. The United States is the world's largest food producer, and it has the responsibility to help others who are not as fortunate as we are.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Iowa on the fine statement that he has made.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman for his kind words but also for his many hours of work in support of the food-for-peace program. I am proud to be associated with him in this venture.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Iowa on the fine statement that he has made.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman for his clear understanding of the need. There is no form of capital that we can more easily make available. There is no form of foreign aid that we can be more sure will actually help the people of the world. There is no form in which we could accomplish this purpose with the assistance of the United States. Any country that will share its surplus food with the world will be provided with the food to help them share their surplus with the world.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman for his clear understanding of the need. There is no form of capital that we can more easily make available. There is no form of foreign aid that we can be more sure will actually help the people of the world. There is no form in which we could accomplish this purpose with the assistance of the United States. Any country that will share its surplus food with the world will be provided with the food to help them share their surplus with the world.

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Iowa for the very fine statement that he has made.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Iowa on the amendment. I support the amendment.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Iowa for the very fine statement that he has made.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman for his kind words but also for his many hours of work in support of the food-for-peace program. I am proud to be associated with him in this venture.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Iowa on the amendment.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Iowa on the amendment. I support the amendment.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, I have in the past joined several of my colleagues in introducing food-for-peace legislation. As the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Wolf) has told you, this legislation would authorize the United States to make surplus agricultural commodities available to the United Nations for distribution to nations throughout the world.

To me, this legislation makes good sense. I want to put our surplus agricultural commodities to work. And I can think of no better way to do this than by putting them to work in behalf of a lasting world peace.
Many nations are hard pressed to meet the day to day food requirements of their people. They do not have large reserve stocks to pick up the slack in the created food reserve upon which nations depend for assistance which curtail production.

There should be an internationally created food reserve upon which nations which suffer temporary shortages could draw. Nations of the world would join the United States which suffer temporary shortages could draw on this food reserve.

"When the time comes," Mr. Judd says "I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that other nations of the world will join the United States in making food and fiber available to this food reserve.

Communism thrives on the difficulties of other people. Communists are quick to exploit temporary food shortages and other natural disasters. Russia could be expected to oppose, in the United Nations, any and all international food reserve, for they know if food is available for nations to use, if and when disaster strikes, that area can be turned over to the Communists.

The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. Taus] makes the point of order that is is not germane to the bill before the Committee.

The Chair has had an opportunity to examine the amendment, the Mutual Security Act of 1964, as amended, particularly Title IV thereof, which provides for special assistance and other programs, and calls attention to the fact that in Title IV there is specifically mentioned surplus commodities pursuant to the Agricultural, Trade, Development, and Assistance Act of 1954.

The Chair feels that this amendment to the Mutual Security Act is germane to the bill before the Committee, and, therefore, overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota wish to say anything further on the point of order?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, Mr. Chairman, just one further word. I realize that this point of order was made last year, but it is my understanding that the amendment this year is not in the same substance as the amendment last year. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further on that point?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that this is a tightened-up version of what we understood we offered last year. If the Chair would like to refer back to the original wording, he will find it is very similar. We have shortened it up, we have taken out some of the long verbiage, but I am sure that the meaning and the intent are identical.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, did not the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa have to do substantially with surplus commodities or the United Nations feeding programs?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further on that point?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is germane because legally, if it is the same substance, it is the same framework of language, that carries the same obligation or the same authority, then the mere statement of intent by the individual, or any member of the Committee, has no effect. So it is germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] offers an amendment to which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] raises a point of order.

The Chair has had an opportunity to examine the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa. The gentleman from Iowa has referred to the language of the Chair at that time in concluding that the amendment then was germane to the amendment pending. The Chair feels that this language is germane to the bill that is pending before the Committee at this time and therefore overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that the gentleman from Iowa has a great humanitarian interest in this amendment and I commend him for it. But this amendment proposes to find further uses for farm surpluses. It deals with the same general area as does Public Law 480, but uses the UN to dispose of the surpluses. I think there are 11 bills now pending before the great Committee on Agriculture on this very issue.

I think the Committee on Agriculture has jurisdiction over this type of bill. I believe it should have consideration by that committee. This amendment completely bypasses the Committee on Agriculture.

Another thing, this is going to dump a lot of our surpluses all over the world. Many nations have no machinery or organization and will have to meet this competition of free food. We have to use great care or we will do more harm than good. We have to show interest in feeding hungry people, but I do not think this amendment will do the job. The United Nations has no machinery to start utilizing this great amount of surplus food that will be involved. I note that the gentleman puts restrictions in his amendment to make it dependent upon a request from the Secretary of the United Nations to the President of the United Nations before it becomes operative. I am afraid it will encourage the setting up of a lot of jobs for United Nations bureaucrats. I do not think this amendment will do the job as the gentleman wishes.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. With all due respect to my distinguished chairman, I should like to point out that I received a letter from the Deputy Under Secretary stating that they have no restrictions on
this amendment and there are no problems dealing with this amendment. I am sure, with all due respect to my distinguished chairman, that they know their business well enough to inform me if they think so.

Mr. MORGAN. I read the letter, which the gentleman furnished to me, that he had received from the United Nations that referred to his letter concerning a minor official who did not speak officially in a manner that would be binding on the United Nations.

Mr. WOLF. With all due respect to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, that letter was sent by a minor official that I attended at the United Nations the very top leaders were there, with the exception of Dag Hammarskjold himself, on several occasions. While this man wrote in his own behalf, he wrote as the Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs. I think in his capacity he was entitled to know his position.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I quarrel with it from time to time. The United Nations has made such a howling failure in every crisis it has faced that I would not want to trust it to administer a program of this kind.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment because I think "food for peace" can be added successfully to the United States foreign aid program, if anything can. When food is here in storage and costing us money and we are giving it away over to the Communist tyrannies in Eastern Europe, why have we done so? We are giving away food, which is available to us, to countries which have the same pocketbook problems as we do. We are giving away food because they do not think wheat could be sold in any greater quantity than it is at the present time even though ample authority and laws to promote such sales does exist. They agreed on this rate of distribution and sales. I point this out for this reason. It takes more than law—it takes a change of administration, if we are going to push this kind of program. I think the Secretary of Agriculture shall have so certified prior to such shipment or donation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues in this body are well aware, for a number of years I have been very critical with regard to the giving of food surplus to our needs in this country under Public Law 480. The Secretary of Agriculture has shipped abroad, edible oils like butter, margarine and cottonseed oil. He has shipped fruits and vegetables and canned meats, hams, and hamburgers. He has shipped abroad fresh and frozen and dried vegetables—fruits, canned and frozen, juices of various kinds and any number of other substances which have been denied to our people at home. Each time I have made this complaint, very little has come of it. I have never before had the letter come up to this Hill a denial from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, the function of this amendment is to be sure that if there is another foreign giveaway program established that at least we will remember the simple axiom that charity begins at home. I do not believe it is right to squander the fruits of the labor of our taxpayers and the surplus commodities of our farms are given away to our own people at home first, and then are given away as they should rightly and properly be given away abroad to our suffering fellow humans. I point out again that on many occasions I have visited with high officers of the Department of Agriculture and I have engaged in lengthy correspondence with them, and urged them to make available the fruits and fiber and vegetable products of our farms to our people at home first, and then to give them away under these foreign giveaway programs next.

Mr. Chairman, I come from a district which has been very hard hit by the depression of needy people. There are other districts which have the same pocketbook problems that face the people of my district, full of people who have need of these things, and who exist on a less than adequate diet. The function of this amendment to the amendment is very simple. It is to guarantee that if this food is to be given away abroad that first claim shall rest with the people of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to speak for a few minutes to point out a couple of facts with respect to the distribution of food throughout the world. I have in my hand copy of a hearing held on January 5th before the Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs of the Senate. I have been very critical of the Secretary of Agriculture or his deputy agreed with the Secretary of State on the rate of distribution of these products and their sales of cottonseed oil. I have been very critical of the Secretary of Agriculture and his deputy agreed with the Secretary of State on the rate of distribution of these products and their sales of cottonseed oil.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to speak for a few minutes to point out a couple of facts with respect to the distribution of food throughout the world. I have in my hand copy of a hearing held on January 5th before the Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs of the Senate. I have been very critical of the Secretary of Agriculture or his deputy agreed with the Secretary of State on the rate of distribution of these products and their sales of cottonseed oil. I have been very critical of the Secretary of Agriculture and his deputy agreed with the Secretary of State on the rate of distribution of these products and their sales of cottonseed oil.

Mr. CHIEF Justice. The amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL to the amendment offered by Mr. WOLF. After the period at the end add a new sentence as follows: "Provided further, That no food or fiber products shall be donated or shipped abroad unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall have so certified prior to such shipment or donation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues in this body are well aware, for a number of years I have been very critical with regard to the giving of food surplus to our needs in this country under Public Law 480. The Secretary of Agriculture has shipped abroad, edible oils like butter, margarine and cottonseed oil. He has shipped fruits and vegetables and canned meats, hams, and hamburgers. He has shipped abroad fresh and frozen and dried vegetables—fruits, canned and frozen, juices of various kinds and any number of other substances which have been denied to our people at home. Each time I have made this complaint, very little has come of it. I have never before had the letter come up to this Hill a denial from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, the function of this amendment is to be sure that if there is another foreign give-away program established that at least we will remember the simple axiom that charity begins at home. I do not believe it is right to squander the fruits of the labor of our taxpayers and the surplus commodities of our farms are given away to our own people at home first, and then are given away as they should rightly and properly be given away abroad to our suffering fellow humans. I point out again that on many occasions I have visited with high officers of the Department of Agriculture and I have engaged in lengthy correspondence with them, and urged them to make available the fruits and fiber and vegetable products of our farms to our people at home first, and then to give them away under these foreign giveaway programs next.

Mr. Chairman, I come from a district which has been very hard hit by the depression of needy people. There are other districts which have the same pocketbook problems that face the people of my district, full of people who have need of these things, and who exist on a less than adequate diet. The function of this amendment to the amendment is very simple. It is to guarantee that if this food is to be given away abroad that first claim shall rest with the people of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to speak for a few minutes to point out a couple of facts with respect to the distribution of food throughout the world. I have in my hand copy of a hearing held on January 5th before the Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs of the Senate. I have been very critical of the Secretary of Agriculture or his deputy agreed with the Secretary of State on the rate of distribution of these products and their sales of cottonseed oil. I have been very critical of the Secretary of Agriculture and his deputy agreed with the Secretary of State on the rate of distribution of these products and their sales of cottonseed oil.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to speak for a few minutes to point out a couple of facts with respect to the distribution of food throughout the world. I have in my hand copy of a hearing held on January 5th before the Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs of the Senate. I have been very critical of the Secretary of Agriculture or his deputy agreed with the Secretary of State on the rate of distribution of these products and their sales of cottonseed oil. I have been very critical of the Secretary of Agriculture and his deputy agreed with the Secretary of State on the rate of distribution of these products and their sales of cottonseed oil.

Mr. CHIEF Justice. The amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL to the amendment offered by Mr. WOLF. After the period at the end add a new sentence as follows: "Provided further, That no food or fiber products shall be donated or shipped abroad unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall have so certified prior to such shipment or donation."
Committee on Agriculture, where it can be studied fully and in consultations with the responsible top officials of the United Nations. Then we can vote for something based not only on good will, hope, and prayer, but on plans and arrangements that are solid and give greater chance of succeeding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WOLF] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF]. The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF]. The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLF) there were—ayes 46, noes 33.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER III—CONTINGENCY FUND

Section 531 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to the President's special authority and contingency fund, is amended by striking out "$1,000,000" in the first sentence and substituting "$161" and "$800,000", respectively.

CHAPTER IV—GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Chapter IV of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to general and administrative provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 504(d), which relates to small machine tools and other industrial equipment, is amended—

(b) In section 508(a), which relates to loan assistance and sales, insert after the first sentence the following new sentence: "Commodities, equipment, and materials transferred to the United States as repayments of advances not authorized under this Act, other than title II of chapter II, shall be sold at prices determined by the Board of the Reserve Bank of New York."

(c) In section 513, which relates to notice to legislative committees, insert after the first sentence the following: "and under the last clause of the second sentence of section 404."

(d) Amend section 517, which relates to completion of plans and cost estimates, as follows:

(1) Insert "(a) Immediately after "Sec. 517, COMPLETION OF PLANS AND COST ESTIMATES."—"

(2) Add the following at the end of such section:

"(b) All nonmilitary flood control, reclamation and other water and related land resource programs or projects proposed for construction under title I, II, or III (except section 306) of chapter II, under section 400, or under section 431 of this Act, shall be exempt from the provisions related to the acceptance of contracts for construction within the continental limits of the United States of America. In all cases the budget shall be established by the administrator of the Bureau of the Budget, and a copy of the determination shall be submitted to the Speaker of the House of Rep- resentatives and the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. No such program or project shall be ordered until the cost thereof is determined not to exceed the costs and which does not otherwise meet the standards and criteria established, by law, for projects of flood control, reclamation, and other water and related land resource programs and projects proposed for construction outside of the continental limits of the United States of America as per circular A-47 of the Bureau of the Budget, dated December 31, 1950."

(e) Amend section 527(c), which relates to employment of personnel, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), which relates to employment of personnel outside the United States, strike out "seventy" and "forty-five" in the first sentence and substitute "seventy-four" and "forty-nine", respectively.

(2) In subsection (c), which relates to employment of personnel outside the United States, strike out "Director" in the introductory clause and substitute "President"; and insert before the period at the end of paragraph (3) the following new provision:

"527(c). Service Reserve Officers appointed or assigned pursuant to this paragraph shall receive in-class promotions with such regulations as the President may prescribe."
give these positions to them. The fact that the number has been increased to 2,075 from 400 demonstrates that we have done just that.

Mr. BURCHETT. The Congress has also created 276 positions under Public Law 313 of a scientific nature which also are above the old level of grade 15. These scientific and professional positions have a salary limit of $19,000 a year. The number is 275. Our committee also has jurisdiction over the creation of these positions.

Mr. BURCHETT. Furthermore, the amendment because we cannot hold this thing down if other committees are going to reach out and grant these supergrade positions every time some agency asks for them. I realize, as you do, that the floor of the House is not the place to write legislation; but I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and I knew nothing of this until the bill and committee report came out. So at the first opportunity I am calling it to the attention of the House and I am urging as strongly as I can that these supergrades be granted only as provided by law. That is, only to the agencies which have been urging more effective control and positions, and the act which creates coordination and better administration supergrade positions.

Mr. ZABLICKI. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Why does not this outfit come to the proper legislative committee of the House for these supergrades?

Mr. ZABLICKI. Because, as pointed out, they cannot draw from the Federal pool. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which the gentleman from Georgia is a very valuable and distinguished member, does not deal with the personnel for ICA or for the Coordinator or for the Development Loan Fund. The ICA and Coordinator may use Foreign Service officers. But few are available. Most of them do not have the experience in aid programs or do not have the technical requirements needed. Therefore it is necessary that four additional supergrades are authorized.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLICKI. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to say to the gentleman that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has jurisdiction over supergrades for all agencies. But the fact remains that if letting agencies come in in a bill like this and ask for supergrades and get them, our control over supergrade positions is gone and we cannot hope to properly evaluate the need for these positions.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLICKI. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to say to the gentleman that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has jurisdiction over supergrades for all agencies and this is the proper procedure of letting agencies come in in a bill like this and ask for supergrade positions and get them, our control over supergrade positions is gone and we cannot hope to properly evaluate the need for these positions.

Mr. ZABLICKI. Does the gentleman from Georgia maintain that his committee acted upon the 74 supergrade positions that have been authorized for the mutual security program in the past?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. No. I contend that we should act upon them and justify the tremendous cost that way. We want to destroy the control which that committee has over supergrade personnel.

Mr. ZABLICKI. But we are not bypassing your committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Oh, yes. Mr. ZABLICKI. I respectfully suggest to the gentleman that we are not.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. You refer to 74 supergrades that are in the committee report to supergrade positions, and the act which creates supergrade positions is an act which places the authority for the Comptroller General for supergrade positions on Post Office and Civil Service, and that is the committee which has jurisdiction over supergrade positions.

Mr. ZABLICKI. That is not my understanding.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the Chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not true that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has not been consulted about these additional supergrades?

Mr. GROSS. It is.

Mr. MURRAY. That comes under our jurisdiction and certainly we should be consulted about it.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman completely.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Davis].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASEY: On page 13 add a new section immediately after section 534 as follows:

"(c) The annual supergrades...

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, we are operating on borrowed money here today. We are talking about giving it and lending it to someone else, but we owe almost $300 billion and I want to make sure that these countries that we do assist are doing all they can, at least equal to what we are doing, for themselves.

I pondered in writing this amendment how I could fix the yardstick. That is the only criticism. But we have some very good economists who are coming out in the papers every month telling us how much interest the Treasury has gone up, how much it is costing us more to borrow, and that $10 million and the India Finance Co. in India has gone up one-tenth of 1 percent, or 0.1 percent. So the development loan fund had just something like that.

I noticed on the ticker yesterday that the Development Loan Fund was going to loan that money to a country, the India Finance Co., in India. I do not see anything wrong with my amendment, but I think it is a reasonable request, and I trust that you will see fit to adopt it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

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

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

Mr. MORGAN. I just want to say that an amendment similar to this was offered last year. An amendment of this kind killed that last year. I did not vote for this amendment and you vote against the program.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is exactly right. It is impossible for these underdeveloped nations to tax their people at a rate equal to ours at this stage of their development. It would require financial sophistication of a level which is impossible because of the underdeveloped stage of development. It would also require enforcing facilities equal to the Internal Revenue agency that we ourselves have. Furthermore, as to the $500 exemption that we have in our own laws, the per capita income of the people in most of these countries who need aid is far below the $600 level.

I therefore urge that because of the impossibility of enforcing it and the possibility of this amendment's being applied to the underdeveloped nations we oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASEY. I do not see anything in the amendment. With reference to a $600 exemption or any dollar sign at all. It says in proportion to and commensurate with. I daresay that they would determine it in the case of each individual recipient on the basis of their cost of living, the average income, and what would be commensurate and proportionate. I do not think it would destroy the program. I think we just make sure they would pay their own way.

Mr. GALLAGHER. We certainly would like them to pay their own way. The point is, it would take many years for them to develop to the point we have, and by that time the need for the program might have disappeared.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Casey].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Casey), there were—aye 36, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROUSH: On page 12, line 16, insert "(1)" immediately below line 17, insert the following:

"(3) Add at the end of section 534 the following new subsection:

The amendment to presentation to the Congress of assistance proposed to be furnished under titles II, III, and IV of chapter II of this Act shall not be classified as "secret," or bear any other similar security classification. All information concerning such assistance, whether furnished under such titles II, III, and IV shall be freely available to the public. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require the publication of any information the publication of which may be detrimental to the national security.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, on the tables behind which sit members of the committee are seven volumes of presentation books containing information relating to the mutual security program. Each of these seven volumes bears the classification "secret."

The amendment which I am presenting at this time will take the secret label off those presentation books—except where the information deals with the military.

Why should such an amendment be adopted? It certainly is not proposed so as to weaken the program. If we are going to give money to other countries, I warned that program be as strong as we can make it. When that program does not have the public's scrutiny, then I am convinced that it will not have that strength required. When that program does not have the benefit of publicly provided by our press, TV, and radio but rather finds itself hidden behind a veil of secrecy then the right to know is being seriously thwarted. When the detailed aspects of that program cannot be discussed, we lose control of the money spent, and public criticism then I am convinced, that it will not have that strength required. When that program does not have the benefit of publicly provided by our press, TV, and radio but rather finds itself hidden behind a veil of secrecy then the right to know is being seriously thwarted. When the detailed aspects of that program cannot be discussed, we lose control of the money spent, and public criticism then I am convinced, that it will not have that strength required. When that program does not have the benefit of publicly provided by our press, TV, and radio but rather finds itself hidden behind a veil of secrecy then the right to know is being seriously thwarted. When the detailed aspects of that program cannot be discussed, we lose control of the money spent, and public criticism then I am convinced, that it will not have that strength required. When that program does not have the benefit of publicly provided by our press, TV, and radio but rather finds itself hidden behind a veil of secrecy then the right to know is being seriously thwarted.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, and colleagues, those volumes and the detailed information they contain are not open to the public's scrutiny, those volumes and the information they possess are not open to members of the press, TV, and radio in order that they in turn transmit to the vast audience of readers, viewers, and listeners. And, although I can go through these volumes and you can go through them and we can inform ourselves, this information which bears the label "secret" has no right to be hidden behind a veil of secrecy.

The members of the committee cannot have the benefit of research done behind a veil of secrecy. When the detailed aspects of that program cannot be discussed, we lose control of the money spent, and public criticism then I am convinced, that it will not have that strength required. When that program does not have the benefit of publicly provided by our press, TV, and radio but rather finds itself hidden behind a veil of secrecy then the right to know is being seriously thwarted. When the detailed aspects of that program cannot be discussed, we lose control of the money spent, and public criticism then I am convinced, that it will not have that strength required.
this bill are critical of many things which are happening. I wonder if much of this is not the result of the fact that the information concerning various phases of this program is not open to public scrutiny and discussion. We are a democracy. We are proud of the fact that the power of governing lies with our electorate. How can we, however, govern, how can we legislate if we are deprived of knowledge? James Madison once said:

A people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives. A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prologue to a farce or tragedy, or, perhaps both.

Could it be then, if this is true, that our lack of power and strength in this mutual security program lies in the fact that those who govern—the people—lack the knowledge from which power is derived?

Although I recognize the need for classification of information in certain military matters, I feel it is overdone, and I am convinced that the national welfare could best be served by greater disclosure of information. And, although I am aware of the arguments favoring secrecy in the mutual security program, I am convinced that they are heavily outweighed by the right of the people to know and through that right to know, cause strength to be generated within the program.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the gentleman's amendment prevails, the secret information books will be available to Communist agents, would they not?

MR. ROUSH. Yes, they would.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Does the gentleman agree that the Communists would be the greatest beneficiaries if we declassified this program?

MR. ROUSH. If the gentleman will permit, I read in your report where there is a desperate attempt—or at least an attempt—to declassify information in order to prevent the free flow of information. I think if the declassification takes place the American people would benefit and this program would benefit. It would be a stronger program because of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Rouss) has expired.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that it would be the happiest moment for the Communists if we would adopt this amendment. As the gentleman admitted, the material is available to responsible people. Any Member of Congress has access to the information in the classified presentation books. If we declassify them, by his own admission, such an action would give the Communists the information on the platter. Would this be in our national interest? I want to assure the distinguished gentleman from Indiana that this committee and this House is charged with the executive to declassify information to the greatest extent possible; I repeat it would be a mistake to vote for this amendment. I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. MORGAN. Is it not a fact that everyone who reads through these books and insists that the executive branch declassify everything possible that is not vital to the security of this country?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is a fact.

Mr. MORGAN. Would not the opinions of our Ambassadors and generals of the effectiveness of the armed forces of other countries and of the competence of foreign officials which are contained in these books cause us embarrassment in dealing with other governments?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It would ruin our diplomatic relations with other countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman's amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Rouss).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KYL: On page 11, after line 10, add the following paragraph and number accordingly:

"(g) During the annual presentation to the Congress of requests for authorizations and appropriations under this Act for fiscal years ending after June 30, 1961, and within ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, there shall be submitted to the Congress, a detailed report of all country arrangements, showing for each foreign country, the commodities, equipment, services, and materials to be furnished, the terms of such transactions, the purposes for which funds are required, and the purposes in detail, for which funds requested, and funds otherwise available, will be obligated during the fiscal year in which the requests are made. Except where the President determines that the national interest requires that funds available for other purposes and projects described in any budget submitted pursuant to this subsection be transferred in accordance with section 501 of this Act to other programs and projects, funds appropriated, and funds otherwise available, for any fiscal year shall be available only for the program or projects described in any budget submitted for that fiscal year."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has just been read by Mr. KYL is the same amendment I proposed last year during a discussion of this bill. I might say in this connection that this particular amendment has a great deal of appeal to the people of the Fifth District of Indiana. In response to a questionnaire which I distributed throughout my district, over 92 percent of those responding favored such a program as stated in this amendment.

This amendment is not designed as a crippling amendment.

Its whole purpose and design is to give greater emphasis to the mutual security program by this Congress. It is an amendment which both advocates and opponents to the foreign aid program can in good conscience support.

Very simply stated the amendment does just this:

First. Requires the submission of a firm, detailed budget by the administrators of the program.

Second. Makes adherence to that budget mandatory.
Third. Places the budget presentation and adherence on the same basis as our domestic budget.

When we think of the very strict requirements which we appropriate—will be spent.

It should lead to a more definite program. It will 1ead to long-range planning.

The amendment supplements and strengthens the requirements placed in the act last year which requires the furnishing of greater detailed information by requiring the submission of a budget and adherence to that budget. I might add, Mr. Chairman, that it is my desire that the program be terminated. I believe that is the feeling of a great majority in this Congress. Yet, unless we claim our right to control, direct the program through our legislative prerogative and control of funds it will be a self-perpetuating program which will continue to grow and grow. It is my hope that by reason of what we are doing the world will be free. That the people and nations of the world in using their present freedom might become economically self-efficient. This hope and this desire mean that I am opposed to any program of foreign aid which is everlasting and never-ending. I feel keenly that it is the responsibility of this Congress to make this program work to give it emphasis and efficiency by assuming the leadership in controlling the aid, achieving its goal and then preventing it from becoming a permanent part of the world's economy—a never-ending drain on our economy.

The amendment before you will give us armed control. It is a set of standards in budget presentation—one for domestic agencies and a loose, lax, and indefinite standard for JCA.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Did not the gentleman hear that we do not have time to scrutinize this multi-million-dollar spending program?

Mr. ROUSH. Yes, I heard that, but I believe we do have time to look after the taxpayers' money.

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

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Does that include military aid?

Mr. ROUSH. Yes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Does the gentleman think it would be wise to list the countries throughout southeast Asia and know how much money is given by this country to one country as against the other, Vietnam, Burma, Laos and the others?

Does the gentleman suppose that if in the future we find that country X just does not know what the other country got, both for military aid and economic aid, that would make for friendship with this country?

Mr. ROUSH. This body rejected an amendment which would open up all of that information. This could be put under the classification of "secret," I imagine.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana offers this amendment last year. The amendment, of course, would add nothing of importance to what is already in the bill.

In the Mutual Security Appropriation Act for 1960 two new sections—sections 111 (a) and (b), are incorporated. Both of those sections in the mutual security appropriation bill, and 537 (f) in the Mutual Security Act, in my opinion, take care of the problem adequately, and I therefore ask that the amendment be defeated.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Does the gentleman say this amendment is already in the bill? This amendment is not in the bill. There is nothing in the bill or act which requires strict adherence to a budget that has been presented, is that not correct?

Mr. MORGAN. As I said, there is in the mutual security appropriation bill, plus 537 (f), sufficient authority in my opinion to accomplish what the gentleman wants to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill be considered as read, and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

The balance of the bill follows:

CHAPTER VI—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS REPEATING NEW LIMITS OF UNITED STATES

Sec. 601. The Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 203 (c), strike out "continental" in the twelfth clause of the first sentence.

(b) In section 411 (d), strike out "the continental limits of".

(c) In section 500 (a), strike out the "continental limits of" in the introductory clause.

(d) In section 527 (d), strike out "the continental limits of".

(e) In section 530 (a), strike out "the continental limits of".

(f) In section 537 (a), strike out "continental" in the last proviso of paragraph (5) and in paragraphs (19) and (17); and strike out "the continental limits of" in paragraph (10).
"(1) Expenses of the committee shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, on warrants signed by the chairman of the committee."

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for reserving the point of order.

If this amendment is not germane, Mr. Chairman, it is nonetheless certain that the amendment and statements made during the last 2 days must have convinced anyone in the House that there is probably more question about this program than any other operation of our Government—more doubt about its effectiveness, more criticism of its operations, more question on the part of some, indeed, as to whether the program justifies itself; and certainly on the part even of those who support it, honest soul-searching as to what can be done, at least, to improve it.

Mr. Chairman, we have been promised in the New York Times that what we will be keeping—the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs that next year the committee will bring to this body a new bill, what we call a "clean bill." I am not sure that the House appreciates just how the bills have been prepared since 1954. It was in 1954, and not since then, that the House was presented with a new bill. Since that time, every year the administration has sent to the committee a draft form on which the committee, with deliberation—and I would say contentiously—has worked its will. But here we have had, Mr. Chairman, in 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1960 what might be colloquially, even if inelegantly, called a "rehash" of the bill of 1954.

Next year this House and the other body are due to receive new legislation. I think, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the moment is ripe for taking a new look at the policy, the pattern, and the operation of the mutual security program. Our Committee on Foreign Affairs should be ready to welcome such a look. I think that the committee would welcome such a look, based on a new perspective, based on evidence based on the viewpoint of those who may be less inclined to look back and produce only a continuation of what we have done year after year after year. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the country would welcome such a look. And, I would say to those who criticize the program, an honest evaluation, report, and recommendations as suggested, could bring in more body proper answers and proper actions—or at least proposals to terminate unjustified activities. It would certainly bring to those who support the program if continuation be ever warranted, arguments on which better to urge continuation. Above all, it would make us intelligent about what we are doing. Of course, I could not outrank the imperative branch to take a fresh look, too, at our problems in this troubled world and at the way that those problems might be freshly approached.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, someone might say: Is not the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate prepared to do just this?

First of all, sometimes a committee that has not in its entirety dealt so long and so often with proposed actual profits from disassociation with previous trials and errors. The proposed committee will have not only perspective but fresh inspiration. It may find a new pattern and pattern in our own safety and the peace of the world. But in addition, and very practically, Mr. Chairman, I realize that this present bill is not going to pass both bodies immediately, that the appropriation bill will be on our minds at least for a month or two and that we are going to adjourn as a body, hopefully we say, in July. The Committee on Foreign Affairs will not be meeting between that time and January. I therefore feel that the time has come when it is appropriate for new investigation by the Joint Committee on Mutual Security, comparable to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, after which this proposal which I have outlined is patterned. I would certainly think that the committee would raise a point of order against an amendment offered by one of its members in very good faith, but I would like to say that if the committee, perhaps because it does not realize the significance and helpfulness of the amendment which I have offered, does press that point of order, I shall certainly later introduce this amendment as a resolution and ask that it be sent to the Committee on Rules where I hope that it will receive prompt action.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I must reluctantly insist on the point of order.

I have the greatest admiration and respect for the legislative ability and skill of the gentleman from Illinois. Her amendment may have great merit, and I know that it is offered with the best of intentions. It provides, however, for the creation of a Joint Committee on Mutual Security and a new proposal, under the rules of this House, should receive appropriate consideration by the Committee on Rules. Our Committee on Foreign Affairs does not ever want knowingly to transgress the jurisdiction of any other committee of the House. Therefore, although I appreciate the spirit in which this amendment is offered, I trust my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois, will understand my position and my insistence upon the point of order.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, does the gentlewoman from Illinois desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. CHURCH. Regrettfully, Mr. Chairman, I think that the decision to press the point of order results in a loss of valuable time for investigation of a policy and a program that needs investigation—and I repeat, I conceive the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The point of order is sustained.
Mr. PASSMAN. Expenditures and not appropriations?

Mr. GROSS. Expenditures under the 1954 act, as amended.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. Does the gentleman make any provision that this food, and certainly we have plenty of it, gets into the hands of the people and not the administrations of the governments?

Mr. GROSS. No; I make no provision in the bill for that in the language in the bill.

Mr. WIER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GROSS. The form of surplus foreign aid programs.

Mr. WIER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I think we have done was exported under programs administered by foreign aid programs. I think we have done certainly we have plenty of it, gets into the hands of the people and not the administrations of the governments?

Mr. GROSS. No; I make no provision in the bill for that in the language in the bill. The testimony is that $175 million is about all that can be spent for or sent in the form of agricultural commodities, that is now being done and to adopt this amendment would just seriously cripple the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS). The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS), there was aye 60, nay 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Would the gentleman be kind enough to clarify his amendment?

Mr. GROSS. I did not say anything about foreign governments.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I would be kind enough to clarify his amendment so as to let me know if he is talking about needy people abroad or the needy people at home?

Mr. GROSS. As far as my amendment is concerned, it could be used to take care of needy people at home as well as abroad.

Mr. BAILEY. I would say amen to that.

Mr. GROSS. I did not say anything about foreign governments.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I would be glad to see some of the food paid for out of these foreign aid giveaway funds, go to hungry people in West Virginia. That would suit me fine.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Would the gentleman please explain this amendment would damage the bill.

From June 1946 through June 1949 the agricultural exports of the United States amounted to $49.1 billion. Of this amount those exports made under specific Government-financed programs amounted to $20.8 billion or 42 percent of the total. Of the $20.8 billion, $10.2 billion was administered under programs administered by ICA and its predecessor agencies; $7.2 billion of the $10 billion was financed by foreign aid programs. I therefore I do very well with the surplus food in this country under the foreign aid programs.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. In 1953 I offered an amendment, which was adopted, to require an up to $500 million of the aid provided under this bill should be in the form of surplus agricultural commodities. One year, I believe that ICA used up to $375 million.

Section 402 of the existing law requires not less than $175 million of the funds appropriated in this bill be used andYawing the fact that we cannot now use more than that because production in most of the countries that needed food and fiber in the beginning of the year, well restored; they now are recovered from the devastation of war. Many of the countries to which we are giving most of the help are now self-sufficient in food. What the nations that need help in nutrition, and various kinds of equipment and materials to develop their economies. The testimony is that $175 million is about all that can be spent for or sent in the form of agricultural commodities, that is now being done and to adopt this amendment would just seriously cripple the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS). The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS), there was aye 60, nay 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if he would outline the effects of section 601 under chapter VI.
Mr. MORGAN. This takes care of surplus bread grains and other foodstuffs to be donated to underprivileged countries under title 2 of Public Law 480.

Donated surpluses will be used as part payment in the development of public works in the form of loans, credit facilities, and cost-sharing. A Government program, and I have joined my colleagues as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and as a member of the Special Study Mission to Aid East-West捎 latterly, the Middle East, Southern Europe and North Africa in offering such constructive criticism. But too many of the bitter critics do so because they are driven by a desire to be violently opposed to any foreign-aid program, and the record will show this to be true.

There is nothing wrong with the mutual security program that better administration cannot correct. The Foreign Affairs Committee, under the able leadership of its chairman, Dr. Morse, without having written into this bill, H.R. 11510, amendments adopted by the committee which should be ample safeguards. However, the responsibility for the administration of the mutual security program is vested in the International Cooperation Administration. This executive agency must accept full responsibility for the record of past charges of maladministration. In spite of repeated evidence of such maladministration over the last several years, there is no indication of administrative corrections. Because of this situation, the mutual security program is carrying an unnecessary burden of criticism which has affected its acceptance by the American people.

I plead with my colleagues to put the blame where it belongs—squarely on the shoulders of the executive department. The many examples of waste and extravagance in the mutual security program which have been revealed to the Congress and the American public over the last 8 years have never been given one line of public recognition by the President or any of his executive administrators.

Whether we like it or not, world opinion is watching the Congress as it works its will on the mutual security bill. Again, whether we like it or not, the billions of people in the uncommitted nations throughout the world and where the mutual security program has been in operation, will be affected by the action of the Congress of the United States.

Our foreign aid programs are in direct competition with the Soviet Union foreign export programs in most of these countries. Are we afraid to meet this competition? Can we in all good conscience fail now to meet our responsibilities, to ourselves and to these people?

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my condolences to the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for the fine work they have done on H.R. 11510 and its accompanying House Report 1404. The bill is not all that I hoped it would be, but it does contain several significant, forward-looking provisions. These will strengthen the mutual security program and contribute to the benefit of the entire free world.

These provisions reflect an awareness of the need for new techniques and programs for meeting challenges which we have come to realize play an integral part of the exceedingly complex economic framework of young underdeveloped nations struggling to create a stable economic base.

I refer specifically to section 204(e) which endorses the Indus River Basin project, and which is a commendable addition. The implementation of this great plan will prove of immense benefit to both India and Pakistan, and to the free world as well. It is the hope of my colleagues and I that the Congress will accept this bill, acclaim the cooperative spirit which has carried the negotiations on this project to such a fruitful climax and that we should make known our determination to provide material assistance toward the implementation of the agreed goals.

Section 204(m) which provides for a program of loans to encourage the development of farm cooperatives is another commendable addition. Agricultural land reform programs are often among the early measures adopted by underdeveloped nations in their drive toward modernization. Quite often the sudden increase in small, relatively inefficient farms results in a temporary decline in food production. In other nations the condition has long existed of agricultural areas broken up into miniscule parcels as a consequence of age-old inheritance practices or lack of capital funds.

In either case, a possible solution to the problem of creating more efficient agricultural units is the formation of farm cooperatives. To the extent that the application of section 204(m) will aid in this aspect of modernization, its inclusion in H.R. 11510 is highly welcome.

Section 501(a) is closely relevant to section 204(m). This provision for a broadening of the forestry programs of Public Law 480 can prove of enduring benefit to the underdeveloped nations. The use of agricultural surpluses to relieve serious food shortages and to increase food production, to fill gaps left when farm workers swing to industrial and urban occupations or into education, and to fight ravaging inflation when farm stocks fall and hunger causes food prices to soar, fills a vital role in the overall mutual security program. Its beneficial consequences can be many, and I hope that it will be used to the greatest extent possible without infringing upon legitimate agricultural export programs.

The committee is also to be highly commended for the increase in the special assistance program from $247 million to $256 million. This grant aid to 22 nations is utilized for many important purposes, from the military to the political and economic stability to the carrying out of special programs. Its recipients include such countries as Brazil, Israel, Haiti, and West Berlin, among others, all significant members of the free world.

The committee likewise should receive our plaudits for section 2 which declares it to be the sense of Congress that the United States favor a favorable balance of food gation in the international waterways.
and economic cooperation between nations, and that the purposes of the mutual security program are negated and the peace of the world endangered when nations offer economic assistance, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways.

This addition superbly reflects the general policy of Congress as defined in section 2(a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1949, as amended, that—

Peace in the world increasingly depends on wider recognition, both in principle and practice, of the dignity and interdependence of men.

Efforts thus far to promote a concilia-
tory attitude in the UAR as regards its economic boycott of Israel and the closing of the Suez Canal have met with nothing but failure. Surely, if two countries can work mutually to their independent interests, it is these two; yet, the UAR almost pathologically insists upon maintaining a state of belligerency and keeping international law and denying the rights of nations.

The continuation of the Middle East crisis condemns the area to be in con-
stant ferment and affords Russia an open invitation to use her military might to further her evolution of the area's life. This would not only enable the entire region to concentrate on domestic needs, but would greatly augment U.S. foreign policy by removing a sore which has been highly embarrassing to the Administration.

I urge the Congress to support this provision overwhelmingly and thus strengthen the President's hand in its administration. Its adoption will constitu-
te notice to the world of our determination to uphold the principles of justice and equity among nations.

There are other aspects in the com-
mittee report which should be mentioned. One consists in increasing the authority of our Ambassado-
dors over the content, coordination and direction of our aid programs. This ob-
jective has been supported by numerous situations which demonstrate the growing awareness that U.S. Foreign policy can no longer be concerned solely with the external relations of States; the evolution of their domestic life has be-
come a direct and legitimate concern.

Relationships between the United States and the underdeveloped nations today must rest on a shared interest in furthering a process of modernization which will enable transitional societies to develop their own versions of responsible government and to play a useful co-
operative role in the international com-
munity. Fulfillment of this goal will require our Ambassadors to become involved in ac-
tivities directed toward the effectuation of this objective.

I hope that the policy outlined in the committee report will be applied as rapidly as possible in the implementation of U.S. foreign policy.

I also wish to commend the commit-
tee for its striking description of the pipeline problem and the need to main-
tain unexpended balances as an as-
surance of the continuity of our pro-
grams. Lead time is a necessary factor in the administration of the program; the very core of the program depends upon continued adequacy of material ship-
monts.

Continuity in the pipeline can be anal-
gized to maintaining a balance in a pro-
ceding account. Unless deposits suffi-
ciently balance withdrawals, the pipeline will decline and the usefulness of the ac-
count will be destroyed. If we fail to keep the pipeline filled, or if we permit it to be broken, young, free nations will witness a process of revivification by emergency treatment.

These, in my opinion, are some of the outstanding provisions in the bill and in its accompanying report. I hope that the measure will be adopted in its present form or, perhaps, its authorizations in-
creased where necessary to bring them into line with the recommendations of the President.

More than ever, we need continuity, adequacy, and flexibility in the mutual secu-
City program. The occasion calls for boldness and generosity. I deeply regret that the authorization for the Development Loan Fund, both in amount and time, was not substantially increased so that needs might be met, particularly in those nations which are poised just at the economic "takeoff" point, and require significant overseas assistance if they are to break through to modernity.

Mr. Chairman, these are the years that we can never call back. The conse-
quences of opportunities that are missed now can plague us in the future as we find that insufficient effort on our part might well be responsible for the failure of our expectations to fully materialize.

Once these years have passed, we can-
not correct what might have been done.

I commend the committee for the fine advances it has made in the mutual se-
curity program through the provisions of H.R. 11510. I only regret that greater provision was not made to set the direc-
tions in the free world.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, no man in this House has a greater respect for or a sounder friendship than I have for my colleague and fellow Pennsylvanian, the Honorable Thomas Morgan, chair-
man of the Committee on Foreign Af-
matters.

However, all men are endowed with the mental capacity to form an opinion and express it.

So without reflection upon my friend, Mr. DENT, or any member of this com-
mittee I want to again call for the de-
feat of the pet slogan, the "pipe-dream" of charity called the mutual security bill.

While we talk security, we preach, and sometimes I wonder if we also pray, for war and crisis after crisis. One won-
dern, if all this hurricane over war and threats of war, that is, the Berlin crisis, communist aggression, and other pet slogans are not manufactured for the purpose of justifying the $4.5 billion we
spend on defense for this country and our friends.

Certainly we all desire security at home and for our friends abroad, but we also have to admit that you cannot really buy either one of these necessities of life. You can talk yourself into trouble a darn sight easier than shoot your way out of trouble.

I quote this very morning the following editorial in the Financial Post from Tor-
onto, Canada. It ought to show just what others who are not Members of Congress, seeking election, nor are they Senators or state leaders, are thinking Presi-
dent, think about our so-called peace offensive.

I quote the editorial dated April 16, 1960:

Arn.'s Race Reaches Insanity Peak

Preparations for war by the two leading
powers, the United States and Russia, have now reached a pitch of mania and horror that they are ready to do anything to win.

Latest development: In the United States (reported on p. 13) is a concerted effort to cut the U.S. soldiers in low-cost warheads that can kill millions swiftly. Another specialty being developed involves mosquitoes, flies, and other terrible diseases.

This part of the military program has been kept hush-hush because the great public is supposed to have a moral or esthetic ob-
jection to this kind of defense.

But now the U.S. Army Chemical Corps, backed by top military brass and military experts, is out to make these ghastly weap-
on popular. They can kill far more people than the old nuclear bombs.

The cost of this kind of mass killing is only a few cents per corpse which is very much cheaper than the new bombs.

And so Congress is to be asked to speed up, and support with a greatly increased money vote, the making, testing, and stor-
ing of bacteriological and chemical killers.

And some of the militarists seem eager, ferociously eager, not merely to test these mon-
sters but to commit the United States to using them first when, as they evidently expect, war comes.

A new and shameful mockery when proposals of this kind are seriously made.

Surely, the bumbling leaders who have brought us to this desperate pass by their obsessive concentration on world war III mock and insult those who died in World War II.

The one possible basis for security, the necessary prerequisite to any cut in arma-
ments, is a political settlement of disputed

But it is obtainable now, as always, only by patient diplomacy, an art that's unfortu-
nately out of fashion and even despised in the U.S. American foreign policy during the 7 years Mr. Eisenhower has specialized in repeated threats of force, not in the search of conciliation.

Next month's summit conference offers an opportunity for the diplomatic, peacemak-
ing approach. If the chance isn't seized, if the President and the Secretary of State and other ambitious generals are to determine the course of American policy, the human out-
look is frightening indeed.

The latest news from Korea shows that the Korean and United Nations soldiers supplied the Korean Government is working per-
fectly in the street riots against the gov-
ernment forces of Korea which we are supporting.
We can assume that much of our mutual aid cash was used for payment of guns and equipment being used in South Africa.

We also wonder and that is all we can do wonder about the disturbances in South America—Central America, Santo Domingo, and all over the Caribbean area and how much of the equipment, guns, and propaganda was and is being paid for out of the pockets of American taxpayers from so-called mutual aid funds.

Another situation seems to be getting out of hand in our mad race to beat our neighbors into swords and to the proposal by the Eisenhower administration to give away to "friendly" nations our nuclear war equipment.

A few years ago this administration pushed through a bill allowing the President to give away nuclear secrets for peaceful purposes.

Since that time, France has developed the atom bomb without China is on the threshold of this accomplishment. What happens when we give away the war secrets and equipment? Suppose we give these materials to another friendship like Cuba was and a Castro decides to take over. Do we then get hit with our own shells or do we beg them to be nice and not fight "Poopa."

Personally, I must admit I cannot see any sense in giving mutual aid for economic purposes to so-called underdeveloped countries, to countries like Trinidad, to Latin and Far East countries who spend as much or more than we give them to build up what they call military strength.

If we want to give military help, let us admit to this fact; but does anyone believe there is any difference in the British hiring the Hessian to fight the Revolutionary War and our plan to pay nations to fight our battles for us? We will survive so long as we are strong.

If I thought this act before us would prevent wars, I would vote for it time and time again, and so would all Americans.

However, unless we reevaluate the whole situation of trade, aid, loans, gold reserves, domestic requirements for our people, and the coordinated effort to better our way of life, and then give a helping hand to our friends, I cannot at this time support this so-called aid bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, as I listen to this annual debate on our mutual security program, the thought comes to my mind of the reaction of millions upon millions of people to President Eisenhower's visits in the Near East and South Asia and in Latin America. I believe this reaction—one of warmth, enthusiasm, and obvious friendliness—proves how wrong are some of the allegations heard about our foreign aid program.

Take, for example, the charges that our aid has made enemies instead of friends. This charge just doesn't hold up. If it were true, we should have made an awful lot of enemies by now, because we have been in this aid business for a long time and have spent billions of dollars at that. If the charges were true, then why did so many people crowd the streets of so many nations to welcome our President with such an outpouring of affection for his friendship at what happened during the President's visit to Pakistan and India. The crowds were by far the greatest ever to greet a foreign guest and pressed in upon the official cars so that they could hardly move. This reaction, in my opinion, is not unrelated to the fact that we have shown through our aid programs that we are concerned with what happens to the people of South Asia—with their welfare and their aspirations for progress. It is not unrelated to the knowledge on their part that we have put food, quantities of food, to help ward off famines, to relieve victims of disaster, to add to stocks available and help to keep the prices at reasonable levels.

Our aid in both Pakistan and India has reached down to the villagers, in Pakistan, through the village aid program, in India through our help with the community development program. Here we have put in many local self-help projects, such as access roads, drainage ditches, pure water supplies, schools, and other enterprises of direct and immediate benefit. We have worked with these Governments, as with other governments, to make it possible for the average citizen to improve his own condition and that of his family and of his home.

Another familiar charge against the aid program is that the aid is given only to the rich and the common man does not get anything, does not know anything about the aid program, or, if he does know about it, he does not de know about programs and they know how they have benefited them. For example, who gets more benefit from a cooperative health program—the rich who can already afford a doctor, or the poor who learn how to prevent disease? Who gets more out of educational programs—the rich who already send their children to school, or the poor who are helped to build schools, to get teachers, to learn to read and write? Who gets more out of agricultural programs, or out of community development and out of self-help helping projects?

I have in my hand the latest issue of a newspaper called Economic World. On the front page is a picture of President Eisenhower inaugurating a self-help housing project in Chile. This project is the result of advice and assistance given through the aid program and 25,000 houses have been or will soon be built in 26 towns in the through similar self-help activities. What can be a better defense against communism than a home of one's own—particularly a home that a man has built for his family with his own hands and help of his neighbors?

I cannot believe that the warm, overwhelming reception given our President by the people of Chile was unrelated to their knowledge that over the years U.S. technical cooperation experts have worked side by side with Chilean Government officials and ordinary people to help them improve their nation's agriculture, sanitation, education, and social institutions.

The people of Brazil were equally warm in their reception of our President. A terrible air tragedy could extinguish their happiness with our President. We have had years of cooperation with Brazil and, as a matter of fact, it is in this country that the earliest predecessor of the point 4 program was born. The most outstanding success is the Public Health Service in Brazil. It is called SESP—Cervico Saude Publica. SESP started life much more North American than Brazilian—over 90 percent staffed and financed by the United States Public Health agency, larger in fact than the U.N. World Health Organization, and its more than 400 projects throughout Brazil are managed and financed by Brazilians. This is an example of the kind of institutional evolution which we encourage through point 4. It is the kind of help which helps the people directly and from whom many of them know and appreciate our helping hand.

We have all heard opponents of this program say that our aid is not wanted—not that we have been here to help our opponents—and even some self-styled friends say—that
U.S. personnel are inept and stupid, clumsy in their relations with sensitive, sensitive, and our friends ask for more of our technicians and our help. They ask for more because they like what they get; they know it is to help them. They ask for more cooperation because they think it is to their interest to work with us just as we think it is to our interest to work with them. In the other nation—Greece—where the cordiality of the reception given our President exceeded all we could even wish for. The thought of Greece should remind us that many countries literally would not exist at all had it not been for economic and military aid from us. Greece is one such country. Only 13 years ago Greece had been almost entirely taken over by Communist guerrillas. The Red-supported troops occupied 75 percent of the land area and held everything except a few of the larger cities. If there had been no aid from the United States, Greece would have gone down the drain.

But there was aid—both military and economic—and that country is today a valued part of Western strategy and a strong partner for peace. The people of Greece appreciate our aid and in one area they even erected a statue in honor of a U.S. technician who helped them drain and desalt some marshes and then plant them to rice.

Now, of course, the purpose of aid is not to extract expressions of gratitude, but to help our partners to become better partners. But when we receive expressions of appreciation, one asks, when need be, to carry the economic load of defense, to help them to keep their economies from being crushed by this burden. Another purpose is to provide that vital margin of resources which can make the difference between success or failure of plans and programs for economic development. Oddly enough, often help is a fraction, and often a tiny fraction, of the total efforts at economic development. But it is an essential fraction. Without it the situation in this area would be entirely different. With it we are able to create the opportunities for progress, opportunities to negotiate for peace.

Many more examples of the success of the aid program could be given, not only in the countries visited by the President, but in many others also. However, I think no more need be said to prove that the aid is appreciated, is known, and is needed. I urge approval of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I should like to place in the Record an article by Joseph Harrison, published in the Christian Science Monitor, April 1, 1960.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY REAPS GAINS

BY JOSEPH G. HARRISON

The foreign policy of the United States, according to a great deal of available evidence, has been effective in the sixties in a considerably stronger position than many of its critics would have thought possible in the fifties. Indeed, an impartial observer might well argue that America's position in the world, despite certain obvious weaknesses and failures, contradicts those who claim that this position has continued to deteriorate.

It can, in fact, he maintained that the very opposite of what critics expected has happened, and that for several years American foreign policy has been increasingly successful along most lines and at most points.

This does not mean that many grave problems do not exist. The recent problems over Berlin, Washington's presently unhappy relationship with Cuba and Panama, the present situation in Lebanon, the unsettled questions in Formosa, China, and the Middle East are all problems of great magnitude. This country has strengthened this country's international relationships and improved the picture held of this country.

ITES TO 1959

Some students trace the beginning of this improvement, surprisingly enough, to the summer of 1959, when, in the face of a civil strife in Lebanon, an extremely tense situation in Jordan, and the overthrow of the pro-American government in Iraq, the United States demonstrated a powerful contingent of U.S. Marines into Lebanon. This helped end the strife, and al¬lowed, an agreed-upon compromise between the warring factions. But, equally important, the Marines were, to other governments, elements in the Middle East, quietly withdrawn after a few months. Important segments of Asian, African opinion, which had earlier condemned the dispatch of the Marines, even though the Lebanese Government had requested it, were gratified at the speed with which this withdrawal was made.

This and other wise steps taken since eventually resulted in a lessening of Arab hos­tility toward the United States, the fact that Moslem resentment over America's role in the establishment of the State of Israel continues, and will continue for the foreseeable future, to raise many problems for Washington.

At present American relations with the Arab-speaking nations of the Middle East and North Africa seem, on the whole, to be moving toward a steadily better relationship. This is most true in the relations with the United Arab Republic, the most influential of the Middle Eastern nations.

SYRIAN AID RESUMED

Within the past few months, the Syrian region of the United Arab Republic accepted American aid to the extent of its commitments during the early part of World War II. Similarly, American aid to the Egyptian region of the United Arab Republic is rising steadily and negotiations regarding such aid are being held in an increas¬ingly friendly atmosphere. At the same time, the United Arab Republic has quietly but effec¬tively begun withdrawing a considerable number of students which it had earlier sent to the Communist countries of Eastern Eu¬rope and recruiting them to American and British universities.

It is undeniable that the relationship be¬tween the United States and the revolu¬tionary regime of Premier Karim Kassem in Iraq is far from satisfactory, with the United States being frequently lumped with other Western Powers as "imperialist." However, the United States has moved in such a way to avoid the kind of unfa¬vorable attention in Iraq, with the result that Baghdad has been finding fewer reasons to denounce American efforts. Part of this is seen in the fact that Iraq has made no serious attempt to link the United States with her own recent actions. Iraq has left that country in confusion and which resulted in a succession of sensational trea¬son trials.

In fact, the Iraqi-American situation has Improved so greatly of late that the Iraq Government recently asked the U.S. Embas¬sey to help it fill 200 teaching posts at Baghdad University so that it might avoid hiring further Soviet personnel.

In the United States, it is already possible to see how the United States could within the present con¬text of political realities appreciably improve its current situation and that of the Middle East. Washington has already demonstrated a heightened awareness of the complexities of the situation. It appears to want to do as little as possible to rub these sensibil¬ities the wrong way, and it is endeavoring through a number of reported diplomatic activ¬ities to convey the message to the Arabs that the United States not only has no designs against their independence but is sincerely interested in these countries in the form of the develop¬ment of well-being in the area. This is an effective beginning, given the bitter relations which began with the partition of Palestine in 1947.

NORTH AFRICANS PLACATED

In still another Arabic-speaking area the United States has also managed to steer its way through a considerable number of difficult diplomatic waters. This area is North Africa, where interest and emotion are currently being focused on the continued underground in Algeria to win local self-determination.

Let me refer to one other nation—Greece where the personal visit of President Eisenhower to the heads of state in both Morocco and Tunisia, through American willingness to negotiate over U.S. Air Force bases and military aid, through the granting of economic aid without strings, Washington has succeeded to a considerable extent in creating a not unfavorable image of the United States in those two countries.

Similarly, its shrewd voting during crucial test votes in the United Nations, its handling of the Orgueil issue, while not wholly satisfying either the French or their Moslem opponents, has en¬abled Washington to avoid offending either side too deeply.

But it is in south and southeast Asia that one of the most noticeable improvements in American foreign relations has taken place. While communism has been having its diffi¬culties, due largely to Chinese Communist aggression along its Himalayan frontier and its actions in Tibet, the United States has, through a number of careful steps, managed to improve relations with several Asian States. If not exactly Imperialistic itself, nonetheless was a fellow traveler of Euro¬pean imperialism. Through generous eco¬nomic aid, but also through the American line which it has shown at a number of critical junctures during the past year and a half in the Far East, America has given a tremendous model to a considerable extent the image of this country held by many influential Bur¬mans, Ceylonese, Indians, Indonesians, and other Asians.

EISENHOWER GAINS NOTED

It goes without saying that the triumph tour through this area taken late last fall by President Eisenhower could only be¬firm and forward what was already a notice¬able trend toward warmer relations with America on the part of a number of Communist countries of south, southeast, and east Asia. Indeed, this tour seems to have given impetus to the growth of a network of Asian States, some of which are not in the present area included therein.

One has only to think back to the tense situation which existed two years ago between the United States and the Republic of Indonesia on the occasion of the Sumatran expedition, to recognize how great the improve¬ment has been in this important corner of southeast Asia. At that time the United States was being openly accused of aiding the rebellion.

But by patient insistence upon its in¬nocence, by carefully refraining from actions which might lend weight to these wel¬crowns, by the extension of post-revolt
aid, and above all by the skillful and friendly diplomacy exercised by American Ambassador Howard P. Jones, Washington has converted its estimate that the United States is not exercising adequate world leadership. A second is that America's defense position has deteriorated in comparison with that of the Soviet Union during the past decade and has been directed toward enabling other countries to stand upon their own feet, to make their own decisions, and thereby lessen, rather than increase, their dependency upon the United States.

From this point of view, may not the decline in America's influence be partly regarded as a victory for the United States? It is obvious that this line of argument cannot be justified by pointing to the abrogation of all American leadership. Nor does it mean that America can afford to stop trying. Quite the contrary: it would be as dangerous as it would be foolish. But one cannot dismiss out of hand the arguments that many nations, which once felt obliged to pin too great hopes thereon at the present time, should the Kremlin so wish. It is, of course, true that this is not an easy decision. This renewal of close American-Cuban relations may move in the direction of the Kremlin. It is, of course, true that this is not an easy decision. This renewal of close American-Cuban relations may move in the direction of the Kremlin.
for 5 months at Johns Hopkins University and Boston University. We see many millions of dollars being spent to build high schools and colleges in Ethiopia, India, and the rest of the world. We see millions being spent to economically develop Africa and we see many, many other millions being spent to lend both military and economic aid to other nations. We see the expense of the American taxpayer, under a program where their Representatives in Congress have no voice in the spending but have delegated absolutely no power to the State Department, to ICA, and others. We see the farmers of so-called underdeveloped nations receiving substantial benefits to the tune of many millions of American taxpayers' dollars from these foreign aid funds. We hear rumors of hospitals being built in foreign countries, of railroads being built in Italy and we hear tell of foreign aid funds to the people of the world, and one million per mile to build a 300-foot-wide highway with underpasses, overpasses, and cloverleaf approaches—the Saigon-Bien Hoa Highway in Vietnam—and we understand that in our country such a program will be continued with foreign aid funds anticipated in the bill presently before Congress and those to be presented in future years.

While all this takes place and while a majority of Democrats on a bipartisan approach to foreign policy support President Eisenhower in his request for passage of the bill to authorize funds for foreign aid and the items above set forth, plus many others, President Eisenhower has, nevertheless, asked Congress, and particularly the Republican Members thereof, to vote against almost every bill which provides any funds or program to aid or assist the American people. The farmers will witness this session of Congress attempt to deny further agricultural programming funds to carry on the soil bank program which is due to terminate at the end of 1960. The numerous areas throughout the country that are underdeveloped and need assistance through the passage of the bill to aid the underdeveloped areas through a study and a joint plan of cooperation between the community and the Government to make economic taxing units out of areas that have long been uneconomic and underdeveloped.

FHA mortgage insurance which is due to terminate will have a difficult time securing approval in this session of Congress. The VA loan program will be permitted to die and the direct VA loan program has been virtually inoperative for the last 20 years. The 30-year mortgage guaranteed by FHA is virtually a thing of the past. High interest rates prevail for businessmen who seek loans to carry on legitimate business activities throughout the United States. It does not permit us to assist the people or our economy through a program that would compel lower interest rates, the whole industry subjects itself to the attack of the Government to act. Small businesses go bankrupt because of our own insecure economic position, and the Government does nothing to aid the small businessman.

We now see our Government actively engaged in a program to encourage and induce American industry to expand and develop in foreign countries. This takes jobs away from Americans and taxes away from the United States, as well as from the individual States and local units of government. The Government permits foreign imported products to enter this country at one-half or one-third of the amount being sold in competition with American-made products. This brings down the wage scale of American working men and women and eventually results in a substantially lower standard of living for the American working people. The Government actually encourages this under the guise of helping redevelop the underdeveloped parts of Europe and is heard to say that this program is, in effect, a foreign-aid program.

The gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman PASSEY, chairman of the subcommittee hearing the foreign aid bill, has documented the statement that our present foreign aid program is costing the American taxpayers in excess of $11 billion a year and adding to this American business which is being encouraged to develop in Europe, you can see that the cost of foreign aid to the American people, both in the form of pocket dollars lost in lost revenue, wages and taxes is staggering. This country still has 5 million unemployed men and women. It has long suffered and continues to suffer from major farm depression. Small businesses face its most severe economic test of this generation and a large percentage of them are being forced to quit or go bankrupt. American industry and big nations is feeling the economic pinch of trying to compete in wages and costs against the substandard wages and living costs of foreign countries.

In speaking of this, we are asked to authorize more billions of American taxpayers' dollars to aid foreign countries while every American aid program which has been tried and dependant on the theory that we cannot afford it and we cannot unbalance the budget.

I have always favored foreign aid and mutual security in the past. I, at this time, would vote for a reasonable expenditure for foreign aid and mutual security in those areas where such aid is essential to build an ally strong enough to enable them to resist Communist aggression of either a direct physical or economic kind. I am not permitted to vote for such a sane and sensible program. I am forced to vote for a bill that continues to enable those administering the program to boondoggle American tax dollars on public works programs throughout the world. I am asked to vote for programs which have little if any relationship to the rebuilding of those nations as strong units to resist communism.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa is an attempt to take a further step toward intelligent and effective use of this great weapon for peace, to help our business through the proposed decisions in the best interests of the American taxpayers, American citizens, and the country as a whole that I must vote against the foreign aid authorization bill. I, in doing so, promise to fight to secure such funds as are needed to carry on a reasonable mutual security program. This, of course, will only be possible if the present foreign aid authorization bill is defeated and that is the decision in the best interests of the American taxpayers, American citizens, and the country as a whole that I must vote against the foreign aid authorization bill.

I may summarize this by saying that I do not oppose mutual security but I do oppose the mismanagement and gross waste of billions of American tax dollars through a program that has been grossly mismanaged and unnecessary expenditures that have been made in the past and that are provided for in the present foreign aid authorization bill. I, therefore, will vote "no" on the foreign aid authorization bill for 1960.

Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. Chairman, one of the great tragedies of our time is the waste of American surplus food in a world in which one-half of the people go to bed hungry every night of the year.

That tragedy is compounded by the strange fact that we pay out more than a billion dollars a year for storage and wasteful costs of handing this surplus food.

It is literally true that we could give away much greater portions of this food surplus, to the hungry people both inside our own country and abroad, and save money in the process.

In recent years we have made progress toward a more intelligent disposal of this great food surplus, which is one of the richest blessings our country enjoys. Millions of American children, and additional millions of people all over the world, have benefited through our successful disposal of food.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa is an attempt to take a further step toward intelligent and effective use of this great weapon for peace, to help our business through the proposed decisions in the best interests of the American taxpayers, American citizens, and the country as a whole that I must vote against the foreign aid authorization bill.

I hope the amendment will be adopted, and commend its author for the fight he has consistently waged to use America's surplus food in the cause of peace.
The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 598, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments. The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentlemanwoman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, in the Chair, said: Mr. Speaker, I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentlemanwoman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS—243

AYES—131, not voting 57, as follows:

[Insert list of representatives]
Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Federal excise tax on long-distance telephone calls is a continuing, discriminatory and deceitful penalty imposed upon business enterprise and individual convenience. When this tax was levied by Congress during World War II, it was understood that it was an emergency measure for the purpose of increasing revenues and conserving materials that were needed for the war effort. Everyone agreed that this tax was necessary as long as the war should last. By the same token, it was expected that it would be discontinued as soon as possible, once the war was over. For 15 years, however, this temporary tax has been extended, thereby restricting the development of a communications system that is essential to service the expanding needs of our people and our economy.

In the United States, the telephone is a business and social necessity. A second telephone is being used in the kitchens of many American homes for the handy use by the busy housewife. Outdoor telephone booths are becoming a familiar sight on city streets and country highways to serve the general public at any hour of the day or night.

As Members of Congress, we would be unable to service the needs of our constituents without the availability of an efficient telephone service. Fortunately, we are provided with an allowance for this purpose. But if we had to pay for these toll calls out of our own pockets, we would immediately feel the financial burden of this federal tax and would vote to repeal it forthwith. It mystifies me why this tax is still in effect when there is no justification for it.

The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. paid Federal, State, and local taxes on its operations during 1959, totaling $1,690,289,000. These taxes averaged $3.39 per telephone per month. In addition, telephone users paid directly some $600 million in Federal excise taxes. This is double taxation with a vengeance, and not counting the triple taxation on a stockholder-user.

With the surplus of $4 billion that is anticipated by the U.S. Bureau of the Budget, it is clear that the wartime telephone excise tax is now a matter of habit and not necessity. Its repeal will mean that the Federal Government will still enjoy a substantial surplus of revenues over expenditures.

We must caution the States that the Federal Government does not intend to remove this tax so that State legislatures may reimpose it for their own purposes. Businessmen and individuals alike must rely on the punitive excise tax on local and long-distance service.

I have introduced a bill to remove the Federal excise tax on all telephone service, effective July 1, 1960. I believe that the lifting of this burden will be of direct benefit to every business enterprise and to most individuals.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON LONG-DISTANCE TELEPHONE CALLS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

**My Friend Dick Neuberger**

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, my friend and coworker from Oregon, Senator Richard L. Neuberger, died March 9, 1960. It is not easy for me to realize that he is in fact gone from this earth. So many of our mutual projects continue to come to my attention. I miss his wise counsel and friendship.

Dick's great public services are fully discussed in the editorials and articles which follow these remarks. I am going to record here a few personal facts about my friend with him.

Long before I met Dick I had heard about him. I was a student in Woodrow Wilson Junior High School in Eugene when he was a student under Wayne Morse, among other professors, at the University of Oregon. I knew of him as a fearless, brilliant editor of the Oregon Daily Emerald, the student newspaper. Later when I came to Congress, in the east I would talk about Dick Neuberger's latest exploits with Bill Tugman, longtime editor of the Eugene Register-Guard and more recently editor-publisher of the Portland Oregonian. And then two crusaders fought together for what they believed right.

Like millions of Americans, I read Dick's articles in many of the leading national magazines. We bought some of his books for our oldest boy, Don. He found them fascinating.

Late in 1951 my work with the American Bar Association's Survey of the Legal Profession, with headquarters in Boston, came to a close. Malcolm Bauer, a good friend of Dick, wrote on these subjects for the Eugene Register-Guard, and I was well aware of his great public services.

Dick died March 9, 1960. It is not easy for me to realize that he is in fact gone from this earth.
Mr. Speaker, if I have been overly personal in these remarks about my friend Dick Neuberger, it is because his death was a very personal loss to me. Some people come to Washington to grow, others to swim against a well-known tide. Dick grew. His friends were many. I thank God that I was one of them.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1960]

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

When the Oregon way from Oregon took his seat for the first time in the U.S. Senate on January 3, 1955, he was far better known in the state he represented than in Congress. He was a writer and crusading conservationist than as a political personality. When untimely death took him yesterday at the age of 47 his extraordinary qualities of mind and heart and spirit had achieved for him in those 5 short years a secure eminence of stature as a Senator.

It is difficult to write of Richard L. Neuberger in the past tense. His enthusiasm and strength of character and his high sense of public service combined to make him not only one of the most respected Members of the Senate but also one of the most useful and most vital. His powerful pen and his persuasive voice gave him a particular influence and note-able improvement of the legislative process and preservation of this country's dwindling natural and scenic resources—that brought him into conflict with interests that a lesser politician would have been afraid to offend.

One of his current projects dearest to Senator Neuberger's heart was enactment of legislation to establish as a national seashore one of the Oregon beaches. It had been included in the Oregon Dunes. No more fitting tribute could be paid him by the Congress and the people of his state than to pass the Neuberger bill that would set aside forever this area in memory of a fine legislator and great outdoorsman who was determined that future generations should share in the great natural heritage of this country that he knew so well and loved.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 10, 1960]

SENO.R NEUBERGER'S UNEXPECTED DEATH

The death of Senator Richard L. Neuberger is particularly poignant. A man in his vigorous and youthful prime, the junior Senator from Oregon, was cut down in the midst of an oper­ation for cancer. The malignancy had been arrested, and he was preparing to run for re-election in the fall. Moreover, he had been for many years a tireless advocate of greater Federal spending on medical re­search both on the floor of the Senate and in the press.

Senator Neuberger was a man steeped in the tradition of Western liberalism, a tradi­tion which can boast many famous names in American political history. But his style was entirely his own—freewheeling, unorthodox. He was a man who knew that although the brashness gave way to a re­active maturity in the last few years. And he always believed in a more liberal approach to the problems of the day. His was a most regretted loss to the Northwest and to America's public life in general.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 10, 1960]

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

The Senate has lost an extraordinarily useful, constructive, and independent-minded Senator Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon. There is extra pathos to Senator Neuberger's death in that he had apparently withstood a long siege with cancer little more than a year ago and had sought renomination in the Democratic primary, only to fall victim of a cerebral hemorrhage.

Always a liberal by conviction, Dick Neu­berger was a provocative and controversial figure when in 1964 he became the first Democrat Senator from Oregon. The 60-year-old Senator died after a long illness. He had been a prolific author on political science subjects as well as on environmental issues. Dick Neuberger had con­tributed a team with his attractive wife, Maurine, in the Oregon Legislature. If he had his principal victory, his death marked a bit of prudence when he came to Washington, he soon rejected the doctrinaire approach to public life. He regarded as the preconceived notions of his liberal friends as to strike at entrenched reaction.

The result was that he was regarded with respect and affection even by those he op­posed, and his analytical quality sometimes provided a catalysis in the Senate. Par­ticularly after his cancer operation he de­veloped a rare humanitarian gentleness, a warmth that was appreciated in Oregon as well as in his interest in health legislation. One of his great regrets was the feud pro­duced by his Oregon colleague, Senator Morse. Withal he was a man of much cour­age, not hesitating to criticize ethical stand­ards in Congress. His death is a loss to us all.
He knew, he never emerged from the coma, felt a cerebral hemorrhage that struck him on Tuesday morning. He had meanwhile learned something else: how to compute the odds, against grim odds, how to accept the sudden, devastating proof of mortality and go on from there. He would take that away from Dick Neuberger.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Mar. 11, 1960]

Senator Richard Neuberger

Sometimes one might think it was a rule of the universe that the average man may accomplish only so much in a lifetime. Most of us struggle along to our 3 score and 10 without more than a small fraction of the achievements of U.S. Senator Richard Lewis Neuberger, Oregon Democrat, at his untimely death this week at 47.

As a member of the Oregon Legislature at 29, a prolific writer, lecturer, historian, world traveler, dedicated proponent of conservation, his flame burned brightly while it lasted.

During his service in the U.S. Senate, beginning in 1954, was complicated by the cancerous attacks of his senator colleague, Warren L. Manfield, Nebraska's vigorous advocate for economic programs in underdeveloped nations, a man who, as the words a dozen years later, could well be a power in the United States Senate.

The sudden, tragic death of Oregon's young Senator, Richard Neuberger, will be mourned far beyond the borders of his native State. For the things that Dick Neuberger fought for, the value and high meaning for mankind everywhere: human rights and the betterment of the lot of his fellow man.

A successful writer, Democrat Neuberger was attracted to politics by his admiration for his fellowman. His personal struggle against cancer operation, his contacts with men of different opinions and he was quick to take advantage of this.

It was only a few months ago that he was assured he had conquered the cancer for which he had been operated on in 1956. His personal struggle against this dread disease won him respect and admiration throughout the nation and he used his own experience and his position as Senator to campaign successfully for vastly increased medical research.

Following his cancer operation, he wrote: "A brush with cancer tends to place many things in true perspective * * * old antagonisms and new quarrels seem to form political disagreements into any feelings of personal malice. When one is grateful for his survival, it is difficult to dislike a fellow human being."

For many Americans, Senator Neuberger symbolized young courage and intellect and a dedication to a higher cause than the lowest traditions of political democracy. He was also a vigorous advocate for conserving the Nation's natural resources and Senator Mike Mansfield's announcement of a bill to name the proposed Oregon Dunes National Park for Senator Neuberger would seem to have been personally gratifying to a courageous heart who, in the words of Mr. Mansfield, was "a star whose light remains."
The book on the center of his desk remained as he had closed it—"America's Wonderland—The National Parks." It was one of the 200 or more books he had reviewed for the New York Times.

Strangely enough, what Senator Neuberger would not have liked to do in life he was able to accomplish in death. He had stayed—at least, temporarily—the harangue and anger of the press and had suffered itself.

For 3½ hours the men and a lady of the Senate left aside the bickering on civil rights to hear the words of the man who had gone on to other things. And then they adjourned.

The passing of Senator Neuberger also brought to an end the personal and painful assault against him by the colleagues of his on the firing line for organized labor.

Now Senator WAYNE MOSS droned on in eulogy for 25 minutes. Before closing, however, Senator MOSS observed that when Dick Neuberger left Washington for a rest in Portland he must have felt he would never return—that he was going to die soon.

But even in death Senator Neuberger disagreed with the senior Senator from Oregon.

For on the Senator's date calendar stands this note: "Dick's luncheon, Friday, April 1, Philadelphia."

[From the Trialman News, Mar. 14, 1960]

HARVEY BROOKS

Senator Neuberger's untimely death at the age of 47 represents a deep loss for the entire nation. He was a battler for justice for all who make up our citizenry.

A dedicated proponent of liberalism, he also could be depended upon to do his utmost to bolster the interest and advancement of the little fellow.

The Oregon Democrat many times was found in the forefront of organized labor. He delivered his abilities to other causes which to him represented a sense of fairness.

Senator Neuberger will be missed on the national scene.

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times, Mar. 10, 1960]

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

The able newspaperman who became Oregon's junior Senator, Richard L. Neuberger, died unexpectedly early today as his home in Portland, Oreg. Having won sensationally in 1954 as a Democrat from a Republican State, Senator Neuberger had filed only last week his intentions of seeking reelection.

He suffered a cerebral hemorrhage following several weeks of illness when he had been beset by a series of virus infections.

At the age of 47, Senator Neuberger had been a most wholesome influence during the last 6 years of his life as a U.S. Senator and also in the 20 or so years before in which he was a prominent writer for newspapers and journals. His influence was primary in the conservation of natural and human resources.

As a resident of the Far West, he believed sincerely in the public protection of the forests, the waters and the growing foods, whether they were on land or the fish of the running and still waters writings on these subjects as well as his advocacy of these conservation matters in the U.S. Senate, will be of great value even years go on in the development of a sound conservation policy.

As a believer in the public's ownership of the resources, he was particularly effective in pursuing the hydroelectric power developments of the Northwest. He was a strong advocate of the public development of these resources.

Consequently, it can be said that the American citizen had the primary right to enjoy the huge power resources of the nation. The fact that he was a writer made him particularly effective in conveying in terms that people could understand effectively the story of this nation's resources. Unfortunately, he was not old enough in the 1930's to be a part of the huge governmental resource programs of that decade but had been undertaken and even completed before he was old enough to work in their behalf. Yet, he was able to write about these things, which he considered of great importance to the American people, and, thus, write ably about them in proposing programs which are yet to come. The thing he has been writing and saying since World War II will come to as the years go on in the development of the resources.

And an ardent backer of equal rights for the laboring man, died of a cerebral hemorrhage at his home on March 9, 1960.

Neuberger made our world a finer place to live in; his departure from our ranks should inspire us to more vigorous advocacy of the causes of fraternity and justice, to which he devoted his fertile mind and great heart.

[From the Enginemens' All American, Mar. 18, 1960]
[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer]

SENATOR NEUBERGER’S DEATH CUT OFF PROMISING CAREER

The untimely death of Senator Richard L. Neuberger of Oregon came at a period of his career when he was at the brink of emerging as a potent Senate force.

He had spent years in Congress and at first may have been looked upon by some as a bit too vocal for a newcomer.

But the Senator was gaining in his own persuasive, learning from experience. He even had broken with his old mentor, Senator Wayne Morse—an event which alone improved his stature. Moreover, he was in fact highly knowledgeable, particularly on conservation. His views on that subject were highly regarded.

Had he lived to be reelected this year—he was an odds-on favorite—he might have become the first Senator from the United States. He had the intellect and despite serious illnesses, a tremendous vitality.

His change in thinking was illustrated last year when he wrote this: “A brush with cancer tends to place many things in true perspective. It makes you hold an antigovernment, face away. I no longer can transform political disagreement into any feelings of personal malice. When one is grateful to be alive, it is difficult to dislike a fellow human being.”

There, in a paragraph, is the clue for many of us as to why Senator Neuberger was a likable and respected leader for the lawmaking comrades, whether they be flaming liberals or otherwise.

[From the International Woodworker, Mar. 29, 1960—Reprinted from the Toronto, Ontario, Canada, Globe and Mail]

SENATOR NEUBERGER KNEW, CARED ABOUT CANADA

Senator Richard L. Neuberger, who died in Portland, Ore., was a true friend of Canada.

It was his belief that ties between this country and the United States were so close and unquestioned, both in war and in peace, that nothing should be done to strain them. He took the trouble to visit Canada—no once, but many times—in determined attempts to understand our people, our problems and our policies against the United States.

He praised the Canadian family allowance program as a great social experiment for the United States to study and at one time advocated formation of a police force modeled after the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to protect the voting rights and lives of Negroes in the Southern States.

He was one of the first to offer a resolution in the U.S. Senate to consider sending a joint Senate-House of Representatives committee to study Canada-United States relations.

Not all. Mr. Neuberger’s suggestions were acceptable to Canadians. His bill calling for joint session by the two countries to pass the Alaska Highway was coolly received in Ottawa; and Canadians were incensed by his suggestions that the two countries join together to form one great North American community.

But Neuberger did care something about Canada, and he did know something about the American people. None of his suggestions was more than could be said for many or most of his colleagues in Washington.

[From the Intermountain Jewish News, Mar. 18, 1960]

ADL, AMC MOURN SENATOR NEUBERGER

The Anti-Defamation League has lost a good friend. Senator Richard L. Neuberger, a Democrat from Oregon, was a member of the American Medical Center in Portland, Oregon.

Richard Neuberger, a leader in the American Medical Center, has strongly opposed the death of Senator Neuberger.

Richard Neuberger, a board member of the American Medical Center, was re-elected to the Board.

After Senator Richard L. Neuberger, Oregon Democrat, has successfully undergone a cancer operation he so beautifully and touchingly said: “A brush with cancer tends to place many things in true perspective. It makes you hold an antigovernment, face away. I no longer can transform political disagreement into any feelings of personal malice. When one is grateful to be alive, it is difficult to dislike a fellow human being.”

Neuberger was once an extremely controversial figure in Oregon politics. He served the state Senate in the Senate. Oregon editors also covered his 1954 campaign. In recent months they had praised him.

At one time Neuberger and Wayne Morse, companion Democrats Senator from Oregon, were close friends. However, Neuberger’s credit that he parted with the vindictive Morse. Morse once had even threatened to withdraw Neuberger’s credit from the Senate. When Neuberger was re-elected this year, Morse had praised him.

[From the Tarpon Springs (Fla.) Leader]

TRAGIC LOSS OF BRILLIANT LEADER

The death of Senator Richard Neuberger, of Oregon, from a cerebrovascular accident at the age of 47 is doubly sad because of the Senator’s gallant fight, and apparent victory, against cancer.

Since the passing date to file for Senator in Oregon ends tomorrow, Mr. Neuberger’s death leaves the state into an even greater confusion. So popular was the Junior Senator that even the Republicans were entering only token opposition to his candidacy.

But Senator Neuberger had that precious combination of unwavering liberalism and level-headed pragmatism which enabled him from trying to remake all our social and political institutions in a day. There are all too few such statesmen left, and to the Senate he so admirably served.

[From the Locomotive Engineer, Mar. 25, 1960]

LOSES A FRIEND

First in the congratulate and later the Oregonian, Richard L. Neuberger was a warm friend of rail labor.

The Senator was a writer and newspaperman before entering politics in 1940. He served as the Oregon Times correspondent in the Pacific Northwest.

He wrote many fine travel articles for popular magazines and many of them were good boosters for rail travel.

His views on the social and economic consequences of rail travel came as an extra shock because of his seeming victory over cancer two years ago.

He took his death at the peak of his public service.
Dick and I differed politically, but we worked well together. He was an excellent judge of occasions and earned each other's respect. The first of these occasions was the great fight over the march of inflation and the necessi- ties fees in the bitter depression year 1933; the fee had been $6 per term; Dick and his goody-goody view, won it.

The athletic gang (which had conspired to make Dick editor of the Emerald with the mistaken notion of defeating me) had a ball of a year, and I put it away. A bill was introduced in the 1933 legislature.

Dick, Gene Allen, and Steve Kahn came to my house one evening and asked if I would appear with them the following morn- ing at a public hearing on their bill in full. I was pleased to pick me up at 6:30 a.m. with a car.

The ride to Salem in that old open "ja- lopy" was almost as rugged as a trip to the North Pole, but in spite of icy roads we made it in time.

The chairman of the committee, a long-time friend of mine, gave us a courteous hearing, and when it was over—toward noon—we felt we had accomplished a blow. There was so much of it in time.

Dick Neuberger was a senator, whose life was so much so much. He was so much to my house one evening and asked if I would appear with them the following morn- ing at a public hearing on their bill in full. I was pleased to pick me up at 6:30 a.m. with a car.

The ride to Salem in that old open "ja- lopy" was almost as rugged as a trip to the North Pole, but in spite of icy roads we made it in time.

The chairman of the committee, a long-time friend of mine, gave us a courteous hearing, and when it was over—to toward noon—we felt we had accomplished a blow.
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The chairman of the committee, a long-time friend of mine, gave us a courteous hearing, and when it was over—to toward noon—we felt we had accomplished a blow. There was so much of it in time.
Those who said the change was phony were either talking through political purpose or through their hat.

For example, Neuberger called a Republican, Senator Marland of Oklahoma, over the Oregon sand dunes proposal. It was this friend's advice that led to the compromise which probably will result in establishment of a national park on the coast. Yet it had become a perfect political issue, with Neuberger's advice that led to the compromise of the plus aspects on Neuberger's side.

There's no doubt Neuberger wanted the park more than he wanted the political points.

But influencing everything he did was his ability: no matter how complex the personal makes. When one is grateful to be alive, it is difficult to dislike a fellow human being.

It was our observation that the maturing process began because of his cancer illness. Neuberger turned away from extreme partisan-ship to accomplish things which could not be done by the usual methods. In other words, Neuberger had his enemies. Rather it seemed hostile to the proposal.

In his role as a freelance writer, Neuberger would now more than ever before publicly Oregon nationally. His writings were eagerly accepted in the top publications, and reflected the change in his life. This reached a climax in Oregon's centennial year when Neuberger's articles wider than could possibly have been otherwise well known.

Neuberger's experience with cancer height-ened an already held interest in the public health field. He was a man of some maturity in behalf of a step-up in cancer research, using his own illness to dramatize the need. It may be that in looking back over his life this is the thing in which he would have taken most pride.

Dick Neuberger will be remembered for his flashing mind, his restless energy, his wide range of interests, his flashes of humor, and his willingness to do with party affiliations.

But particularly following his cancer oper-ation, his sense of values underwent a con-siderable change, and partisanship no longer was a deciding factor in his thinking.

During the period of illness which started out with the "squirls on the White House lawn" controversy, and which brought him to national notoriety and ridicule, he became less strident, less combative, less convinced of his own omnipotence.

And, following successful fight to save the great pine forests of the Klamath Indian Reservation from destruction, he was now able to speak for the statesmanlike approach to matters of concern to Oregon.

He went to the Senate as a champion of conservation and he remained one. He fought increased appropriations for the Forest Service, the national parks, and the other Federal agencies charged with the responsi-bility for the conservation and protection of the Nation's outdoor resources. He fought for the multiple use concept, and, within the credit which will be accorded him for years to come.

Dick Lewis Neuberger, 47, will go down in the State's history as one of the great public servants.

Nor will his stature be diminished by the fact that he had his enemies. Rather it will be enhanced.

For a man often is judged more accurately by the enemies he makes than by his friends. And, particularly in the last year or so, Dick Neuberger's enemies did him the most credit-which will be accorded him for years to come.

[From the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., Mar. 10, 1960]

SENATOR NEUBERGER'S DEATH TRAGIC LOSS

The untimely death of Senator Richard L. Neuberger, October 26, 1954, was all the more tragic because of his service to this State. The cancer which came after he had seemed to us a victory over cancer, which had once before taken him into its grasp.

Cancer was not the direct cause of death, though one might assume that it contrib-uted to a loss of resistance which, coupled with his habit of mercilessly driving himself, made him prey to other ills.

The sadness which comes now has no partisan lines, for Dick Neuberger had count-less friends at National, State, and local levels whose political beliefs were different from his own.

So full and varied was his life that his activities cannot be summarized and app-raised in the space permitted here.

Never could a man be called a "neutral" about him.

For days when, as editor of the daily Oregon Journal, he took public and personal the issues which had become hotly debated; for days when he was a strong leader, for days when he was a relentless fighter; for days when he was a quiet meditator, he was a tireless worker, he was a human being who lived his life.

But nobody can speak of Neuberger now without thinking of his last days, for Neuberger himself traced this primarily to his earlier brush with death from cancer, and the fear of death meant no longer could transform political disagreement into any form of personal makes. When one is grateful to be alive, it is difficult to dislike a fellow human being.

It was our observation that the maturing process began because of his cancer illness. Neuberger turned away from extreme partisanship to accomplish things which could not be done by the usual methods. In other words, Neuberger had his enemies. Rather it seemed hostile to the proposal.

In his role as a freelance writer, Neuberger would now more than ever before publicly Oregon nationally. His writings were eagerly accepted in the top publications, and reflected the change in his life. This reached a climax in Oregon's centennial year when Neuberger's articles were more wide-ranging than could possibly have been otherwise well known.

Neuberger's experience with cancer height-en-ened an already held interest in the public health field. He was a man of some maturity in behalf of a step-up in cancer research, using his own illness to dramatize the need. It may be that in looking back over his life this is the thing in which he would have taken most pride.

Dick Neuberger will be remembered for his flashing mind, his restless energy, his wide range of interests, his flashes of humor, and his willingness to do with party affiliations.
learning to be newspapermen. It was a friendship that came over the years, to mean more to me than a parent has to a child.

Dick Neuberger's death is a tragedy for so many people, not alone his friends. There was so much ahead for him to do, tasks that no one else could do as well as he.

Before he went to the U.S. Senate he was established as a writer whose stories on any subject were sought by all the best magazines and by such great newspapers as the New York Times and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

In less than 6 years in the U.S. Senate he became a statesman who was admired and respected beyond the confines of the State for his intellect, his capacity to serve the people of his State and his fairness and tolerance.

Because of the respect Members of both parties had for him, he was getting more and more done for Oregon. He worked as effectively with many Republicans as he did with Democrats in the Senate. Members of the Republican Party in Oregon knew that he would unfailingly place the interests of all citizens of Oregon ahead of any other consideration. They knew that they need not hesitate about going to him with their problems.

A few days ago he told me he intended to serve (if Oregonians desired that he should) one more term in the U.S. Senate. He never set out to do that because there was a lot of unfinished business in the Senate he wanted to have a hand in. We all knew that his one term in the Senate in his first term that he most certainly would have accomplished much in the second.

Another term and then he was coming home to Oregon to spend the rest of his years writing and enjoying life with close friends.

Dick Neuberger had an almost unbelievable capacity for work. He fulfilled his duties on the Senate Cuisine as any man Oregon has sent to Washington. But he also found time to write for magazines and newspapers, to carry on personal correspondence that would have kept most men busy had they nothing else to do, to make a great number of speeches, and to read every week more than most of us get to in a month.

His personal correspondence was of amazing magnitude. Children of his friends always knew they would have a letter from him and would send them gifts. So many letters to parents on important matters contained special autographed notes.

He loved young people. When he went to the Senate he was offered patronage rights. When he declined to accept them, he distributed them on the Senate page. He established a research internship on his staff for outstanding graduates of Oregon colleges in political science and journalism. He gave a large portion of his earnings from magazines to Oregon colleges as scholarship funds. The book he wrote for children about the Lewis and Clark Expedition was a best seller.

His devotion to the preservation of natural beauty was his true north. He loved the wonders and beauties of nature more than lip service, as all who read his magazine articles knew. There was no subject he enjoyed more writing about. He enjoyed more a day at the beach or at a lake or on a mountain trail. One of the most enjoyable times he had with Neuberger was that on the beach at Ecola Park, a day of such beauty that we spoke of it many times after.

Dick could have done so much for this State and its citizens in the years ahead. But there is nothing to be gained now in speculating upon that. Let us speak of the high place he has in the history of this State because of all he accomplished in 6 years in the U.S. Senate and in countless other ways. Those who knew him intimately saw early a man of great stature, a statesman who other recognized later. When he was elected to the U.S. Senate, I said to some who had doubts, "Dick Neuberger will be a great Senator. But he measured up so well recognized throughout Oregon that it was conceded by almost all the politicians that he would be sought for by the biggest margin ever given a candidate for the Senate from this State.

I could write much, much more about Dick Neuberger and it would be personal and this is not the place for that. I shall close by saying that no man will pass this way whom I shall think better of.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Mar. 11, 1960]

NEUBERGER'S RISE IN SENATE RAPID, IMPRESSIVE, DESERVED

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Richard L. Neuberger came to the Senate as a crusader in which he has been a rare, literary sense and in the most part partisan sense. He departed as a creative and skilled legislator and his accomplishments seem destined to memorialize him for decades to come.

In his relatively brief 5-year career as a U.S. Senator, Neuberger rose from the estimate of impartial observers here, and even in the view of many who disagreed with much Neuberger advocated. The change in Neuberger, one of the most evident witnessed in the Senate in years, came about in midway through his term when, coincidently, he deliberately broke his political alliance with Wayne Morse.

Neuberger decided, he said in 1957, that Oregonians could not afford to have two faddly Senators. He did not begrudge Senator Morse this role nor challenge his seniority in rank or experience.

He observed a useful purpose; but for as himself, he explained, he would thereafter concentrate on "getting things done" legislatively for Oregon.

In the 2 years or less left to him, Neuberger amassed an impressive legislative record for the State. He has voted the most time and effort was saving the Klamath pine forests from the threat of clear-cutting, as a source of sustained-yield timber, a wildlife sanctuary, and a wildlife sanctuary. The threat had arisen from a Republican-sponsored act ending the Klamath project. But vocal opposition did not just let it pass; the Oregonians who then pressed for Government intervention did raise, and in recent months Neuberger joined forces with Gov. Mark Hatfield to compel the Oregon Congress to accept. Nevertheless, Congress steadily increased cancer research funds, for which he was credited with at least an assist on the final scoreboard.
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WASHINGTON.—Richard L. Neuberger came to the Senate as a crusader in which he has been a rare literary sense and in the most part partisan sense. He departed as a creative and skilled legislator and his accomplishments seem destined to memorialize him for decades to come.

In his relatively brief 5-year career as a U.S. Senator, Neuberger rose from the estimate of impartial observers here, and even in the view of many who disagreed with much Neuberger advocated. The change in Neuberger, one of the most evident witnessed in the Senate in years, came about in midway through his term when, coincidently, he deliberately broke his political alliance with Wayne Morse.

Neuberger decided, he said in 1957, that Oregonians could not afford to have two faddly Senators. He did not begrudge Senator Morse this role nor challenge his seniority in rank or experience.

He observed a useful purpose; but for as himself, he explained, he would thereafter concentrate on "getting things done" legislatively for Oregon.

In the 3 years or less left to him, Neuberger amassed an impressive legislative record for the State. He has voted the most time and effort was saving the Klamath pine forests from the threat of clear-cutting, as a source of sustained-yield timber, a wildlife sanctuary, and a wildlife sanctuary. The threat had arisen from a Republican-sponsored act ending the Klamath project. But vocal opposition did not just let it pass; the Oregonians who then pressed for Government intervention did raise, and in recent months Neuberger joined forces with Gov. Mark Hatfield to compel the Oregon Congress to accept. Nevertheless, Congress steadily increased cancer research funds, for which he was credited with at least an assist on the final scoreboard.

SUCCESSFUL FIGHT

Dick Neuberger did not, however, renounce those liberal programs he had previously espoused. But he did insist that it was a liberal's responsibility to face the cost of new programs—not simply because it was virtuous to balance the Federal budget but because, he pointed out, the bulk of Federal and state and local debt falls upon the low and middle income groups, not just the rich, and the corporate interests whom liberals often condemn.

After he fought back successfully from his cancer bout, Neuberger spoke and wrote more about the demands for more cancer research funds at the National Institutes of Health. But his massive program in this field was cut two years ago to cost containment to accept. Nevertheless, Congress steadily increased cancer research funds, for which he was considered a successful champion.
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squirrels were being trapped and shipped to Washington, D.C. because they dug up the preidential golf green.

But Neuberger learned the ropes rapidly. If he was not physically weak, he even wrote an article about the mistakes he had made as a freshman. In another article he said the papers were not doing their duty to keep in mind that the other fellow might be right. He frequently prefaced comments with, "I may not think so," and he displayed a tolerance in debate that was uncommon in a chamber where headstrong and willful men sometimes create that atmosphere of absolute certainty.

A PUBLIC MAN

Throughout his career, Neuberger was truly a public man. He yearned to communicate his ideas to the public, to persuade and to lead, to explain and to justify. He had faith that the citizens of Oregon, when given full and candid accounting of public business, would respond intelligently even at possible cost to themselves.

So in the final analysis, Neuberger's accomplishments cannot be seen only in his conversion to the spirit of bipartisan accommodation within the Senate which marked his later years. It also came from his faith in the people's sustaining role in the democratic process.

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Press, Mar. 11, 1960]

PASSING IN REVIEW

(By Dewey Rand)

It is difficult to realize Dick Neuberger will no longer stride Oregon's political stage to represent his State in the U.S. Senate. Even his series of recent illnesses were accompanied by the hope for his tragic death this week at the age of 47.

It doesn't seem like two and a half decades since I first met Dick back in the gloomy and bright young man became interested in political techniques as a cure for a serious national illness.

And it was then, in the thirties, that the political interest led to one of his two extraordinary successful careers. The Senator, a fierce partisan through the beginning—a young man reached the U.S. Senate and was a credit to that body, and over the years his opposition to the current administration and his personal support was unreserved.

But none could fill the void. But none could fill the void. It is ironical that this useful man, who through his series of recent illnesses filled, his great talent in making complicated public issues clear to the public will be sorely missed.

He had decided then to run for reelection and had made clear my support was warranted. In a conservative State as it is a new thing in a chamber where headstrong and willful men sometimes create that atmosphere of absolute certainty.

We talked of the coming campaign and he assured me he could help. It was a small thing but he was pleased. And now I am pleased that I told him that I had faith that the citizens of Oregon, when given full and candid accounting of public business, would respond intelligently even at possible cost to themselves.

And when I appreciate more fully that he has left the stage older than he was. More than I do today. Brightness and imagination, his skilful political activities in behalf of issues in which we both believed. But most of all I'll miss his steady friendship as with hundreds of others.

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Press, Mar. 11, 1960]

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

The sudden and tragic death of U.S. Senator Richard L. Neuberger, a void in the State of Oregon that will not soon be filled, if it ever is.

He was a great humanitarian who, through his congressional influence, contributed measurably to a better life for people all over the world. He was a loyal native son of Oregon who never missed an opportunity to bring credit and improvement to his State. But more than all that, he was a particularly gifted and dedicated publicist for the Pacific Northwest and a defender of the unfortunate and aged, the sick, the aged, the poor, and the underprivileged.

It is ironic that this useful man, who struggled so hard for better health for others and himself, was the one best able to be a successor to his seat in the Senate and, as he was, undergoing an examination to determine whether his life would go on or sooner than it would.

The Senator, a fierce partisan through most of his life, had mellowed and just begun to specialize in the field of health, in which field he saw no partisanship. He said, after his scare with cancer, that he never again could be so partisan, that the man of the people wrapped in a sheet, as he was, undergoing an examination that would determine whether his life would go on or sooner than it would.

In the course of events there will have to be a successor to his seat in the Senate and, because the Democratic Party has become so vigorous one in Oregon, there are a number who could fill it. But none could fill the same role that Senator Neuberger filled.

As this is written, a number of possibilities present themselves. One is that Maurine Neuberger, herself a person of great stature as a record five-term Republican editor of saying that Dick Neuberger has done.

On that day in November 1954, when the late count of ballots showed that Richard L. Neuberger had defeated the veteran incumbent, U.S. Senator Guy Cordon, the Oregonian's editorial comment began: "Someone—perhaps it was Woodrow Wilson—once observed that when men move to Washington, D.C., he either grows or swells."

The editor who wrote those words, the late Philip H. Parris, then editor of the editorial page of the Oregonian, also said of the Senator-elect: "We know he has the intelligence to grow into the job." Mr. Parris did not live to check the record of Senator Neuberger's performance.

And now I am pleased that I told him that I had faith that the citizens of Oregon, when given full and candid accounting of public business, would respond intelligently even at possible cost to themselves.

And when I appreciate more fully that he has left the stage older than he was. More than I do today. Brightness and imagination, his skilful political activities in behalf of issues in which we both believed. But most of all I'll miss his steady friendship as with hundreds of others.

One of my most distressing experiences was the result of the disagreement between Dick and Wayne Morse. I had admired these two men for many years and considered them both my personal friends, as I did until the last day. But there was nothing I could do about this clash of personalities as much as I wished to avoid it. Over the years I thought it all unnecessary. They were never so very apart on the larger issues they were called upon, and now I am pleased that I told him that I had faith that the citizens of Oregon, when given full and candid accounting of public business, would respond intelligently even at possible cost to themselves.

And when I appreciate more fully that he has left the stage older than he was. More than I do today. Brightness and imagination, his skilful political activities in behalf of issues in which we both believed. But most of all I'll miss his steady friendship as with hundreds of others.
Dynamic is a descriptive term that fits Dick Neuberger, a political liberal who was the first to introduce Senatorial Voting in Oregon Senate from 40 years. His effective speaking no less than his brilliant writing, served the people of his native Oregon as had no other. His years of service in the State legislature, where he and Maurine formed the able team that also worked for Oregon Congress, likewise should not be forgotten.

To Maurice, to his mother and father, and to his siblings, however, the Neuberger was the uncle's favorite, we offer heartfelt sympathy, Dick, as he liked to be called, will live on for years to come, in memory of one of the great Oregonians of our century.

The untimely death of Senator Neuberger, who was only 47, has been a shock to us all. But, not that the final tribute has been paid, our thoughts must not linger with the past but must turn to the future. Dick would want us to do exactly as he would have done himself.

Maurine Neuberger has worked closely with her husband in the Senate and is by far the best qualified candidate to carry on with his work and carry on hiscors, and we have no doubt that Mrs. Neuberger, we feel she should be elected by an overwhelming majority in the coming election.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, 1960]

FIVE YEARS OF SOLID ACHIEVEMENT

All through Wednesday the teletype machines brought in their pounds and pounds of paper telling of the death of Senator Richard Neuberger. Much has been expressed sorrow at the loss of a man who was a personal friend to thousands. That wave of sorrow did not reach us. One of the world's really nice people was dead. But we cannot forget that Oregon and the Nation also lost a man of great ability and achievement. Perhaps other Senators have accomplished as much in 5 years. Many have done much less.

The Neuberger file in any Oregon newspaper office is a thick one. Leaping through it, the researcher finds a commendable record of achievements in almost every field. He or she fails to find one of the drawbacks of plans. Here are a few of the accomplishments:

The future of the Klamath Indian Reservation will be forever under sustained yield management, thanks to Mr. Neuberger's hard work.

Oregon has its first historic shrine, the National Park Service's Fort Clatsop near Astoria, thanks to the efforts of a man who was also Oregon's greatest living fan of Lewis and Clark.

The country has standards to protect roadside beauty, including the 42,000-mile interstate highway system, thanks to a man who liked grass and trees.

The Yaquina Bay project, a $610 million job, was authorized, thanks to a man who recognized the need for industrial development, commerce, and trade.

The Federal gasoline tax was raised and postal rates went up, thanks to a man who felt in many areas.

Public employees can take part in a voluntary health insurance program, thanks to a man whose concern for human health was a passion. This was the passion, stimulated perhaps by his own sufferings, that made him urge greater Federal aid for medical research.

His work was not done. Still close to his heart was the establishment of a seaore recreation area on the coast and legislation for a Columbia River regional development corporation which would work to make better improvements self-financing.

He was a man of his time. The country needs visionaries. Most of the established programs, public and private, were his. Yes, that is a truth. But it is reality because visionaries refused to think of them as unattainable. Senator Neuberger, how­ ever, had made more progress in his program for medical research, especially into cancer. He, as his loyal political supporters and his opponents in past political battles, did not swell. He grew. His stature as a Senator increased. A man becomes greater in each of his talents. He was well on his way to becoming a statesman.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, 1960]

EDITORIAL WRITERS PAY TRIBUTE TO NEUBERGER

Oregon newspapers today paid editorial tribute to Senator Richard L. Neuberger who died Wednesday.

Headline in Portland Oregonian, for whom Neuberger once worked as a youthful sports writer, referred to an editorial written by the Governor.

So said Parrish, after Neuberger's 1954 election.

It began "someone—perhaps it was Woodrow Wilson—once observed that when a man goes to Washington, D.C., he either grows or swells."

The newspaper's editorial today said "it must have been recorded for him, barely got in the Senate, Neuberger, in Washington, D.C., and in the hearts of his many personal friends, that Neuberger was a genuine liberal on matters of human welfare. He was moved by suffering and distress, and those who considered themselves his political foes than any man we can remember. Neuberger was a statesman." He was a visionary, true enough, he did not hesitate to move to their relief." He said, "for Richard Neuberger the epitaph should be: Distinguished journalist, con­ ciliator, legislation, ardent conservationist, statesman."

The Bend Bulletin said "Neuberger and his wife, Mauritine— a charming lady who stood stanchly at her husband's side—made one of the Nation's most prominent political teams. It is broken up now, and Oregon and the Nation are the losers."

The Eugene Register-Guard said "Dick Neuberger earned his way to greatness. Oregon could not have been any more abrupt at the peak of his public career was not born to it, did not love it with a love that moved him to urge those who considered themselves his political foes than any man we can remember. Neuberger was a statesman." He was a visionary, true enough, he did not hesitate to move to their relief." He said, "for Richard Neuberger the epitaph should be: Distinguished journalist, con­ ciliator, legislation, ardent conservationist, statesman."

The Medford Mail Tribune said, "And now just where does that leave us?" His political career was what could have been his most useful and most influential years he fell by a stroke brought in no small measure by his own sufferings, that made him urge greater Federal aid for medical research.

Richard Lewis Neuberger will go down in the history of statesmanship in the State's..."
history as one of the great public servants of this generation.

So-called the World called Neuberger a "man of driving energy and possessor of a bottomless well of ideas."

There was nothing too much to be done in the World for Oregon's foremost author of ideas and exponent of discussions to be still.

In the case of Dick Neuberger, the sum of life is great. He leaves behind a river of ideas and a reservoir of principles. These of ideas and exponent of discussions to be ance will remain."

His career in the Senate got rich and because of his rich life interest, his re-

markable talent for research, analysis, and communication. But influencing everything he did was his love and sympathy for and killed those at his fellows, their hopes and problems. He could be militantly in-

dependent and tough minded in a fight for a principle. But he didn't want to hurt anyone personally, not even his severest critic. * * * We consider that Neuberger has been an outstanding American and citi-

zens of Oregon."

[From the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin, Mar. 9, 1960]

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, 1912-60

Richard L. Neuberger, junior U.S. Senator from Oregon, died early today in a Portland hospital after a cerebral hemorrhage suffered yesterday.

Ironically, he died of the same ailment which made him a political hero, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It is difficult to write of Neuberger and his career in an objective fashion. Neuberger was an example. In Oregon, his name was first place. In the second, he was a close personal friend of the editor of this newspaper and was on good terms with many members of its staff.

Dick Neuberger was the best served to the U.S. Senate, by a very close margin of vic-

tory, 6 years ago. He was then one of the Nation's more controversial political figures.

His career in the Senate got off to a rather shaky start. But he matured quickly, and at the time of his death was noted from all walks of American political life, as a Member of the Senate. He was a fine Senator for the State of Oregon.

Neuberger was an extreme partisan earlier in his political career. His maturity, plus the fact that he has been a U.S. Senator for 2 years ago brought him expressions of hope and good will from all walks of American political life, had dimmed his partisanship.

Future historians of the Senate probably will not recognize Neuberger as "a great" in that body. Such honors never are ac-

credited those who serve only one term.

But Oregon historians will recognize him, we are sure, as one of the most articulate men ever to serve in high office in this State.

The king is dead, long live the (new) king. Dick Neuberger has received quick and fleeting attention given to a politician who dies in office. No sooner is the death anounced than the infighting begins to deter-

mine his successor.

The balance of Neuberger's term will be filled by a man appointed by Gov. Mark Hatfield, a fellow citizen and colleague. Unfortunately his name is not known, nor will the time of his death be noted as an effec-

tive Member of the Senate. He was a fine Senator for the State of Oregon.

Neuberger's death occurred only a little more than 48 hours before the final deadline for filing for nominations for the U.S. Senate. And it creates the biggest shuffle ever known in Oregon political life. A juggling over the political fate of the 1st Senator.

Dick Neuberger was appointed the nomination. He faced no serious opposition. Now that the nomination is completely changed, and serious

Democratic—probably led by ex-Gov. Robert D. Holmes and Congresswoman Ennis Osborne—has its work cut out to maneuver and real-soul-searching in the next 48 hours.

Reportedly, too, has been hard put to find a serious candidate. One mentioned was ex-

Gov. Elmo Smith, Albany newspaper pub-

lisher. If others were interested in the race, we were unable to find word of their candidacy.

Neuberger and his wife, Maurine—a charming lady who stood stanchly at his side in the Senate and as leader of the Oregon State Senate in their battle to defeat the general sales tax.

Two of Dick's earliest and closest friendships were with Ben Osborne and Kelley Lee. They fought to-

gether, side by side, in many a battle for the people's benefit in Oregon politics.

Ben Osborne was an iron worker and a dedicated trade unionist who provided great support to the Oregon State Federation of Labor through the depression years until his death in 1938. Kelley Lee, a printer by trade, was one of Oregon's pioneering labor leaders.

He served as legislative assistant to Ben Os-

borne and his successors until his death in 1948. Both Osborne and Kelley Lee were close friends with Dick Neuberger during his early years as a student and young free-

lance in politics—before his first campaign for public office.

It was during the 1941 session of the State legislature that I began to follow Dick's career with close interest. Though it was his first session in the legislature, Dick served with distinction and his qualities of kindliness and courage were immediately apparent.

During that 1941 session, many bills harmful to the interests of the people were intro-

duced. Dick fought them with courage, brilli-

ance and tremendous energy. It was during that legislative session that the people of Oregon began to learn that Dick was their champion.

After serving in the Armed Forces in World War II, Dick returned to public service in Oregon when he was elected to the Senate in 1948. He served with great distinction as a State Senator for 1949, 1951, and 1953 sessions of the legislature.

His voice was heard supporting many causes that were not popular in that day. With his tremendous fund of knowledge and energy, and his passion for research, Dick got the facts and presented them in a most ef-

ficient manner.

The facts usually fell on deaf ears in those years, but much of the progressive legislation that has been enacted in Oregon has resulted from Dick Neuberger's early support and con-

stant advocacy.

Late in 1953, when a liberal candidate was being sought for the U.S. Senate, Dick was asked to make the race. I feel proud of the small part I had in persuading him to become a candidate.

And I can remember, as if it were yester-

day, when Dick called my home early on that historic November morning in 1954 before all that had been done that year. He believed at that moment that he had failed to win election. But before the day was over the picture developed and Dick became a U.S. Senator.

He served with all his might. He gave everything he had, including his life, to serve the people of Oregon.

Dick will be missed not only by members of labor unions but by all citizens of Oregon and the Nation.

When history is written the name of Dick Neuberger will fill many pages. Because of his faith in people, because of his great work to develop and protect the natural resources of the Pacific Northwest, because of his un-

failing humanitarianism, the memory of Dick Neuberger will never die.

[From the Oregon Labor Press, Mar. 18, 1960]

DICK NEUBERGER'S COURAGE WILL BE LONG REMEMBERED

(By James T. Marr)

Despite many difficulties in the labor movement I can remember Dick Neuberger well. Back in the early 1930's, when he was still a student at the University of Oregon, Dick was working on progressive legislation that would benefit people.

Dick was the people's friend. He was always opposed to special-interest legislation that would not benefit the great majority of people. He was a great humanitarian.

I well remember, from those early years, that Dick worked with the Oregon State Fed-

eration of Labor and the Oregon State Gar-

rige in their battle to defeat the general sales tax.

The sudden death of Senator Richard L.

(Dick) Neuberger is a great shock.

A controversial figure in State and Na-

tional politics, Neuberger was high among the Nation's characters on the political stage. Plate blotted a future that held for him great political promise.

It seems somewhat odd that the Senator, a recent cancer sufferer, should die from what apparently was an unrecognized physical con-

[From the Roseburg (Oreg.) News Review, Mar. 10, 1960]
dition. Overjoyed that he had been found free from malignancy, after surgery, Neuberger recently had suffered from several al­
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A hard worker, worried by his physical condition, driving himself to serve in the of­

tice, he had a brief vacation in an effort to regain his health, had decided. Neub­

erger to return to work. Neuberger, who was un­

He had taken a brief vacation in an effort to regain his health, had decided not to re­
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On the other hand, I held him in high estee­

because of his dedication and sincerity of purpose. Neuberger had an uncanny ability to seize­

upon the weaknesses and frailties of men and to make use of them to "nurture" his contemporaries. In that respect he unquestionably helped to clean up various practices and to produce a better brand of politics.

In this column I have opposed from time to time what I felt were "schemes" carrying political motivation. In such cases I have been un­
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and my respect had grown into warm admiration for the man himself and for the work he was endeavoring to do in represent­ing the people of the State in the Senate.

"I think I have never known a man whose mind was so fertile. He was constantly com­

The senator was a man of wide interests. In terms of his long interest in Oregon, he was a

The senator was not always so eager. He knew that the Senate was a place of negotiation, and

The senator had a keen feeling for the preservation of natural resources. He paid special atten­tion to the problem of overabundance. He knew that the problem had been a long time in the making, and that it would not be easy to solve.

"The Family Farm Income Act of 1960 is designed to raise family farm income while simultane­ously reducing the cost to taxpayers."
As proposed the estimated cost of the program would be limited to no more than 5 percent of the annual market value of each of the commodities participating in the program. It is estimated the program would cost about one-tenth the sum now being spent—or $0.5 billion yearly as compared to today's $5.3 billion.

In discussing this legislation with my colleagues I am aware that amendments will be necessary. I understand, for example, that the dairy industry has a working marketing program and does not feel it is wise to change it. Changes in wheat marketing are needed. I know that revised bills include such provisions.

My purpose in joining with my colleagues is to lend support in an area which does affect every other area of our economy. A healthy and strong farm economy is not an impossibility.

Surplus food, stored in warehouses at high cost to the taxpayer, benefits no one. Poor acreage confined to a soil bank program does not meet the need to take out of production productive land. This sort of operation does little more than rob the taxpayer as well as cripple the farmer.

The taxpayer and the farmer demand a sound, effective farm program. Piling up surpluses is no answer. The Family Farm Income Act of 1960 offers the best route out of a distressing situation.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS ON FOOD FOR PEACE PLAN

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have permission to extend their remarks following my remarks on the food for peace amendment which was offered by me today.

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

There was no objection.

UPWARD ADJUSTMENT OF RESIDUAL OIL IMPORT LEVELS IS DEPLOYABLE AND INEXCUSABLE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound regret that I learned the Department of Interior was again bowing to the will of import companies. There is no need for the program to be about-face which defies a Cabinet committee's security standards and strikes another cruel and unnecessary blow at labor and management in the domestic fuel and railroad industry.

The import levels were created to prevent foreign oil from eroding the American coal industry's emergency potential. For more than a decade incentives to use residual oil have been closed mines, relocated miners and towed the ranks of the unemployed, shoveling railroad cars into an inactive state of deterioration, and taken away the jobs of maintenance and operating personnel. The effect on our whole business community has been primarily responsible for the gross labor surplus prevailing in coal communities and railroad centers.

I say to you frankly that, while I was gratified at the White House order initiating the mandatory controls program on April 1, 1959, I was not at all satisfied with the import levels decided upon. Using 1957 figures to establish the criteria reflected a generosity toward import companies that was unacceptable from the standpoint of the domestic economy. In 1957 the importers had shipped a total of 173 million barrels of residual oil into fuel markets of this country. It was a record year. These imports amounted in energy value to more than 41 million tons of coal.

Having seen the gradual erosion of what has taken place in Pennsylvania's coal mining country, a consequence of the rising tide of residual oil from foreign refineries, I favored a cutback that would reemploy open production opportunities elsewhere. In other regions where foreign oil had literally wrecked opportunities for miners, railroaders, and other workers whose livelihood is reliant upon a vigorous domestic industry, after careful consideration of the problem, came to the conclusion that it should adopt the quota limitations recommended by the Cabinet Committee. The late revision of this vital gas deficit program at what point oil imports become a threat to the national security. The 1957 figures were set as the safe level.

Those of us seriously concerned with the impact of oil imports accepted the decision with reluctance. We were at least pleased that the White House had finally taken this official recognition of the importance of the coal industry and its relationship to the movement base. So we sat by and waited for the results.

We felt that the limitation on the volume of residual oil imports thus established might be lifted in the event that the coal industry of just how far importers are allowed to go. The coal industry could make its plans accordingly.

Railroads could use this information in projecting their operations to conform with general economic expectations of the coming years.

Now the status has been summarily upended. The Department of the Interior has clarified that any consideration of the impact of oil imports would be bated as another threat to the national security. The Department of Interior is inexcusable.

The estimated value of the plant's present material inventory is $123,018,907.

A review of the total employment figures of the weapons plant beginning on June 30, 1956, to date substantiates my deliberate phasestep charge:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Personnel on board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 1956</td>
<td>5,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 30, 1956</td>
<td>5,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 30, 1956</td>
<td>6,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 30, 1956</td>
<td>6,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 30, 1956</td>
<td>6,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 30, 1956</td>
<td>6,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 30, 1956</td>
<td>6,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 1960 (approximate)</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to explain why I feel it necessary to address this body this afternoon,
I would like to review briefly my relationshps with the Navy Department through the Bureau of Ordnance in connection with two Government installations, the Naval Propellant Plant at Indian Head, Md., and the Naval Weapons Plant at Garden City, N.Y. On January 9, 1956, I was confronted with a continuing series of layoffs at both installations, which were quite obviously being precipitated by the reorganization of the Bureau of Ordnance as the Bureau of Weapons, an establishment for having the capability of competing in today's propellant fashion. What we should be debating today is the knowledgeable or denied information or denied participation to be idle until I am convinced of those reductions in force were unavoidable. However, many serious questions have been raised as to contract efforts in this deadly struggle with Soviet Russia to its idle is unthinkable. But yet, we are doing just that with the Naval Weapons Plant.

For, one, will not apologize for defending as fine an installation as the weapons plant. In fact, I am proud to report today that the hundreds of dedicated employees of the plant. In my statement to me of August 14, 1957, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, for what he did in 1960, 255 additional employees.

In his statement to me of August 14, 1957, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, for what he did in 1960, 255 additional employees. He was the one who approved the bypassing of the Naval Propellant Plant in 1956, and in his statement to me of August 14, 1957, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, for what he did in 1960, 255 additional employees. A YEAR IN BOARD EMPLOYEES

Before the end of 1956, I was left with the role of the gun factory in the new Navy. It was already established that the Naval Gun Factory might be forced to shut down.

Actually, gun factory officials, we are getting more work now than we have for some time. Although we have passed through some lean years during the last 2 or 3 years, culminating in the recent reduction of force in about 800 workers, we now have enough work to maintain our present work force of about 6,280 employees...

Captain King came here in November 1956, of 255 additional employees.

A number of rather sensational stories appearing in the local press recently resulted in a spate of rumors here. The local newspaper quoted the testimony of a naval official indicating the role of the gun factory in the new Navy. It was already established that the Naval Gun Factory might be forced to shut down.

Actually, gun factory officials, we are getting more work now than we have for some time. Although we have passed through some lean years during the last 2 or 3 years, culminating in the recent reduction of force in about 800 workers, we now have enough work to maintain our present work force of about 6,280 employees...

A number of rather sensational stories appearing in the local press recently resulted in a spate of rumors here. The local newspaper quoted the testimony of a naval official indicating the role of the gun factory in the new Navy. It was already established that the Naval Gun Factory might be forced to shut down.

Actually, gun factory officials, we are getting more work now than we have for some time. Although we have passed through some lean years during the last 2 or 3 years, culminating in the recent reduction of force in about 800 workers, we now have enough work to maintain our present work force of about 6,280 employees....
In the April 11, 1958, edition an interesting article appeared describing a large flowtoning job under a contract to produce 10,000 canisters for the Sidewinder missile.

It was reported that the weapons plant is unable to produce the weapons demanded by today's modern Navy. At this point I think it well to refresh the recollection of all on the fine weapons plant who, several years ago, when a large number of Chinese Mig's were shot down by Free China's jets armed with the Sidewinder missile.

On July 23, 1958, further RIC's were announced. They were deemed necessary as a part of a modernization program consistent with an assigned new role to the naval gun factory. This new role and optimistic statements about the future were set forth in glowing terms in the July 3 edition of the Log.

Excerpts are as follows:

**NAVY Assigns Gun Factory New Role for Missile Age—Will Keep Plant Open for Defense Output for Years to Come**

The Naval Gun Factory, now in its 116th year, is about to take on a new look. The Navy has decided not to scrap it along with its 1958-level mission.

The gun factory will become primarily a plant for research, design, and the prototype manufacture of the new missile age weapons, C. E. Briner, NGF superintendent, announced recently.

The Navy's decision to maintain the gun factory as an important facility for the design, prototype manufacture and testing of new type weapons should allay some fears of the workers who have been working under a cloud of uncertainty as to their future career. Probably less than 5 percent of the total work force now on board will be affected by the change.

But once that changeover is effected, once the gun factory has settled down to its clearly defined place in the Navy, there should be a considerable uplift in employee spirit. For although most workers have not lost faith in the plant they have been left hanging under a cloud of uncertainty as to their future career. Probably less than 5 percent of the total work force now on board will be affected by the change.

But once that changeover is effected, once the gun factory has settled down to its clearly defined place in the Navy, there should be a considerable uplift in employee spirit. For although most workers have not lost faith in the plant they have been left hanging under a cloud of uncertainty as to their future career.

In August 1958, in a letter to the board of trade, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Richard A. Jackson estimated that the transition in the Naval Gun Factory would take 5 years and would result in large savings and high employment here. He also wrote that although the changeover would require adjustments in personal, the program would be executed with a minimum personal dislocation. It was at this time that Rear Adm. T. A. Ahroon, Acting Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, told the Washington Board of Trade that "none of the facilities at the Naval Gun Factory are essential to the defense of the Navy." This was new in the latter part of 1958. On September 24, 1958, a statement was made by the superintendent of the gun factory, in connection with a still further reduction in force, and I quote:

"I realize there have been some pretty wild rumors. Right now let's get one thing absolutely clear. Let me repeat, the gun factory is not planning new major reductions in force involving a large number of employees. The modernization of the gun factory is proceeding, and I know the Bureau of Ordnance is proud of the excellent work being done here and that the Bureau will continue to utilize the facilities of the gun factory to the maximum extent possible. I expect that, with normal attrition, only a very small percentage of our civilian employees will be affected by the changes that will be required of the gun factory."

"I had every reason to believe that the superintendent of the gun factory made this statement in absolute good faith, as did the factory's employees. Unfortunately, those above him did not share his views."

On December 12, 1958, we find an editoral appearing in the Log, stating the following:

**Workload Situation Very Good**

There appears to be some confusion as to what has been happening at the Naval Gun Factory in regard to our workload over the last few months. I have tried to clear this away right away now. Today the Naval Gun Factory can be said to be in a period of saturated workload. What I mean by this is that we have been caught up with our shop capacity and if we don't watch out, it will bog us all down.

In keeping with our outfitts run through lean years and fatty years. We have, in the last few years, been caught in the Korea-Vietnam conflict and we have been caught up with our orders. During this time, we have attempted to shift over to a year of reducing force. But our major program now is not that of getting more work, but how to get the already heavy commitments into the shops and out from under. We have been able, after completing our reduction-in-force actions of last spring, we have slowly managed to shift over to a year of reabsorbing the necessary workforce we had cut down.

Our major problem now is not that of getting more work, but how to get the already heavy commitments into the shops and out from under. We have been able, after completing our reduction-in-force actions of last spring, we have slowly managed to shift over to a year of reabsorbing the necessary workforce we had cut down. This has happened mostly because of major programs started in the last few months. In the guided missile launcher programs some design problems have been difficult and the schedules are now really tight. Our job is to get the guided missile launcher programs to produce items as quickly as possible.

We now have the best and most optimistic work situation that the gun factory has had in several years. This is actually financially supported for well over a year.

And on January 7, 1959, the following New Year greetings from the superintendent of the factory:

**New Year Greetings From the Superintendent**

The new year, 1959, holds great promise for the Naval Gun Factory. If we continue our efforts to stretch our dollars, the workload looks good, and I am sure that with the concentrated teamwork the Naval Gun Factory will continue to occupy an important place in the ordnance development program of the Navy.

I extend to each of you my best wishes for much happiness and success in the coming year.


It was during the month of December 1959 that the Eichert Subcommittee and the Special Investigating Committee at my request, investigated the conflicting statements concerning the outlook of the gun factory. During testimony I attempted to determine if the defense electronics plans today are given a chance to support private industry to the extent of protecting the taxpayers' investment in idle equipment. Assistant Secretary of the Army for Logistics Higgins answered as follows:

"I see your point. Yes, I would say generally, if you play with overhead and buy this in competition on the outside, we would do it."

I then asked:

"Despite the fact that it would mean a plant sitting idle?"

The answer from Mr. Higgins was:

"That is right. Yes, sir."

Further on, in testimony before the Hébert subcommittee, significant questions were asked of Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bantz and Admiral Stroop. During the course of this testimony an internal survey was mentioned for the first time. A very interesting history will follow as to what the attitude of the Department of the Navy has been on its own survey and how my attempts to obtain pertinent facts concerning the status of the current F.A. and Armed Services Committee, were rebuffed by the Department of the Navy.

During the course of the hearings, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bantz and Admiral Stroop, in response to my questioning, that our facilities could be utilized to a greater extent than they are and assured me that the Department is more conscious of the value of producing components parts of the Navy's weapon systems in facilities such as the Naval Gun Factory.

These were reassuring words to the committee, but unfortunately actions during the next 12 months made it very clear that these words were not truth.

A most informative discussion took place during the hearings between Mr. Bates, a member of the subcommittee, and Mr. Bantz and Admiral Stroop, concerning the computation of what we spend, and costs. Admiral Stroop readily admitted that "if you want to play with overhead, you can get any kind of a price you want."

The reason why the overhead discussion is so important is that the true cost of items manufactured at the plant is not being fairly computed. Admiral Stroop referred to the long-range activities at the plant. Approximately $1.40 an hour is loaded into the Naval Weapons Plant's total costs price as a result of such tenant activities, which in no way contribute to the produced item.

A most interesting sidelight, which is germane to this discussion, is the number of personnel in one of the facilities of the weapons plant involved in long-range activities. In the Supply Department, of 900 employees only 250 are involved in the supply of the industrial factory.

I recommend for the record that in its opinion this was a vital facility to our defense effort and relied upon the assurances given by the witnesses that the recommendations of the survey referred to previously would be given serious consideration and implemented wherever possible in order to create a more stabilized situation at the plant. Since it appears that the survey in question would have a great bearing on the future workload
of the plant. On December 2, 1958, dur-
ing a conversation with Admiral Stroop after his testimony before the commi-
tee, I requested that I be furnished a copy of the survey.

It became necessary for me on De-
cember 12, 1958, to make a formal re-
quest of the Secretary of the Navy, who
was denied. For the first time the con-
tracting officer of the Bureau of Or-
dinance, to whom I had again denied my request. I felt
most strongly that if I, as an individual
Member of Congress, did not have a ri-
ight to this survey, then most assuredly
the elected representatives of the people,
should have a right to examine and to make
our people of these facts and
decisions.

It is for this reason that I made re-
deemed demands for the survey in order
that I could form my own opinion as to the
accuracy and truth of the survey and the
standpoint of the Secretary of the Navy.

It became necessary for me to refer
denial to the House Committee on
Government Operations, the Subcom-
mittee on Government Information, and
the Chairman of our distin-
guished colleague, Congressman John E. Moss. The committee, on April 20,
21 and 23, held extensive hearings on
this arbitrary denial and completely
vindicated my position that I, as a
Member of Congress, was entitled to the
survey in question.

It must be emphasized again at this
point that the survey board I refer to
was convened by the Chief of the Bu-
reau of Ordnance on March 21, 1958, with
Capt. B. L. Lubelsky, U.S. Navy, as
chairman. To use Admiral Stroop’s words,
Capt. Lubelsky is “an out-
standing industrial engineer with consid-
erable experience, both in the Bu-
reau and our activities.”

Quite properly, there were doubts
raised as to certain of the recommenda-
tions and, more importantly, consider-
able confusion did exist as to why many
of the sound recommendations contained
in the survey were not implemented.

I have emphasized the Lubelsky re-
port and the reliance placed upon it by
the committee for a reason. At the
conclusion of my remarks, I will submit
a reiteration proposal for the plant
publicly by the highly trained and capable
engineers. The proposal, to a large ex-
tent, is an outgrowth of the original
Lubelsky report, which, incidentally,
cost the taxpayers $12,135 to prepare, yet
Congress has been denied access to it.

During the course of the Moss sub-
committee’s hearings, Mr. Bantz, in an
attempt to discredit certain public
statements I had made, said this con-
cerning the future outlook of the
Naval Gun Factory—and this was ap-
proximately 1 year ago:

I would like to say this to you. We have
talked about this Naval Gun Factory here in Wash-
ington for a little over a year and a
half. There has been a lot of publicity given
to it. Since my tenure of office down here, there
have been many, many cents, and I
would have known, any plan to close the
Naval Gun Factory, there is no such plan
now.

Further in the testimony, the possi-
ability of a name change was raised with
Secretary of the Navy, and I, the Secretary of the Navy,
and no one, had decided on the plant.
His comments certainly led all of us to be-
lieve that the plant would remain as an
active producer of naval weapons.

Subsequently, on May 18, 1959, the Navy
announced the name of the Naval
Gun Factory would be changed to the
U.S. Naval Weapons Plant, effective July
1, 1959.

Prior to this announcement, and shortly
after the conclusion of hearings
held by the Hebert subcommittee, the
long-range outlook for the Naval Weap-
ons Plants, effective July 1, 1959.

On February 23, 1959, the Chief of the Bu-
reau of Ordnance, in a letter to the
superintendent of the plant, advised the
plant of the implementation of a pro-
gram to be known as Project Fire Con-
tr

I quote from this letter:

1. In order to provide a needed “in the
        house” capability in the fire control area, the
        Bureau of Ordnance is planning to assign man-
        ufacturing and engineering personnel to the
        Naval Gun Factory. This step, being
        one of major proportions, will require the highest
        and most effective type of manage-
        ment by the Naval Gun Factory and the
        Bureau of Ordnance, and the complete
        support of higher levels within the Navy
        Department.

Understandably, after this letter was
made public to the employees of the plant, morale rose considerably, and it
seemed at long last that the plant could
look forward to a reasonable future in
remaining part of the chief
defense effort. Late in October 1959 rumors be-
gan to appear concerning the possible
loss of the aforementioned fire control
contract. I immediately dispatched a
telegram to the Secretary of the Navy
and was joined in this by the Governor
of the State of Maryland. This apparent
breach of faith on the part of the Navy
caused considerable consternation and
very directly has led to the present-day
situation.

In my telegram, I asked for a complete
report on the status of the previously
awarded Naval Weapons Plants, and in
the absence of Secretary of the Navy
Franke, was acknowledged by Under
Secretary Fred A. Bantz, and I quote
from his telegram of October 28:

In the absence of Secretary Franke and in
regard to your telegram of October 27, 1959, I
would like to assure you that at the pres-
ent time the Navy has no plans to transfer
any work which has been planned for the

Sincerely,

Fred A. Bantz.

The rumor subsequently proved to be
true, inasmuch as the approximately
$10 million contract was pulled from the
weapons plant. Originally an outright
cancellation was not made, however, as
the Bureau of Ordnance informed the
plant that budget troubles threatened
to delay the contract for a few months.

Capt. Charles Briner, plant
superintendent, was quoted as being “a
little upset” by the events. “We are
ready and prepared to do the job,” he
said. “No one has yet informed us that
we have lost the contract.”

But Briner said the Bureau had prom-
ised him again that week, this was in
October, that the plant would get the
contract eventually and that there were
nothing to train personnel in advanced
concern as had been reported. “If and
when the plant gets the contract,”
Briner said, “seven hundred new em-
ployees will be added to assemble
electronic parts and to work in the
electronic field.”

It was at this stage of the proceedings,
before the weapons plant had been in-
formed officially that it did not rec-
ceive the contract as promised, that I
was advised by letter of November 10,
1959, by Admiral McCain, Chief of
Legislative Affairs, that the Navy had
decided to establish a new ad hoc committee of four civilian industrialists to
study a number of activities administered by the Navy.

Among the activities to be re-
surveyed was the Naval Weapons Plant,
located on the campus of Maryland. This
was assured that I would be advised of developments after the committee completed its examina-
tion and submitted recommendations.

The ad hoc committee referred to in
this letter has long ago completed its
findings and has submitted its recom-
mendations to the Secretary of the Navy,
the Under Secretary of the Navy, and the
Chief of the Bureau of Weapons. To
date I have received no information
whatever officially from the Depart-
ment of the Navy concerning the recom-
mendations of the committee. On
January 5, 1960, I discussed this matter
by telephone with the Chief of the
Bureau of Ordnance and was informed that the report by the four indus-
trialists had not yet been completed.

There is no doubt that the report in
question has not yet been completed, is
under active consideration by the respon-
sible officials in the Department of the
Navy as of this very moment.

I find it difficult to understand the
necessity for an additional committee
such as this one. The Navy saw fit to
rereview the Lubelsky survey, which took 6 weeks to
prepare, as opposed to the few hours
spent by the civilian industrialists at the
weapons plant.

On December 2, 1959, I was advised by
Admiral McCain that the program known as
the electronics fire control program
planned for the Naval Weapons Plant
for spare fire control systems for the Ter-
rant and Tartar guided missiles would
do withdraw from the plant. I was in-
formed that the cancellation of this
program would have no immediate effect
on the level of employment at the Naval
Weapons Plant, and was assured that
enough work was being made to find ad-
ditional future work for the Naval
Weapons Plant to take the place of the guided missiles fire control program.

On December 10, 1958, a lengthy meeting transpired between the Secretary of the Navy, Thomas S. Gates, and Under Secretary Bantz concerning the cancellation of this fire control contract. I was assured that there was no basis for rumors that the contract cancellation was caused by the transfer of the work to private industry, and that every possible effort would be made to find additional work for the plant.

They worked, I must regrettably report today, that in my opinion, not one single specific thing has been done. In fact, as I will develop in a few moments, every effort has been made in recent weeks to prevent the Naval Weapons Plant from procuring additional work on its own.

On December 8, 1959, the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade brought the following statement to the attention of the Subcommittee on Preparedness Investigation of the Committee on Armed Services:

"The development and improvement of defense plants which are essential to the national defense is a public duty. These plants are far superior to anything the government has ever been able to build and the men and women who work at them are among the finest in the country. They are national assets and are the result of the combined efforts of the government, the contractors, and the workers. The present level of employment would be maintained and understood by all responsible officials of the Navy Department if it would be demonstrated that it was efficient and economical to continue operation of the weapons plant. We requested them to advise us if such a determination had been made and if so, that the Navy Department would then be willing to declare all or part of the plant surplus to its needs.

Understandably, therefore, we were considerably surprised to learn early in December 1958, that the guided missile fire control system program had been canceled. It seems to us utterly inconceivable that responsible officials of the Navy Department can change their minds after such an important economic impact on the National Capital. This establishment was an important employer in the area even before the National Government was transferred to Washington in 1800.

Our research department has carefully re-examined the statements that, in addition to the approximately $36 million payroll of the more than 8,000 military and civilian employees, the weapons plant supports 8,250 gainfully employed people in the Washington metropolitan area with a total 1960 payroll of $335 million. The total economic impact, therefore, on this community of the naval weapons plant is approximately 14,500 jobs having $60 million annual payroll income. This is 1.5 percent of all employment in the metropolitan area of Washington. These jobs support approximately 10,000 individuals having a total spending potential of some $20,000. We estimate that total retail sales attributable to the weapons center and supporting employment in about the same area will be $44,500,000 per year. These statistics make it clear why this organization is deeply concerned about the trend which seems to be in progress.

The current cycle of work reduction in this plant began in the spring of 1958. On May 29, 1958, the then president of the board of trade, Mr. Gunther, appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee and sought his assurance that the present level of employment would be held.

Subsequently on July 2, 1958, a committee from this organization discussed the problem with Mr. John W. Slaton, Deputy Under Secretary of the Navy William B. Franke at the Pentagon. We inquired of Mr. Franke if the employment level of the Naval Weapons Plant could be maintained and if so, we advised him to assure us that it would not go below something over 5,000.

At that time we advised the Under Secretary that we would not support or request continuation of the present level of employment if it would not be demonstrated that it was efficient and economical to continue operation of the weapons plant. We requested them to advise us if such a determination had been made and if so, that the Navy Department would then be willing to declare all or part of the plant surplus to its needs.

The Navy Department on July 29, 1958, advised us that at the present time, none of the facilities at the Naval Gun Factory are excess to the needs of the Navy. Some months ago we began to hear rumors that an effort was being made to transfer the fire control systems program which had been assigned to the naval weapons plant to another facility. We were advised by responsible officials of the Navy Department that there were no such plans.

Understandably, therefore, we were considerably surprised to learn early in December 1958, that the guided missile fire control systems program had been canceled. It seems to us utterly inconceivable that responsible officials of the Navy Department can change their minds after such an important economic impact on the National Capital. This establishment was an important employer in the area even before the National Government was transferred to Washington in 1800.

Some competently trained people were stationed there and are now employed there. As an example, this past year we selected a very significant economic impact on the National Capital area. It would seem to be highly essential that the Navy Department formulate a sound policy towards this plant, make its plans known to the responsible elements in the community and then proceed to follow same.

We sincerely trust that the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee will carefully review the current level of the work for the weapons plant and will welcome the opportunity of furnishing additional information and appearing at any hearing which may be held.

Very truly yours,

E. K. Morri5,
President.

Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1960, a meeting was held by the board of trade and representatives of the plant to discuss the future of the plant. Secretary Milne gave his assurances that a decision would be immediately forthcoming and that the board of trade would be advised as to what, if any, facilities were available for the use of private industry. I have been advised by Mr. Gunther, of the board of trade, that over 100 civilian employees have expressed interest in the plant and its highly skilled personnel. Obviously, if the present rfs are allowed to continue and these individuals, by necessity, must leave the Washington area, many of these individuals, with the attraction that certain of the plant's facilities may have for private industry will be considerably lessened, if not completely nullified.

While I am still convinced that there is absolutely no justification for the Navy Department to allow this facility to wither on the vine, I nevertheless feel that the present level of employment here is what steps must be taken and taken now to restore this defense plant to the industrial establishment of the United States. It is inconceivable to me that we can afford to squander the type of facilities that are here, and more important that we can afford to lose for one day the highly skilled crafts and highly trained engineers available to our defense effort.

During this period, as a result of an unusual publicity given to the plight of the plant, the general public seems to have been given the impression that we are discussing an obsolete facility that is of little or no use to the Defense Establishment. Letters of commendation recently received by the plant should correct this erroneous impression.

Under unanimous consent I include at this point in the Record a letter dated February 8, 1960, from the Chief or Naval Operations to the Superintendent of Naval Weapons Plant, commenting on the superior performance of the Naval Weapons Plant:


From: Chief of Naval Operations
To: Superintendent, U.S. Naval Weapons Plant via: Commandant, Potomac River Naval Command

Subject: Superior performance of Naval Weapons Plant

1. The Naval Weapons Plant recently participated in a quick reaction capability program given that required more than a certain shipboard fire control system and the installation of several units of classified experimental electronic equipment equipment. This task involved considerable engineering effort and required completion within the 4-month deadline.
2. Engineers assigned by the Naval Weapons Plant accomplished this project expeditiously and with the highest quality of performance. In the close support and coordination with the Naval Research Laboratory scientists resulted in very quick delivery and test of the components of the system. It is now evident that without the close support and coordination of the Naval Weapons Plant the project would have been delayed by at least 6 months.
3. The Chief of Naval Operations comments the superintendent, U.S. Naval Weapons Plant and the personnel under his command for the expedient and excellent performance in this important electronic countermeasures program.

WALLACE M. BRASKELY,
Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, (Fleet Operations and Readiness)

On February 17, 1960, the Navy Department announced the large-scale reduction in force, one of which is currently taking place.

The Navy Department in its statement of February 17 in its fact sheet on the Naval Weapons Plant makes the following statement:

There is no additional work which can be assigned to offset the decline in work in process which necessitates these reductions in force.
This statement, which may have been true when issued, is definitely no longer true. The facts in the case are that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is turning down work that could be assigned to the plant.

One specific example, which has been recently brought to my attention, involves the contracts for castings to be delivered to the plant for processing and had to be picked back up by the Maryland Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. when the plant stated that they could not honor the scheduled delivery date. The Bureau of Weapons issued instructions that there would be no more direct solicitation of workload for the weapons plant by the Bureau of Weapons officials as to whether or not they directly solicited the work in question. A particular portion of the contract has now been placed with the plant, and I am certainly hopeful that the full potential of this contract can be realized. Very recently, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force placed an order for 200 Tartar missile booster sustainers. This was not an act of charity on the part of the Bureau of Weapons plant officials as to whether or not the Navy has a need for guns. I assume is made available routinely to the Secretary of the Navy and his staff.

What has brought about this situation? Most assuredly a partial answer to that question stems from the official policy of the present administration; and, in my opinion, is to be deliberately phased out completely as an industrial entity.

Another recent case which has been brought to my attention involved the attempted placing of an approximately $1 million contract for electronic equipment in Quinxto, for the manufacture of handling and loading equipment. I have been advised that the Bureau of Weapons, in its present status, is in the production of expendable missiles and their component parts. This was not an act of charity on the part of the Bureau of Weapons officials as to whether or not the Bureau solicited the work in question. A particular portion of the contract has now been placed with the plant, and I am certainly hopeful that the full potential of this contract can be realized. Very recently, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force placed an order for 200 Tartar missile booster sustainers. This was not an act of charity on the part of the Bureau of Weapons plant officials as to whether or not the Navy has a need for guns. I assume is made available routinely to the Secretary of the Navy and his staff.

The bulletin further states:

"The bulletin further states:

The bulletin further states:
Mark 7 Missile Launcher; Mark 12 Missile Launcher; Depth Bomb Mark 101; Gun Director Mark 68 dual thrust rocket motors, which includes the Tartar rocket motor assembly, various telescopes produced by one of the most outstanding optical shops in the country, either private or government; Side- winder, vacuum fine components; and propellant grain immobilizers.

How effective has the plant been in the manufacture of the items just mentioned? Let me read more letters of commendation and other statements. Once these letters and bland assurances are considered, I think all will realize why each employee of the weapons plant has a right to know the reason for this incredible mismanagement of an installation that each man knows to be one of the finest of its type in our Nation's industrial establishment.

The following statements will clearly show that these fine workers have met the national recognition it had received for its expert technical competence in the welding research field, which is a major factor in the critical period of technological change and missiles development. Mr. Julian Kobler, a highly regarded engineer of the plant whose recommendations for the future of the weapons plant appear at the close of my remarks, had this to say:

CIAH. E. BRENNER.

Early in 1959, the gun factory very justly had every reason to be proud of the national recognition it had received for its expert technical competence in the welding research field, which is a major factor in the critical period of technological change and missiles development. Mr. Julian Kobler, a highly regarded engineer of the plant whose recommendations for the future of the weapons plant appear at the close of my remarks, had this to say:

CIAH. E. BRENNER.

COUPLED with engineering department progress in ultrahigh strength steels and related development projects, it is apparent that the Naval Gun Factory is the leading Bureau of Ordnance activity concerned with structural fabrication.

On January 23, 1959, a very interesting statement appeared in the Log. The statement was made by a representative of Radio Corp. of America. Previous to this statement, RCA asked the gun factory whether they had facilities to do grinding work on a very hard ceramic cylinder, and if they did would they be interested in doing some work for them. The answer, of course, was "Yes" to both questions. The fact that the job was done satisfactorily can best be expressed by the following statement from the RCA representative who stated:

The Naval Gun Factory in 3 months has done with a 10-inch cylinder the grinding job which RCA over a year to do with a 6-inch cylinder.

On February 27, 1959, Admiral Ahroon, in an address made to a group composed of Naval Gun Factory top management personnel, stated that there are good reasons for keeping the gun factory in operation. He said:

The shipbuilding industry recommended your continuing * * * * . The fact remains that the decision was made long ago to keep the gun factory a going concern in the Naval Establishment.

The lead article appearing in the Log on February 27, 1959, went on to say that the reentry of the gun factory into major fire control projects—subsequently re- voked—will place our engineers in dynamic new fields and lead to substan- tial shopwork. If we can succeed in redeveloping these capabilities, we will truly versatile." The admiral also said that he could see then where "we would be in a position to branch out in the new supermissiles field and space operation.

Admiral Ahroon further stated in his article that not only did he expect the gun factory to regain its old competence in fire control, but he expected us to save the Navy money.

On March 4, 1960, a letter of com- mendation from the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations was read by the superintendent of the weapons plant. The letter complimented the plant for the fast, excellent work done on an im- portant project called Project Piggyback. One of the most praiseing sentences in the letter is as follows:

It is now evident that without the close supervision and co-operation of the Naval Weapons Plant, the project would have been delayed by at least 6 months.

Here again is another of many exam- ples which emphasized the quick reaction capabilities of the plant.

On July 31, 1959, the industrial con- trol officer of the Naval Weapons Plant issued a report which appeared in the Log on the workload for the plant for the next 18 months. I quote from this article:

The reaction of all hands to the heavy demands for overtime which has been needed to keep important programs on schedule has been remarkable, and through your hard work we have been able to hold the line on deliveries and come through with outstanding success in our delivery of the first Mark 7 guided missile launcher last month.

Further quoting:

Therefore, my statement today: "The situation for the next 18 months looks excellent."

And now, as late as April 1, 1960, the Naval Weapons Plant was again praised in a letter from the Naval's Director of Special Projects, Rear Admiral Raborn. The praise was for the plant's expedient handling of the Poliaris handling device. In his letter, Ad- miral Raborn began by saying that dur- ing January 1960 an "urgent request development within the launching and handling branch of the Office of Special Projects." He then gave the date on which the plant was contacted and the date on which the Polaris handling de- vice was needed. The weapons plant proved its quick reaction capability by delivering the Polaris handling device on time and where it was needed. In con- cluding his letter, Admiral Raborn asked that his sincere appreciation be ex- pressed "every who participated in the expedient handling of this mate- rial required for the Navy's top priority program."

As many of you know, there is at the present time under consideration by the House Appropriations Committee a rider to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act. This rider was proposed by the metal trades department executive council in session at Miami Beach,
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Fla., on February 5, 1960, and the subcommittee has been urged to give consideration to the inclusion of the rider on the appropriations bill for fiscal 1961. The effect of the rider, which has already caught the attention of all who are familiar with the situation, would be to force defense agencies to allocate enough workload money to existing activities to maintain the personnel "on board" in each Government-owned and operated defense facility at its January 1, 1960, manpower figure. I feel it appropriate for me to serve notice that what has been happening at the Naval Weapons Plant, Townsville, D.C., has been happening throughout all defense installations and there will be, I trust, in the days ahead, an opportunity for each of you to consider this matter most carefully and to register your protest to the policy of the present administration—the all-out farm-out—at-any-cost policy that was put into effect in 1955.

The effect of this rider on the weapons plants is enormous. I have been informed that the plant can maintain its present work force with manufacturing orders totaling approximately $40 million per year, by eliminating the unnecessary of the amount spent each year by the Navy Department alone on aircraft, ships, guided missiles, electronics, and communications. It is impossible for me to consult and to mention here that there are not sufficient component parts suitable for the Naval Weapons Plant to handle.

Once again, I wish to impress upon each member of this body that my remarks are not to be construed as local in nature. What is happening here can happen and has happened throughout the entire United States. It is, indeed, unfortunate that the District of Columbia does not have its own representation. If one of its representatives should happen to be a Republican, there is reason to believe that a little more consideration will be given to the fate of the Naval Weapons Plant than appears to be the case today. My reason for making this statement, as distasteful as it is to me, is that I do not wish to see the Naval Weapons Plant shut down.

To drive home his contention, Moorer related the following personal experience: "In the last Congress, I spent a lot of time and effort trying to persuade two Republican Members of the House, who come from labor districts, to support the labor legislation. One of them flatly refused saying it would be political suicide. The other reluctantly agreed to go along with us.

"The very next day the Pentagon announced without the slightest previous warning that a new installation would be shut down in the district of the House Member I had laboriously won over. But that isn't all. In that same announcement, the Pentagon also said that a new installation would be built in the other Member's district; the one who had turned down our pleas because he would be political suicide for him to vote with us.

"I had a tough time explaining that "mafu" to the one who had more sense than the other.

That's why we simply must have a 'clearing committee' to keep a check on these things."

President Eisenhower, while agreeing in theory with Moorer, turned thumbs down on the proposed committee being part of Republican majorities.

Instead he agreed to the "clearing committee" being under the White House.

It is unthinkable to me that political considerations of this nature are influencing decisions as to when, where, and how to effectuate cuts in defense establishments.

In bringing this order to a close, I would like to read a letter from one of my constituents who has written me concerning his own personal problems in connection with the deplorable conditions existing at the plant. Perhaps this will be of interest to others.

Dear Sir: As one of your constituents, I may take a moment of your time to voice my fear and anxiety over the present situation at the U.S. Naval Weapons Plant.

Capt. Charles E. Briner today made the following comments to Washington post employees by February 1960: this was bad news. But his statement that there would be other Closings for the months to follow.

Mr. Lexam, I don't know what to say at this point. It makes me sick inside.

I can't eat or sleep. I cannot even think straight. I come home in the evening and the Naval Weapons Plant to my wife and four lovely children. My dinner is on the table and the children are all happy because daddy is home. They are laughing and trying to tell me of the day's adventures; so what does that say about the future of his family. He snaps at the children and tells them to be quiet, he is not interested. (That's not like daddy.) For my father had a face for his children. He never ever looked into the eyes of a child that you have hurt, you will know what an agonizing experience it is to hurt a small boy or girl. You look at you as if to say, "Why, Daddy, why?"

This question, "Why?" is what I do not understand; why is it that our country is Leaders must know what to do. You look at me and ask, "Why?"

Mr. Morton, I believe these employees, and indeed all concerned, are entitled to an appeal to emotions.

I have dwelt, I suppose, at length on the past and the present. I have raised questions which, I believe, demand an answer. But I do not intend to end my remarks with questions critical in nature.

Under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the Record a proposal for the reorganization of the Naval Weapons Plant. It was prepared under the supervision of one of the plant's most outstanding engineers. This proposal should be given every possible consideration and, for once, foolish pride and stubbornness should be abandoned in the interest of the common good of preserving an installation that has proven itself time and time again in the past. It will not be long before the greatest day is made available in my office for those interested in making a detailed study of the suggestions raised.

I submit that a complete clean sweep, a complete overhaul of the plant, both

The special "clearing committee" that is to cope with this politically explosive problem...
internally and externally, is in order, and I realize in saying this that there are bound to be certain individuals and associations that will suffer. I fully recognize must be. Not only should there be a clean sweep and removal of the plant, but assurances should be given that the plant in- cludes the necessary personnel and equipment. Technical evaluation, which many realizations are, might be avoided by a functional reorganization and consolidation of facilities, as proposed herein.

III. PROPOSED REORGANIZATION

The existing organizational structure of the Naval Weapons Plant could be drastically revised in order to accomplish the aforementioned objectives.

Proposed organizational charts prepared for the Naval Weapons Plant, the research and engineering department, and the manufacturing department are submitted herewith. Listed below are the basic recommendations relative to each chart.

Chart No. 1. Naval Weapons Plant organization—Recommendations:

1. Establish the position of executive director of the Naval Weapons Plant.
2. Establish the position of deputy director for the manufacturing department.
3. Redesignate the engineering department as the research and engineering department.
4. Establish an office of decentralized services in the administrative department.
5. Establish a separate activity under the supervision of an officer in charge responsible for Gage and ASRO to report directly to the Bureau of Naval Weapons.
6. Creation of the positions of executive director, deputy director for manufacturing, and deputy director for research and engineering clearly establishes definite lines of responsibility. Candidates for these positions should not be selected from within the Naval Weapons Plant. The deputy director for research and engineering should either have an engineering or science education in addition to a manufacturing background.

Chart No. 2. Manufacturing department organization—Recommendations:

1. Establish the position of deputy director for the manufacturing department.
2. Establish the production engineering division and transfer its responsibilities to a manufacturing engineering division and a production planning and control division.
3. Establish a manufacturing engineering division.

Chart No. 3. Research and engineering department—Recommendations:

1. Establish a technical advisory council composed of representatives on a retaining basis.
2. Disestablish the engineering administration division.
3. Disestablish the functional design division.
4. Establish the applied research division.
5. Establish the technical evaluation division.
6. Transfer the fabrication engineering functions to the manufacturing department.

Chart No. 4. Consolidation of facilities—Recommendations:

1. Move all optical equipment from buildings 174 to building 159 and dispose of machine tools.
2. Move selected heavy machine tools from buildings 22 to 104.
3. Convert building 160 into an electric, electronic, and plastic facility.
4. Convert building 161 into a transportation center for the public works department.
5. Convert building 177 into a storage area for use by the supply department.
6. Convert building 163 to a complete fabrication facility.
7. Move machining and welding equipment from building 175 to building 158.
8. Establish a limited plating facility in building 158.
9. Establish a sheet metal facility in building 158.
10. Move sheet metal equipment from buildings 113 and 119 to building 158.
11. Move fabrication equipment from buildings 78 and 104 to building 153.
12. Transfer the plating and assembly facility in the annex of building 157.
13. A number of these recommendations have already been formally submitted to the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

V. DISPOSITION AND UTILIZATION OF VACATED BUILDINGS


VI. UTILIZATION OF VACANT LAND CREATED AS A RESULT OF RACING BUILDINGS

Recommendations: Use vacated parking lots and parking areas as indicated on chart No. 4. The need for adequate parking is a growing one and is a situation that must be provided for in the acquisition of the ultimate use of the Naval Weapons Plant buildings.

VII. PROPOSED LEVEL OF OPERATION

The proposed reorganization and consolidation of facilities functioning with a total manufacturing facility of 2,000,000 square feet. The designations of all departments, excluding tenant and tenant related activities, will permit a more efficient operation.
effective, quick reacting capability for the Naval Weapons Plant, thus resulting in increased operational efficiency, decreased operating costs, and improved schedule performance.

VIII SUMMARY

A positive program to reorient the personnel and facilities of the Naval Weapons Plant to meet the requirements of the Bureau of Naval Weapons has been proposed. The committee recommends that—

The Naval Weapons Plant perform those tasks for the Bureau of Naval Weapons that are directly or willingly supplied by industry.

The Naval Weapons Plant provide in-house engineering and manufacturing support in the fields of: optics, fire control, light components and equipment, technical evaluation, environmental test, and field service.

To enable the Naval Weapons Plant to perform those functions, it is proposed that—

The functional organization of the Naval Weapons Plant be significantly reoriented.

The facilities of the Naval Weapons Plant be consolidated.

It is further recommended that the Chief of the Bureau of Naval Weapons direct the Assistant Chief of the Bureau for R.D.T. and the Assistant Chief of the Bureau for R.D.T. & E. to provide adequate support for continued R&D activities, to the Department of the Naval Weapons Plant in the areas of systems, concepts, feasibility studies; laboratory programs; environmental test and evaluation; product and value engineering; documentation; standardization; monitoring technical publications; fleet liaison; and technical coordination for Bureau of Naval Weapons.

Mandatory implementation of all the proposals contained herein will achieve the mutual objectives of the Bureau of Naval Weapons and the Naval Weapons Plant; namely, improved efficiency; increased efficiency; significantly reduce costs; improve schedule performance; improve liaison between the Naval Weapons Plant and the Bureau of Naval Weapons; and improve research development, test, and evaluation capabilities.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. STRATTON. I would like to commend the gentleman from Maryland for the fine statement he is making on this subject. It is really of great importance, and particularly with the new Naval Facilities which is not contrary to the statement he just made that this is a problem that applies not only to the local area but in many areas throughout the country.

In my district in upstate New York we have had exactly the same kind of situation; there has been a cutback in personnel and facilities which is not only impairing, in my judgment, the capacity of the Navy to execute its mission but has also caused severe economic dislocation to the area.

The solution of this problem is not one that is solved in many other sections of the country, and I think the gentleman that has revealed the details of a situation which should be of concern to all of us.

Mr. LANDFORD. From the Armed Services Committee, I have appreciated the fine effort that he has made, and I would simply like to endorse the remarks he has made in this instance.

Mr. LANDFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

"PIE IN THE SKY," OR A REAL PROGRAM OF HEALTH BENEFITS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDAY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MACHROWICZ) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 18, I addressed the House on the very urgent question of health benefits for the aged. I pointed out in those remarks that a new proposal called the Javits bill was being peddled which was designed to stop the tremendous demand for health benefits along the lines of H.R. 4700, the Forand bill. That bill, I stressed, could best be described as "pie in the sky." I have been encouraged during the past week to find that that is greatly away from the "pie-in-the-sky" nature of this proposal.

The so-called health insurance for the aged bill was introduced a couple of weeks ago by some Republican Members in both Houses of Congress because they just could not wait any longer for their administration leaders to come through with any proposals at all to meet the monumental health problem facing our aged population. The pressure was too great. The Forand bill was getting too great public support. And the constituents back home were waiting to see what their respective Congressmen were going to do. Consequently, a bill got written which was supposed to reflect the basic criteria which the administration was using to develop its own program.

As I pointed out last week, the benefits ascribed to this bill sound great. But a reading of the bill—rather than the Madison Avenue press release that accompanies it—cuts very quickly to the core.

"PIE IN THE SKY"!
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The Congress itself—out of general revenues—would have to appropriate $450 million. This is quite a hurdle.

Before any benefits could be paid, the States would have to pass enabling legislation, set up complex administrative machinery, and negotiate contracts with a multitude of insurance companies. This is quite a series of hurdles.

Then, the beneficiary himself would have to make substantial contribution unless he is totally or almost totally without income, with rates as high as $26 per month per couple for undetermined benefits.

And if all these moneys can be raised—from the Federal Government, the State government, and the beneficiary himself—they are used to purchase private insurance. And from experience in the worker's compensation field, a good part of all the moneys will be retained by the insurance companies. This is quite a hurdle.

To all of these hurdles, Mr. Speaker, it now appears there is still another. It is not only $450 million, but the bill was first released. But as yet, neither the White House nor the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have endorsed it. This is certainly quite a hurdle.

But frankly, Mr. Speaker, I cannot pretend to be disappointed in the fact that the administration has not endorsed this bill, even though the rejection of it, to date, is motivated by considerations quite different from my own.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to comment in some detail on one aspect of this "pie in the sky" program which has been given much attention. Unlike the Forand bill, which would make health benefits available to all persons eligible for social security benefits, the "pie in the sky" bill would cover only approxim­ately 12 million persons, the Republic­ans could only cover 7 million persons. Superficially, a 16-million-person program sounds better than a 12-million-person program, but as I urged my colleagues, however, not to be satisfied with the program.

This is the clearest case of political "one-upmanship" I have seen in a long time. It is as phony as any kind of social "one-upmanship" I have come across. Embarrassed by the failure of the ad­ministration to come through with a meaningful program for the great bulk of our older persons, these Republican Members now try to make their program look even better than the one we Demo­crats have been urging. A full exami­nation of the issue will show, however, that this argument is not founded on the facts.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to state most frankly and bluntly that if I had to choose between a proposal which would do a lot for almost all of our older people and a program that did practically nothing—except to offer "pie in the sky"—for all of our older people, I would choose the former.

Second, those of us who have been supporting the Forand bill or legislation along the lines of the Forand bill are precisely the ones who over the years have promoted and helped to enact im­provements in our public assistance pro­gram so that those of our older people who did not have the opportunity to be­come part of the social security system would at least be provided with the minimum decent personal and family medical care. And we are not satisfied with the present program. While the administration is urging cutbacks in assistance, we are advocating greater Federal participation in a broader assistance program. The author of the Forand bill is also the principal sponsor of a bill which would mean sub­stantial improvements in public assist­ance.
Third, Mr. Speaker, the Forand bill was specifically designed—and properly so—to broaden the OASDI benefits to include health insurance. It is strongly supported by the American Lung Association and the American Heart Association, both of whom have specifically stated their opposition to the passage of such legislation. The former has pointed out that the passage of such legislation is necessary to prevent a health crisis.
On April 15, 1960, the Secretary replied to me as follows:

DEAR MR. SCHERER: Thank you for your letter of April 13, 1960, about the Interstate Highway System as it relates to urban areas.

Let me assure you at the outset of this letter that the administration has not given whatever of abandoning any of the routes presently designated as general corridors of traffic in urban or in rural areas. Consistent with this intention, we are continuing, as you realize, to make every effort, in cooperation with the States, to achieve a well-connected system at the earliest possible date.

We all appreciate, of course, that the Interstate System cannot, nor is it intended to, provide the solution to the rush hour traffic problems of our metropolitan areas. That rests in the coordination of many elements, such as the Federal-aid urban arterial highways and other major city and State thoroughfares, combined with both rail and rubber mass transportation and, to a considerable degree, with both air and water facilities. The Interstate System, however, will be a part of this overall approach to the problem and will facilitate the movement of interstate highway traffic without congestion in a manner in which this system has been designated.

I know you are aware that current revenue estimates for the highway trust fund are less than those required to build this projected system on present costs. In our report to the Congress next January we will present revised cost estimates along with a suggested program designed to raise sufficient funds to pay for this program. You also know that the President has proposed an immediate one-half cent increase in the gas tax with extension of 0.4 cent rate through fiscal 1964. This tax would provide increased revenues in the next several years, which are necessary if the program, including the urban routes of particular interest to you, is to get back on schedule.

I should like to say in conclusion that we are constantly seeking ways to achieve the basic objectives of the program with maximum economy.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK H. MUELLER
Secretary of Commerce.

FOOD—PUBLIC PROTECTION

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GLENN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, the public has the right to know the source of the foods it is consuming in packaged form. The law now requires that the package bear a label containing the name and place of origin of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor. An increasing number of packaged foods, fresh, frozen, and canned, are being manufactured or packaged by concern or by another concern or by another concern or by another concern. It is only necessary to bear the name of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor, and hence the public is not given the safeguard of knowing who made the food or packed the food.

I have today introduced a bill that would do two things: One, require that where a packaged food is manufactured or packed by one other than the distributor, the label must also state the name and place of business of the manufacturer or packer; and two, if the package contains a single fresh, frozen, or canned fruit or vegetable, it must recite the name of the State where grown.

There is hardly a State in the Union that is not identified with one or more of the fruits or vegetables of particular interest to any one State and hence the public is deprived of the advantage of knowing at a glance for what it is paying, for example, the cranberries that are grown in New Jersey. In the recent cranberry dilemma, no New Jersey-grown cranberries were condemned or taken off the market. If these cranberries had been labeled as having been grown in New Jersey, the public would have had assurance of safety, and the grower and distributors would have benefited by the identification of the product. Also, a practice has come about of fruit and vegetables of inferior quality being grown in one State and shipped into another State for packing and distribution as the product of the second State. The public will be protected from such practice by this bill and every State will be benefited by the identification of its product.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, 14 bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives which would amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act thereby providing protection for miners who work in mines employing 14 men or less. In August 1959 the subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor held extensive hearings which I believe showed conclusively that this legislation is necessary.

Since then many men have lost their lives in these small mines due to inadequate safety measures. Mr. Speaker, how much blood of innocent men just lost should before Congress acts on this important and urgent legislation?

OASI BENEFITS TO PERSONS AGE 72

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation amending the Social Security Act to provide OASI benefits to persons aged 72 and over who are not presently eligible for such benefits.

Under my proposal, these aged individuals would receive as a matter of statutory right the minimum OASI benefit which is presently $33 per month.

The cost of "blanketing-in" this group with the social security program would be defrayed under a formula reimbursing the OASI trust fund by the Treasury general fund. As I will demonstrate later, in my remarks, the impact of such reimbursement from the general fund will be more than offset in the next several years by savings in the cost of public assistance expenditures.

No dependents' or survivors' benefits would be payable under this new category, and stricter provisions would be applicable to suspension of benefits than under the present law to regular beneficiaries.

It is estimated approximately 2 million persons would be included in the new category. Approximately 1.6 million of these people would be women including 1 million widows.

Generally speaking the group to be benefited under this suggested change in the Social security law are workers who attained retirement age before the social security program reached its present status of virtual universal coverage or are widows whose husbands died prior to this expansion of coverage. The effect of present law with respect to these people is if that retirement age or death of the wage earner occurred too soon for benefit eligibility.

Mr. Speaker, these deserving Americans should be given the opportunity to participate in the OASI program as a matter of right and they should not be penalized by the failure to extend timely coverage to these vulnerable groups. It is estimated that 1.35 million persons included in this category are presently forced to rely on old-age assistance and other public assistance to help meet their livelihood. These people are in their present plight because Congress acted too late to broaden coverage of the Social Security System. Congress should act now to correct the neglect of these worthy people by giving them a benefit based on right instead of making poverty and need the criteria of eligibility.

My proposal represents a significant step in the direction of achieving equity and justice for these aged citizens. The people who will benefit under my bill are those who felt the full brunt of the inflation of the forties and early fifties which destroyed the purchasing power of their savings. That they were victimized by inflation is demonstrated by the fact that 1.35 million of them are now receiving public assistance. Furthermore, this proposal is totally consistent with the philosophy of achieving universal coverage under the system.

Mr. Speaker, it is considered that no present beneficiary under the social security program has paid anything approaching the full actuarial cost of his protection. It is only fair that the discrimination against those not covered under the program be
removed. In demonstration of this point it shall be noted that contributions from the Treasury general fund to the OASI trust fund under my bill will be relatively higher with respect to the persons blanketed in than the contributions paid by and with respect to persons now on the benefit rolls and those coming on the rolls in the near future.

For example, the current reimbursements of the OASI trust fund for contributions payable under the Federal State Savings act by the State were 12% of the value of the benefit which, is relatively 150% as much as was contributed by the employer and the employee. The savings to the fund and is now receiving the maximum benefit.

The category payment into the trust fund would be 10 times as much as was paid into the fund with respect to the average present recipient of a minimum benefit. Thus the payment of categories into the trust fund for the first 3 years and the savings to the fund will be minimal because the level-premium value of the Federal reimbursement will be 0.15 percent of payroll contrasted with the level-premium value of the benefits of 0.50 percent of payroll.

The cost to the Treasury General Fund for the first 10 years of blanket-in will average $100 million annually. This is expected to be totally offset by the federal government with respect to present public assistance costs. In addition the long-range public assistance costs to the Federal and State Governments of the aged will be substantially lower than under present law.

Mr. Speaker, I have had an analysis made of the cost to the general fund of blanket-in aged 72 years and the savings that will result from the enactment of my bill. These figures are presented on an annual basis for the first 3 years and then the cumulative data are presented covering a 10-year period. It is important to remember in evaluating the significance of these figures that the blanket-in benefit will be available to the aged citizens affected as a matter of statutory right and not conditioned on proof of poverty and need as is the case with respect to public assistance. The analysis to which I have referred is set forth in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>State Savings</th>
<th>Federal Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[in millions]</td>
<td>[in millions]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years cumulative</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has never hesitated in the past to make available to the then retired individuals benefit increases that have been enacted from time to time. Moritious as these increases may have been, they have had no relationship to prior tax contributions. Some individuals have become eligible for old-age benefits by reason of benefit increases based on a combined total employer-employee contribution of as little as $6. Since the inception of the act, Congress has increased benefits on five different occasions. At this time while the Committee on Ways and Means is considering benefit increases, it is only simple justice that these beneficiaries, who were benefited under the bill, should receive some measure of consideration. It is conceivable to think of providing further benefits and increases in present benefits without considering the plight of the aged people who are presently denied any protection under the act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Curran) may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

Mr. Speaker, in 1953, then State of Massachusetts as its Governor from 1953 until 1957, was appointed Secretary of State by our great President. The decision to recommend unfailing devotion and dedication with which he has discharged the duties of his office have fully demonstrated the wisdom of the President's choice of Christian A. Herter as Secretary of State.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.
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6. It is refreshing, therefore, to find
that a hard-headed conservative pub-
ication such as Business Week has re-
cently concluded:
One thing about the issue is clear: Al-
though many people may see it as a
vote-catching device, there is nothing syn-
thetic or phony about the problem. Every-
one who has seriously studied the situation
has concluded that the provision of better
health care for the aged is a serious—and
growing—problem.
The problem basically is that the aged
are high-cost, high-risk, low-income cus-
tomers. Their health needs can be met only
done by themselves when they are young or
by other younger people who are still work-
ing. The only way to handle their health
problem, therefore, is to deal with the risks and
through the social security system to which
employers and employees contribute regu-
larly.
We do not pretend to know all the an-
swers to the problem of enlarging the so-
cial security system to include a health in-
urance program for the aged.
Nevertheless no democratic government
can refuse to recognize the urgency of
such demonstrated urgent need and importance.
Contrary to some impressions I have
encountered, this important addition to
our social security plan is not an idea
which has been under consideration for
many years. I am proud of the fact that I introduced
a bill, H.R. 5216, well over a year ago, on
March 3, 1959, which provides this kind of
protection. Like the Forand bill, my
proposal would provide for the cost of 60
days of hospital care, including surgical
services, for the aged in addition to medical
services up to 120 days, if required.
Hospital services would include medical
care generally furnished as an essential
part of hospital care for bed patients.
Such services as medical, dental, nursing,
laboratory, ambulance, operating room,
staff, and such other services as are cus-
tomarily furnished either through hos-
pitals or personal care of persons whom
the hospital has arrangements would be
included.
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The provision for care in skilled nursing homes as an adjunct to hospital care. It is gratifying to see that, in a few communities, nursing homes have been made an integral part of a hospital, thus facilitating the interchange of patients and records. In some other communities, care is provided by both personnel and equipment.

I believe that we must look forward to the development of thousands of well-equipped nursing homes throughout the country. Nursing home care has grown phenomenally in our land within a short span of years. But too often the kind of care provided therein is severely limited because they are not adequately financed—again a direct result of lowered-income in declining years. By providing adequately for the cost of good nursing home care for those of our older citizens who require limited medical attention, we will be encouraging, as well, the healthy development of these important accessory medical institutions.

Finally, let us examine the charge that my proposal represents "nose-undertent socialism."—a charge, by the way, which is especially inept. The Social Security Act was first passed in 1935, and has reappeared with practically every major improvement made in the plan since that time. First of all, let us be clear about the facts that, under the bill, payments are limited to the type now used in nonprofit voluntary plans like Blue Cross. Because the medical profession generally opposed the idea of being "on the Government payroll" their charges are not included. The claim that the medical profession would be "socialized" if such legislation is adopted is, therefore, misleading at best.

Mr. Speaker, this is not "socialized medicine." In a recent and very perceptive editorial, the Washington Post commented on this point:

The one practical way to provide insurance against the health hazards of retirement years is to let people pay the premiums in their working years. This plan has the virtue that they are earning wages and are able to do so. This is precisely how they now provide retirement income for themselves under the social security program—and this kind of protection is made compulsory because the lack of it would have a disastrous social impact. Those who denounce this proposal as "socialistic" without proposing any workable alternative are foolishly doctrinaire.

They might just about as sensibly oppose as socialistic the Nation's public schools, fire departments, and parks, because these represent communal undertakings designed for the fundamental purposes for which the U.S. Government was established to promote the general welfare.

The facts are before us. I am confident that this Congress will face up to this matter. This has been long a matter of study and deliberation. The conclusion is always the same—something must be done. I urge the enactment of the Forand bill, or my bill H.R. 5316 which is identical to the Forand bill, this well-considered and necessary legislation which is generally opposed to the interests of the men and women and on behalf of all of us.
LEAVE OF ABSENCE
By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

Mr. HORAN, at the request of Mr. HALLECK, ON ACCOUNT OF ILLNESS.
Mr. JOHNSON of California, at the request of Mr. JACKSON, for period, April 20 to May 10, on account of official business.
Mr. ROONEY, at the request of Mr. CANNELS, for balance of the week, ON ACCOUNT OF ILLNESS.
Mr. LIPSCOMB, at the request of Mr. HALLECK, for the remainder of this week, ON ACCOUNT OF ILLNESS in his family.
Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, at the request of Mr. CANNELS, for today and balance of the week, ON ACCOUNT OF ILLNESS.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED
By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative recess, was granted to:

BAILEY, for RECORD, was granted to:

extend remarks ing:) in the previous order, the House on House Administration, reported that

include extraneous signed by the

at 12 o'clock noon.

journed until Monday, April 25, 1962 under its previous order, the House on House Administration, reported that

the

Mr. ROONEY, at the request of Mr. CELHORN, for balance of the week, ON ACCOUNT OF ILLNESS.

The motion was agreed to; accord­

GRANTED

RECOGNITION

REMARKS

 finns to the

For balance of the week, on account

in accordance with title I

of the Armed Forces; with amendment (Rept. No. 1537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs, H.R. 10044. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to prohibits the furnishing of services by the Veterans' Administration to any child on account of the death of one parent, and to authorize payment for reimbursement for unemployment (Rept. No. 1538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs, H.R. 9782. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of managers of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers, with amendment (Rept. No. 1539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs, H.R. 10108. A bill to au­t

To the Committee on the State of the Union.

the

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs, H.R. 10108. A bill to au­thorize reimbursement of certain Veterans' Affairs beneficiaries and their dependents for ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls; without amendment (Rept. No. 1534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs, H.R. 10086. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional compensation only disabled veterans, or more children; without amendment (Rept. No. 1541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs, H.R. 11044. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance premiums to certain veterans who became totally disabled in line of duty between the date of application and the effective date of their insurance; without amendment (Rept. No. 1542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs, H.R. 11065. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to allow computation of certain creditable service for pension purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs, H.R. 10966. A bill to change the method of payment of Federal aid to State or territorial homes for the support of disabled pay or retainer pay of those entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from com­

Mr. THORNBERY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 506. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 11318, a bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their re­

Mr. PALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 10496. A bill to authorize appro­priations for the fiscal year 1963, and for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1546). Referred to the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union.
Mr. THORNBERY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 506. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 11318, a bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their re­

Mr. PALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 10496. A bill to authorize appro­priations for the fiscal year 1963, and for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1546). Referred to the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union.
Mr. THORNBERY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 506. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 11318, a bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their re­
treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association (Rept. No. 1547). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference.

H. R. 8684. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide for a deferral of taxation of amounts withheld by a bank or finance company from a dealer in personal property or automobile, and a dependent dealer, until such time as such amounts are paid to or made available to the dealer (Rept. No. 1548). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference.

H. R. 9660. A bill to amend section 6069(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax (Rept. No. 1549). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 11856. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide minimum benefits under the social security insurance program for certain individuals at age 72; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 11857. A bill to provide that section 323(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the loss of nationality by a naturalized national of the United States through residence in a foreign state, shall not apply with respect to certain veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 11858. A bill to extend the veterans' home loan program to February 1, 1965; to provide for direct loans to veterans in areas where housing credit is otherwise not generally available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 11859. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that packaged foods and vegetables be labeled to show the State where such fruits and vegetables were grown; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERIN:

H. R. 11860. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to expand research, extend State and Interstate water pollution control program grants, and strengthen provisions for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 11861. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 30 percent increase in benefits thereafter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 11862. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to terminate the tax on long-distance telephone service simultaneously with the termination (presently provided for) of the tax on local telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 11863. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to accept housing loans, if available, to State veteran agencies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 11864. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that small businessmen, displaced from an urban renewal area by an urban renewal project shall be eligible for loans to assist them in their relocation, under the same terms and conditions as those applicable to loans under section 103 of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 11865. A bill to provide additional lands at, and change the name of, the Fort Necessity National Battlefield Site, Pa., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 11866. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as to deductibility of lawful expenditures for legislative purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. R. 11867. A bill to supplement the national policy against unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce by requiring full disclosure of financial charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OSTERIA:

H. R. 11868. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 11869. A bill to reduce the cost to the U.S. Treasury of high price and income stabilization programs, to provide means by which producers may balance supply with demand at prices that will reduce the volume and costs of maintaining Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, to provide for distribution to the Secretary of international price supports of additional needed high protein foods, to preserve and improve the status of the family farm through greater bargaining power, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):


By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 11871. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act, as amended, to enlarge the site within which the National Cultural Center shall be built; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 11872. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the founding of Vassar College; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H. R. 11873. A bill to provide for the construction of a shellfisheries research center at Milford, Conn.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 11874. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation aid from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally unable to provide for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. R. 11875. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 11876. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Fort Bowie National Historic Site in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARRIS:

H. R. 11877. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to control of non-broadcast station establishment, or continued existence of authorized use for the purpose of receiving radio signals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 11878. A bill for the Horace Amrodose Distil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H. R. 11879. A bill for the relief of Pistro DiGregorio Bruno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 11880. A bill for the relief of Anna Catania Puglisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCFAUL:

H. R. 11881. A bill for the relief of Rosario Saporito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11882. A bill to clarify the ownership of certain church properties located in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interstate and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H. R. 11883. A bill for the relief of Arthur Bibo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYMILL:

H. Res. 507. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Estelle A. Waller; to the Committee on House Administration.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. GROSS: Petition of 128 residents of Charles City, Va., and vicinity in support of H. R. 4488, a bill to raise the Federal minimum wage and to extend minimum wage coverage to include retail and service employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STRATTON: Petition of the common council of the city of Johnstown, and the common council for the city of Johnsonport protesting the recent decision of the U.S. Tariff Commission denying relief to the domestic glove industry from foreign imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Petition of Robert H. Smalls, New York, N.Y., relative to a redress of grievance relating to and requesting the curbing of Moscow sympathizers, and to stop their propaganda outlets and to the curbing of Moscow sympathizers, and to stop their propaganda outlets and freedom to poison our youth's minds, and to stop all attempts to curb our military preparedness and lower our armed forces which is a direct threat to the peace and security of our people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. Dunne: Petition of Clifford Crail, Cincinnati, Ohio, relative to a redress of grievance, and including a copy of the title page of his book entitled "Error of Destiny"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.