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

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, 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 for 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 for that date; and

The nominations of Jack E. Adams et al., which were received on April 11, 1960, and appear in the executive proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date.

IN THE AIR FORCE
JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, U.S. AIR FORCE
Maj. Gen. Albert Meldrum Kuhfeld, 9484A (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, and for appointment as 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 6892, title 10, United States Code:

Lt. Gen. Glenn O. Barcus, 87A.
Lt. Gen. Richard C. Lindsay, 479A.

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

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, were considered and confirmed:

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

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

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

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS
Vice Adm. Charles Wallborn, Jr., U.S. Navy, for appointment as U.S. naval representative, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, as senior Navy member pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 711.

VIET NAM (Sec. Oliver S. Parks, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 2233.

S. Combs, Jr., U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 113.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 2233, the following-named officers for appointment to the grade of admiral, and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of such section, I nominate them for appointment, to the grade of admiral while so serving:

James W. Jackett, USN.
Edward W. Sneed, Jr., USN.
Thomas A. Wornham, USN.
John J. Pappas, USN.
Wallace M. Green, Jr., USN.

The following-named officers of the Navy for appointment to the grade of vice admiral, and which appear in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for 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 for that date; and

The nominations of Jack E. Adams et al., which were received on April 11, 1960, and appear in the executive 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 where their bounds are set.

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 may find where to 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 soundness tomorrow is born of failing hope. Teach Thy will in our national purpose.

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, certain 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 on 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 565.

This legislation, in fact, if 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 this measure. However, after having 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 strong civil rights legislation I say that this bill is meaningful 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 enrolling of the opposition which has arisen since 1957 to my bill demands the enactment into law of the legislation before us now.

We must understand that it is no light matter to modify or amend an entirely new and unequal treatment. The task of changing deeply entrenched patterns of racial segregation demands the full resources of our Government and our Nation. The task requires courage, and the courage and the opposition which have been met and agitated 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 effectuation of Federal court orders in the field of desegregation, and particularly in the field of elective franchise.

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 to meet the new exigencies of 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 specified as the administering officers of 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. Assurance is small relief, but remember a small key can open a big door. Assur-

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 guaranteed equal protection of the law. The bill I am about to introduce, as I have done in the past and as I did during the course of debate on this bill—legislation—strong, effective legislation—to achieve the goal of equal opportunity for all of our citizens.

I wish to point out briefly the substantial differences between the McCulloch bill and the Celler bill. The other body has broadened the scope of this title to include all Federal court orders and increased from 6 months to 1 year the penalty of imprisonment. It also deleted the provision requiring that the criminal penalty imposed be concurrent with any other penalty imposed under the same section. In addition the language which would have made it a crime to interfere with or obstruct the court order of "a threatening letter or communication" was deleted. In title III, the other body eliminated from the House version the proposal which would have made it a crime to travel in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution for having given a false title of another which would be false testimony. However, in the Senate version we include a provision making the conveying of a false title itself a crime. In addition, the Senate version makes it a Federal crime to transport in interstate commerce any explosive for bombing purposes.

In title III, the other body eliminated from the House version the proposal which would have made it a crime to travel in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution for having given a false title of another which would be false testimony. However, in the Senate version we include a provision making the conveying of a false title itself a crime. In addition, the Senate version makes it a Federal crime to transport in interstate commerce any explosive for bombing purposes.

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Forand</td>
<td>Meader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Giaimo</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont.</td>
<td>Hoefield</td>
<td>Norville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchusa</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barden</td>
<td>Horan</td>
<td>Powell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockman</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckley</td>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>St. George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooley</td>
<td>Kleene</td>
<td>Sheppard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>King, Tex.</td>
<td>Sisk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dent</td>
<td>Lafore</td>
<td>Sklar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derrah</td>
<td>Lipcomb</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dove</td>
<td>Lowry</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>McGovern</td>
<td>Tuck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferron</td>
<td>McIntire</td>
<td>Withrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher</td>
<td>Mack</td>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 378 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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 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.

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. Hallick], the minority leader.

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 is a basic right to the wishes 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 category 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 buildings 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 any type of structures which this title is to be applied to.

Title IV amplifies 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 educational facilities for them.

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 us be sure 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 see that it is not 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 no moderate about it. To me it is a very vicious thing. 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 McFadden 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 recognizes it. 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.

You, I am afraid, may be asked at the next election, you come to the South and say, the South is really reaching the grass roots of civil rights. I am going to close this school because I am not going to allow this Negro to vote because I do not want him to vote, and I am going to make it a virtue.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree with this bill. I dislike this bill. I dislike almost any other bill that you have to choose from, not because I am trying to frustrate progress, but I am not. I believe in the American ideals. I believe in the American ideals of democracy, and I believe in the American ideals of freedom.
implications upon them, the country as a whole, and its cherished institutions. In brief, these are some of the evil effects of the voting referendum act. 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 voters discriminatory privileges over white citizens. This definitely illustrates the evil of attempting to enact legislation to make in order the House agreement referred to, to finally bring to the 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 now provide penalties for interstate flight to avoid protection 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 V have also been amended. Title IV gives the members of the Civil Rights Commission the authority to administer oaths or take depositions under oath, and to compel the production of evidence in any civil rights investigation. The original version of this title, it is to be remembered, largely became moot with the amendment to the Mutual Security Act during the 1st session of the 88th Congress that 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 make arrangements 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 already explained, 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 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOUGH], the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. 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 was adopted 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 may emphasize 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. None of the committee 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. The judicial measure to enforce the voting provisions when applicants 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 times 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 Act." The primary reason for this change was to clarify that applicants who had not attempted to register within the time prescribed by the O'Hara amendment are not 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 an administration that believe that the voting provisions of the
the House. This evaluation is based on a purely legal analysis. That analysis, section by section, is as follows:

**TITLE I**

Title I, the so-called obstruction of commerce section, was extended to include all orders, judgments, and decrees of a Federal court. The House version restricted title I school desegregation decree only.

In the motion to recommit which I was privileged to offer, I incorporated an instruction to amend title I by deleting the words "or by any threatening letter or communication." In my judgment, those words, if left in the bill, would have raised a serious question of infringement of freedom of speech and freedom of the press as guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution.

Apparently, a majority of the members of the other body concurred in that opinion; the words are no longer in the bill. During the course of the House debate, I criticized the use of the word "en­deavors" as an unsatisfactory substitute for the word "attempts." The word "attempts," after the word of art, as used in the case law of our American jurisprudence since its inception, was employed in title I of the bill as approved by the other body.

The other body increased the title I prison penalty from 60 days to 1 year. Inasmuch as coverage was broadened and since the degree of the penalty imposed is discretionary rather than mandatory, I find no serious objection to this change.

However, I do strongly disapprove another change in title I made in the other body. As the bill passed the House, any penalty imposed under title I would run concurrently with any penalty imposed for contempt of court growing out of the same violent act. Under the bill as passed by the other body, such penalties may run consecutively.

**TITLE II**

Under title II, the other body added a new section which makes it a crime to transport explosives in interstate commerce. In so doing, they placed a restriction on commerce and impairment of the freedom of the press as guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution.

In my judgment, this was a mistake. 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 pre­sumptions 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 who does not subscribe to this amendment is 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 excluding Negro voters 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 change in the law 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 finally resolved only by the 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 States of the Union by their own will, 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, as a result, not only did the South, but New York, which 24 years later, and motivated by the sorrow experience which her peo­ple had endured under the operation of the enforcement laws, initiated the challenge that what proved to be unwise and unwork­able laws. History may repeat itself.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I will do that later on.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Wible.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, now that the civil rights resolution is finally before us here in the House for a vote, I find that the discussion thereof has been confusing.

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 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 unenviable condition. At least 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 dis­agreement with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'Hara).
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, I offer an amendment which in part provided:

In the case of any application filed 20 or more days prior to an election when disqualification had been held by the court, 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 Colorado (Mr. Roesser), 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 felt that it was necessary to insert into this paragraph language to reinforce the legislative history in the House.

Both the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Dirksen, 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. Roesser), 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 within the time prescribed by State law. To clarify this point, I would like to 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 less than 20 days prior to the election in which he seeks to vote provisionally, the court, in its discretion, may issue an order entitling 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 paragraph, as amended, is whether or not the applicant to have attempted to register at some time prior thereto, and, if registration had been attempted, 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 following statement:

"...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 eligibility to vote, the court can readily determine whether or not the applicant possesses the necessary qualifications for voting under State law. The court then should issue an order entitled 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 with both the intention of those who offered and supported the provision 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 from Michigan 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 accord 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). As 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 or 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 court had to attempt to register within the time permitted by State law even when registration had been attempted, the court would find 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 had been attempted, 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, and is clearly set out in the rule that a court should and should examine the circumstances in each case and not exact a requirement of prior application to the local officials even when 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 Michigan (Mr. LINDSAY), because it would be the criteria that will govern the courts in their interpretation of these sections.

With the approval of the Chair and as the proceedings continue, I am sure that the gentleman will agree, and I am sure that the gentleman will agree, and has relevance only with regard to
the time within which an applicant appears before the referee to seek redress. And I earnestly hope that the House will accept the amendment to this bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. That is in accordance with my understanding.

Mr. CELLER. The language added by the other body does not require a final decision. It simplifies the bill by dispensing with the bill grants under State law before an order entitling him to vote provisionally is issued. The effect of the proviso is to avoid any inference that the court is required to grant the right to vote even if the provisional voting to a person obviously not qualified under State law.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I thank the gentleman from New York for his remarks. I am 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 5 legislative days 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 extension 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 right of every 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 ruled out of order by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee. The amendment I offered stated that when Congress established a territorial form of government for the District of Columbia, this form of government continued in effect until Congress established the District of Columbia, which was finally proclaimed to be the national capital after the national elections of 1800.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days 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 extension 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 right of every 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 ruled out of order by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee. The amendment I offered stated that when Congress established a territorial form of government for the District of Columbia, this form of government continued in effect until Congress established the District of Columbia, which was finally proclaimed to be the national capital after the national elections of 1800. 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 powers.

District citizens voted in the national elections of 1792, 1796, and 1800, but have not participated in a District election since the election of 1800. Under the territorial form of government established by the act of 1801, the District was represented in the House of Representatives; this act was superseded in 1805, but by the act of 1878, and in consequence the District lost its last vestige of any form of national representation.

APPLICABLE LAW AND ARGUMENT

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

A. The Hepburn case: The Members of the House of Representatives are chosen by the electors in each State (art. I, sec. 2, of the Constitution). Members of the House of Representatives of the District of Columbia are chosen by electors for President and Vice President, and representation in the Congress.

I think this should be done now. I would support representation with full participation 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 an area now disenfranchised 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 situation. I am convinced what I advocate can be done. I submit to the House and to the Judiciary Committee a memorandum of law I have prepared. Under unanimous consent I include these remarks.

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 exclude any person from voting for the most 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 1785 and 1786, Maryland and Virginia ceded territory to the Federal Government and Congress, by acts which were approved by the President on July 17, 1786. Congress established the District of Columbia, which was finally proclaimed to be the national capital after the national elections of 1800. Jurisdiction over the District of Columbia was vested in Congress which limited the jurisdiction of the circuit courts to cases between a citizen of the United States in which the suit is brought and a citizen of the District of Columbia, and that the Congress of the United States, which was composed of Senators from each State and from whom it was concluded that the term "State" as used in the United States Constitution was not subject to the jurisdiction of Congress, is extraordinary that the courts of the United States, which are open to aliens, and to the citizens of every State and Territory, should be closed upon them. But this is a subject for legislative, not for judicial, consideration.

Careful examination of the opinion of the Supreme Court in Hepburn v. Ellzey, supra, thus discloses that proponents of the necessity for constitutional amendment (to permit citizens of the District of Columbia to vote in national elections and to have representation in the Congress) are relying upon a decision in which the question of whether citizens of the District of Columbia were citizens of the State of Maryland as to the term "State" as used in the Constitution was not before the Court. The decision in that case was based on the assumption that the term "State" as used in the Constitution and clearly as "State," and that general expressions, in every opinion, are to be taken in connection with the case in which those expressions are used.

That general expressions, in very opinion, are to be taken in connection with the case in which those expressions are used. If they go beyond the case, they are not to be respected, but ought not to control a judgment in a subsequent suit, when the very point is presented for decision.

The National Mutual Insurance Co. case: In the century and a half that has followed the Hepburn case, the court has not reconsidered that case. In Watson v. Brooks (13 F. 540, 543-544 (1853)), for example, the Court, relying upon the Hepburn case in Ellzey, supra, commented: "But it is very doubtful if this ruling would now be made. The question was one of first impression; and it is to be hoped it may yet be reviewed and overthrown.

"By it, and upon a narrow and technical construction of the law, one may be deprived of the protection of the laws and the right of bearing arms; and in cases of invasion or usurpation of power, the protection of the law and the right of bearing arms is of the greatest moment to the safety and peace of the citizen. And in cases of unconstitutionality of the laws, and denial of the right of trial by jury, the protection of the law and the right of bearing arms is of the greatest moment to the freedom of the citizen. And in cases of unconstitutionality of the laws, and denial of the right of trial by jury, the protection of the law and the right of bearing arms is of the greatest moment to the freedom of the citizen. And in cases of unconstitutionality of the laws, and denial of the right of trial by jury, the protection of the law and the right of bearing arms is of the greatest moment to the freedom of the citizen.

In 1805, the District of Columbia was established under the act of Congress in 1801, the District of Columbia was established under the act of Congress in 1801, and the President and Vice President of the United States were elected by the people of the District of Columbia. In 1805, the District of Columbia was established under the act of Congress in 1801, and the President and Vice President of the United States were elected by the people of the District of Columbia. In 1805, the District of Columbia was established under the act of Congress in 1801, and the President and Vice President of the United States were elected by the people of the District of Columbia. In 1805, the District of Columbia was established under the act of Congress in 1801, and the President and Vice President of the United States were elected by the people of the District of Columbia.
of the privilege accorded to all other American citizens, as well as aliens, of going into the courts of the United States and defend their legal rights at home.

Indeed, in the language of the court in Hepburn v. Ellsye, supra, the court said: '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 Black joined, 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. Ellsye, supra,

"Marshall's view of the 1789 act, Herded in his later dictum in Corporation of New Or­leans v. Winter (1 Wheat. 91, 94, 4 L. ed. 44); cf. Sere v. Pitot (6 Cranch 383, 336, 4 L. ed. 249), has been afforded no, but is judicially interpreted to in judicial interpretation of later con­grants of jurisdiction. And, by accretion, the rule of the Hepburn case is, that the District of Columbia is not, by constitutional enactment, a State. But whether citizens are thereby not citizens of any State within the article of Marshall's meaning." 2

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 submitted whether anyone could be found who now would write into the Constitution such an unjust and discriminatory provision for residents of the District of Columbia, that courts in the District are, and long have been, open to citizens of foreign States and foreign powers.

The decision of the Hepburn case was that the District of Columbia was not a State, in the meaning of the diversity clause of the Constitution. In subsequent decisions, the court, over the years, has refused to overrule the Hepburn case, and the Chief Justice Marshall, as well as Mr. Justice Rutledge, has rejected the argument, and refused to overrule the Hepburn case, but concluded that Congress constitutionally had the power to legislate for the District of Columbia with respect to the matter under review, and thus gave life to the prophetic words of Chief Justice Marshall in Hepburn v. Ellsye, in which he had said that the subject was one legislative, and not for judicial disposition.

II. Article I, section 8, clause 17

A. Plenary power to legislate: The District of Columbia is the permanent seat of the Government of the United States. By virtue of article I, section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution, Congress possesses "the combined powers of a general and a State government." (United States v. Edenborough & Cranch (249 U.S. 129, 39 S. Ct. 256 (1919)).) The power conferred by this article is plenary ("O'Donoghue v. United States, 261 U.S. 540, 550, 43 L. ed. 458, 66 S. Ct. 731 (1946)). This plenary power has been recognized in numerous decisions of both the courts of appeal and of this Court, in the cases in which this Court has repeatedly said has called for reexamination of prior decisions. If the right is not now fulfilled in any case, they are in this one.

The Hepburn decision was made before, through later decisions here, had destroyed its basic premises and at the beginning of Marshall's judicial career, when he had 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 for so many years was so happily exercised, which this Court repeatedly has said call for reexamination of prior decisions. If there is no right unfilled in any case, they are in this one.
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tion. 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 forever destroy its character as a State. Neither party had ever consented to that construction of the cession. If, before the District was formed, the cession was unconstitutional as affecting the inhabitants, it would have been void. If done after the District was formed, the voidness would have been equally void; in other words, Congress could not do indirectly, by carving out the District, what it could not do directly. The District was one of the States, a part of the United States, protected by the Constitution. Indeed, it would have been a fanciful construction to suppose the States had ever ceded to the District any rights or powers that it had once been a part of the United States ceased to be such by being ceded directly to the Federal Government.

To the same effect, see O'Donoghue v. United States (at 560) wherein Mr. Justice Sutherland stated:

"It is important to bear constantly in mind that the District was made up of portions of two of the original States of the Union, and that the States ceded the same to Congress.

Prior thereto its inhabitants were entitled to all the rights, guarantees, and immunities enjoyed by the inhabitants of the States, which was the right to have their cases arising under the Constitution heard and determined by the judiciary of the States, and vested with the judicial power conferred by, article III. We think it is not reasonable to assume that the cession stripped them of these rights, and that it was intended that at the very seat of the National Government the people should be less fortified by the guaranty of an independent judiciary than in other parts of the Union."

The nature of plenary power of Congress to legislate for the District of Columbia is fully recognized by the Supreme Court in National Mutual Insurance Co. v. Tidewater Transfer Co., supra. In that case, as pointed out hereinafore, Congress extended the jurisdiction of Federal courts in the several States of actions between citizens of the District of Columbia and citizens of the several States. While two of the Justices sustained the validity of the legislation, on the ground that the District of Columbia and citizens of the several States was a State (thus bringing the legislation within the purview of article III), three Justices, Mr. Justice Black and Burton joined: "It is important that the exclusive responsibility of Congress for the welfare of the District includes both power and duty to provide for the inhabitants and citizens with courts adequate to adjudge not only controversies among themselves but also their claims against, as well as suits brought by, citizens of the various States. It long has been held that Congress may clothe District of Columbia citizens only with the jurisdiction and powers of Federal authority as a State may confer on her courts (Kentucky v. DeCosta, 12 Pet. 603, 619, 9 L. ed. 1181); Capital Tract Co. v. Hof (174 U.S. 1, 19 S. Ct. 59, 43 L. ed. 95; O'Donoghue v. United States, 282 U.S. 516, 63 S. Ct. 740, 77 L. ed. 1336). The defendant here does not challenge the power of Congress to measure justice to the citizens of the District by a standard different from Federal meteors, or to empower a Federal court within the District to run its process to summon to its bar citizens of any State in the United States.

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.
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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 result in some States only as an invitation to lawsuits and further State legislation designed to make voting more difficult.

Then equally as clearly as 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 widely conceived laws. We do not face a whole problem rather than to put our faith in the plous assumption that all will be well once the millennium of universal suffrage is reached.

Mr. HEMPHILL. 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 elections 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 liberty and the Locke 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 spurred on. Some will be led to believe that this legislation enhances 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.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, earlier during the course of debate there was a colloquy among the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA), the gentleman from New York (Mr. Celler), the gentleman from New York (Mr. Lindsay), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCulloch) concerning the effect of the Dirksen amendment to the provisional voting provision. That amendment appears on page 73 of the Senate bill and is numbered "29."

Obviously, the colloquy was planned in advance as an effort to establish so-called legislative intent to guide the courts in the interpretation of the provisions of the Senate amendment. Furthermore, the courts were not given any unusual or special evidence to the contrary. It may be well to note that this legislation the dangers it threatens 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 forms and the process in 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, do not believe we can’t 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, will be won only as all men are treated with equality and as the law is written and interpreted as to the Constitution. This Nation has made progress through patience and the broadening of our laws to guarantee equal rights where force and custom was being applied and where the rights of the minority were being trampled. This Nation has made some effort to register or otherwise to qualify to vote. It is destructive of constitutional principles and personal liberty.

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 remarks the other day be noted here. There is no occasion, no need, no demand for legislation of this character. It is destructive of constitutional principles and personal liberty.

Mr. BERTH. Mr. Speaker, the civil rights battle in Congress has ended for the present. To those of us who will not rest until every vestige of discrimination has been wiped out, the bill as passed is a grave disappointment, and we feel many regrets over the lost provisions of the bill. At best, we have passed only moderate legislation, it is merely a short step forward, and a great dis...
tance 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 withstood every major assault, and if properly enforced, it promises to give the Negro free access to the polls for the first time since the days of the Reconstruction.

The stiff penalties provided in the bill for interference by threats or force with any Federal court order, regarding hate bombings, the requirement for preservation of local election records, should prove effective weapons for ending some of the present evils perpetrated by hate mongers and those who would deny Negroes the right guaranteed them under our Constitution.

Powerful opposition prevented enactment of many provisions which would have been extremely helpful to those homing for elimination of discrimina-
tion; one of these provisions included FEPC principles relating to Government contracts.

Our joy in the victory we have achieved for civil rights today is shadowed by our losses, but we have reason to believe that the day is not too far distant when all our citizens will enjoy true equality. I, for one, pledge my every effort for the benefit of all those who suffer under the scourge of discrimination, and I shall continue to work with confidence, in the knowledge that I stand at the right and will eventually prevail, for it was upon these principles that our Nation was founded.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, to many of us the present bill does not encompass the protection of civil rights that we had visualized when debate opened on this bill.

Giving credit to the bill in the most favorable light, this is only moderate legislation. It is a step towards securing the right to go in guaranteeing civil rights to all Americans, regardless of race, color, or creed. I have given earnest consider-

ation to the question of what the best bill which can be obtained at this time and under these circumstances.

This is an advance over the Civil Rights Act of 1957. This is the second step in the onward march of civil rights for all of our people. It has taken us almost a century to come this far. How-
ever, we have in the past 8 years made much greater progress than in the previous 70 years.

If we can take the experience of the Attorney General with reference to the 1897 civil rights bill, it does seem that we will have better means of enforcement of constitutionally guaranteed rights. In many ways this legislation will be a challenge to the Attorney General to enforce these rights in accordance with the legislation.

I have voted for this bill as a means of helping to achieve a better climate in which civil rights may be enforced and as a means of showing that the Senate made substantial changes when it came to that body. In title I, the Senate deleted the word “corruptly” and struck out the portion under which the criminal penalty imposed would not run concurrently. From the same title was stricken language which would have made it a crime to interfere or obstruct a court order by a threatening letter or communication.

The Senate also struck out a section which would have made it a crime to travel in interstate commerce to avoid prosecution for having given wrong information regarding a bombing. However, the Senate included a provision making it a Federal crime to transport in interstate commerce any explosive for bombing purposes. The Senate version also reduced the preservation of voting records from 2 years to 22 months.

In other sections, the Senate elimi-
nated the House section whereby the Commissioner of Education could negoti-
ate for leasing of school buildings which were constructed with Federal aid— whenever local authorities could not provide educational facilities for children of members of the Armed Forces.

In title VI, the Senate put a section requiring that hearings before any vot-

er referee shall be held under the direc-
tion of the U.S. district court.

It appears to me that this bill is neither over nor to the right, but is essentially a middle-of-the-road bill. However, if properly enforced, I believe that it could result in substantial gains in the next few years for those 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 sup-
port which will be given to those who seek to have their voting rights estab-
lished, as well as to we who have been interested in helping them obtain those rights. I personally shall continue to work with 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 Amer-

icans they are worth working for.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, 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 yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The question was taken; and there were—yeas 290, nays 95, answered "present" 2, not voting 45, as follows:

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. Burnes against.
- Mr. Brock for, with Mr. Young against.
- Mr. Moulder for, with Mr. Finkner against.
- Mr. personal name for, with Mr. Cranston against.
- Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Cooley against.
- Mr. McCormack for, with Mr. Gentleman against.
- Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Barden against.
- Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Mitchell against.

Until further notice:
- Mr. Dent with Mr. Taylor.
- Mr. Montoya with Mr. Norblad.
- Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. McClintock.
- Mr. Oliver with Mr. Horan.
- Mr. Anderson of Montana with Mr. Jackson.
- Mr. Mack with Mr. Devou spanking.
- Mr. McGovern with Mr. Fenton.
- Mr. Diggs with Mr. Anderson of Minnesota.
- Mr. Holland with Mr. Laxalt.
- Mr. Powell with Mr. Lipcomb.
- Mr. Hargis with Mr. Gavin.
- Mr. Javits with Mr. Meader.

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. Gracez]. 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. THORNBERRY, Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I present the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 500) for printing in the Record.

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House, in the course of the normal day, consider passage of the bill (H.R. 10918) to provide for the payment of certain amounts incidental to the retirement of members of Congress who are entitled to military retirement pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were entitled to receive retired pay or retain pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, who were entitled to have their retired pay or retain pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the Act of May 20, 1958. After general debate, which shall be limited to two hours, the resolution shall be considered as agreed to, to dispose of the question of the amendment of the bill and the question of its passage shall be considered as ordered on the amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

RIVERTON FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. ASPINALL. 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 necessary, because the 10-year development period of the project comprising approximately 8,000 acres, was opened to entry in 1949 and 1950. The 10-year development period was established to provide for organization of a district and the negotiation and execution of a repayment contract. 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 accomplished 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 agreements have been reached and it is now necessary that the resolution be brought to a vote in order 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 be asked to pass for water deliveries both this year and 1961.

Although my committee is displeased that this resolution has not been completed, we believe the contract should have been completed within the allowed time, to the time and interest of 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.

Mr. ASpinall. Mr. Chairman, the resolution was ordered to the House on the request of the gentleman from Colorado. Today there are 1,600 Mexican soldiers under the Mexican soldiers under the

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. 1530) 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. Millis 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 F. Austin, Sam Houston, and other great Texas patriots, being mentioned with reverence.

One hundred and twenty-five 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
leadership of their President, Santa Ana. They had, so they thought, trapped on a little rise of ground 910 Texans under the leadership of Sam Houston. They were waiting for the Texans to surrender, but the Texans had burned in their hearts and their minds the memories of the slaughter of Goliad and the slaughter of those brave defenders of the Alamo. They waited for Santa Ana and his well-plumed and well-armed 1,000 to make their attack; the 910 charged the Mexican Army. This was one of the most decisive battles fought between two nations, and after more than 20 minutes Sam Houston’s men had conquered completely the army of Santa Ana. Six hundred and thirty Mexicans lay dead, 230 wounded, and over 700 captured. The Texans lost 9 men killed, and 39 wounded.

There were many Latin Americans in the fray, but we now enjoy a tremendous good neighbor relationship with our Mexican neighbors. Their courage has enriched ours. But on this day we revere, San Jacinto Day. Those heroic deeds still live in our memory when the Texans fought to establish their rights. However, I asked for this time in order to direct the attention of the Committee on Foreign Affairs—the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHURCH], the member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs—the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. JUDD], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd], in his printed supplemental views on this bill, time after time told of his disappointments because of the waste and inefficiency.

I listened to practically all the debate, and I was amused by the panoply of those who are responsible for this waste and inefficiency. The gentleman from Minnesota made no apology for their opposition to the bill. Practically everyone else on the committee who spoke were apologetic. The gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CURRAN], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], on the other hand to help theJ 20.000,000,000 per student, for a 5-month train program at Johns Hopkins and at the Boston University. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired. Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

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. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not think that is true.

Mr. GROSS. It does not miss it very far.

Mr. MORGAN. Yesterday the gentleman said that $100,000 is a lot of money. One hundred and thirty-six million dollars is a lot of money, too, and that is what was kept out of this program.

Mr. GROSS. Relatively speaking, you cut out nickels and dimes. I still insist you gave them just about everything they asked for.

Yesterday I listened to practically all the debate, and I was amused by the panoply of those who are responsible for this waste and inefficiency. The gentleman from Minnesota made no apology for their opposition to the bill. Practically everyone else on the committee who spoke were apologetic. The gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CURRAN], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], in his printed supplemental views on this bill, time after time told of his disappointments because of the waste and inefficiency.

Page 84 of the report there is another disappointment, yet the gentleman from Minnesota supports every dime in this bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman if he can explain all the criticism he made about this program and still defend it.

Mr. JUDD. I practiced surgery for 19 years.

Mr. GROSS. Just a moment.
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 measures 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. I said that I am going to continue to make that sort of constructive criticism and effort with respect to this program.

Mr. GROSS. And if the patient died, the undertaker took care of him. Who would suffer. Sometimes the undertaker took care of him. Who

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 support the 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 ineffectiveness that has been going on from the time this baby was born."

Mr. JUDD. I said 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 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 ineffectiveness that has been going on from the time this baby was born."

Mr. JUDD. I said I think 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 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. There must have been good justification for it or we would not have been able to make a cut in this glorified bill. I do not know why you should want 4 additional supergrades should be for the new agency, the Comptroller is going 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 time before they cut it back from 59 to 35. That was last year.

Mr. GROSS. There must have been good justification for it or we would not have been able to make a cut in this glorified bill. I do not know why you should want 4 additional supergrades should be for the new agency, the Comptroller is going 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 time before they cut it back from 59 to 35. That was last year.

Mr. GROSS. There must have been good justification for it or we would not have been able to make a cut in this glorified bill. I do not know why you should want 4 additional supergrades should be for the new agency, the Comptroller is going 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 time before they cut it back from 59 to 35. That was last year.

Mr. GROSS. There must have been good justification for it or we would not have been able to make a cut in this glorified bill. I do not know why you should want 4 additional supergrades should be for the new agency, the Comptroller is going 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 time before they cut it back from 59 to 35. That was last year.

Mr. GROSS. There must have been good justification for it or we would not have been able to make a cut in this glorified bill. I do not know why you should want 4 additional supergrades should be for the new agency, the Comptroller is going 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 time before they cut it back from 59 to 35. That was last year.
the mutual 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 Development Loan Fund loans. 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.

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 programs abroad. But we are paying educational programs abroad through the International Cooperation Administration.

I have here a letter from the Director of the International Cooperation Administration and from it I should like to read two or three paragraphs. Then I want to take up some of the details that are involved here.

Dear Mr. Bailey: This is in reply to your letter of March 30 in which you request information about contracts between the U.S. Government and certain educational institutions to carry on educational programs abroad.

University contracts are employed by ICA as a means of implementing the technical cooperation program. As of March 31, 1950, the total cumulative obligations for contracts specifically aimed at education amounted to $96,844,206, involving 30 contracts with 27 universities operating in 19 countries. As early as 1951, the Economic Cooperation Administration negotiated an agricultural contract between Cornell University and the University of the Philippines. At about the same time, the American Affairs Association was negotiating a somewhat similar contract with the University of Arkansas for work in Panama, and the Technical Cooperation Administration negotiated a contract with the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College for work in Ethiopia.

May I digress from my remarks at this time to remind you that we built an agricultural college in Ethiopia and we have built or are presently building nine agricultural high schools. The construction is paid for largely by the American taxpayers' money. And we are not only constructing buildings, but we are putting into the major part of the salaries of all of these teachers in that agricultural college.

I have some comments a little further on about that particular effort in Ethiopia.

University contracts are administered under the Office of Contract Relations, International Cooperation Administration.

I have here, and I am going to ask unanimous consent to put in the Record, a list of all the countries in which they are carrying on this program together with a brief description of what the program is. I am doing this, Mr. Chairman, for the sole purpose of calling to your attention the fact that I am going to be here pleading with you in the matter of a few days, I hope, to do something or other about the education of and creating educational facilities for American officers with a brief description of what the program is to build or are presently building nine American

At the same time, the Institute of International Cooperation and Education, a training program to provide for work in Ethiopia. The vocational trades school in Asmara, this institution will now be operated by the Government of the State of Sao Paulo, one of the most active of industrial areas, lacked enough trained lower-level executives to carry on 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, and (5) junior executives within industry. About 30,000 foremen and supervisors were trained in these courses. This program was phased out in 1958. As a follow-up on this training a newer program is now being organized in the same area for skilled related workers.

The Brazilian Air Force had developed an aviation engineering college at Sao Jose de Cambos. 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 ICA this institute became a part of a general engineering college with seven major fields in which students can specialize. Brazil is also now able to supply Brazil with her much needed engineer corps.

The textile industry is the second largest industry in Brazil employing over 400,000 workers. In May 1953, ICA contracted for assistance in conducting literacy classes for new recruits. This in a program of this kind, we ought not even have to go to the trouble of having a debate to furnish our American officers with a brief description of what the program is to build or are presently building nine American

In 1951, the Economic Cooperation Administration opened the Engineering College in Asmara, the nation's 5000-year history as a consequence of stimulation and joint planning with the ICA education program. In 1953 there were fewer than 500 qualified teachers to cope with a school population of 4,000 in 900 classrooms. The single teacher-training institution that year graduated a total of 18 teachers. Today, because of joint effort, there are 14 teacher-training centers, all four of which are working in the nation's 3,910 classrooms which house 210,000 children. Teacher-training institutions now number 500 teacher trainers annually. As a result of ICA assistance about 75 percent of all teachers receive some kind of teacher-training. The establishment of 148 new self-help village schools has improved and expanded educational opportunities in rural areas. This has resulted in 47 postal, elementary, academic, and special schools graduating about 1,500 skilled workers yearly for employment in 22 critical manpower areas.

Through ICA assistance the training of skilled workers in the building and mechanical trades has progressed. The building trade school in Addis Ababa is receiving $210,000 (2,000 man years) annually as a means of producing much needed building tradesmen and trade instructors. Training is now offered in electricity, carpentry, masonry, plumbing, and related subjects in applied mathematics, science, and mechanical drawing. Over 100 graduates annually are obtaining employment in these trades while others are being trained and entering the teaching field in vocational education.

The vocational trades school in Asmara, Eritrea, which began as a cooperative program in 1953, was phased over to the Ministry of Education in 1958. With the assistance of ICA, the Ministry of Education has developed a program in which 5 years of vocational education can be completed by students in the Tigrigna language. Those students who have completed this program may then take a 1-year course in an industry where they have an interest. There are now 600 students in this program.

Libya: The teacher education project in Libya, which was initiated in 1956, has as its objective the training of additional teachers through preservice programs and upgrade others through inservice programs. The accumulation of these programs will eliminate the necessity for the Libyan Government to employ untrained teachers and non-Libyan teachers. Approximately 300 teachers have been graduated from the teachers colleges in Tripoli and Cyrenaica in each of the years 1958 and 1959. An additional 1,000 received training in a 10-week summer program held at Tripoli and in special classes in Cyrenaica. Acceleration for Paraguay: As in other developing countries, Paraguay has a problem concerning illiteracy. The compulsory military training law brings about 1,000 young men in a year. With ICA assistance about 40 army officers have been trained in the techniques of literacy teaching and they are now conducting literacy classes for new recruits. About 1,000 men a time are taken for this training, which is performed by a program ICA is being reduced considerably.

Guatemala: Guatemala has a population reported to be about 60 percent illiterate. The compulsory military training law brings about 1,000 young men in a year. With ICA assistance about 40 army officers have been trained in the techniques of literacy teaching and they are now conducting literacy classes for new recruits. About 1,000 men a time are taken for this training, which is performed by a program ICA is being reduced considerably.

Paraguay: As in other developing countries, Paraguay, while agricultural, needs skilled workers. 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. This school opened in September 1958 when the city of Asuncion installed a water system for the first time.
There were, however, no plumbbers to connect homes to water mains. The vocational school established special courses and, by working on the job, trained the incurred plumbers. As of June 1960 this school is being phased over to the Government of Pakistan's Vocational Technical assistance for effective operation.

Peru: Peru is a country in which the mining, petroleum, fishing, and manufacturing industries have become important, and in all of these industries, chemical and industrial engineering—as well as analytical chemistry—are being used in the mining and broadening of the department of chemistry. Two years ago ICA entered into a contract with the Government of Peru to carry out such a program of assistance at the University of San Marcos through the 1962 fiscal year. The third phase of a modest amount of equipment base to the training program. This very successful program will be completed in June 1960.

Turkey: One of Turkey's major problems is the eradication of illiteracy. Since 50 percent of the conscripts for military service are unable to read or write, the Turkish National Defense and the U.S. military mission found themselves seriously handicapped in their efforts to train modern military units. A project for literacy training in the armed forces was launched in the spring of 1959 under the joint efforts of the Turkish Ministry of Education and Defense, the U.S. military mission and the ICA technical personnel were furnished from the USOM Education and Training Division. During the first phase of fiscal year 1960, 70 U.S. and Turkish engineers were trained in the United States, primarily for teaching the courses.

The program, technical cooperation is concentrated on developing a new program of graduate study and engineer teacher training in five leading engineering institutions. New contracts for this purpose, replacing old contract activities, were awarded during the fiscal year 1960. Contracts have for the training of teachers, who are greatly in demand, in the universities and are being given advanced training in preparation for promotion to higher academic positions. The program is intended to meet these needs and to prepare teachers to teach the new courses now being developed. In addition, the training of 1,500 new teachers, who are needed is currently in progress. The technicians will be given training in the universities and are being assigned to schools.

Jordan, which had no organized teacher education program prior to ICA assistance in 1952, now has preservice and inservice training facilities for about 500 and has increased its in-service training and summer school programs from approximately 300 to 2,500 annually. This growth has been due primarily to the efforts of the ICA and the Jordanian educators who have put into practice the methods with which they have been trained, under the auspices of ICA.

Afghanistan is one of the border countries of the free world. While Soviet bloc economic assistance is being poured into that area, the only bilateral effort which is presently permitted in the field of education which is of some significance is 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 add technology 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 Teachers College and the Agriculture Technical Institute; (b) extension of the Institute of Education and in-service teacher training courses; (c) a large segment of the curricula of Kabul University; (d) the vocational industrial education through the Afghan Institute of Technology; (e) vocational agriculture, through the vocational agricultural school of this program; (f) and a major project in the teaching of English as the second language of India. The Afghan government has undertaken an intensive program of action in education which are presently under discussion with Afghan authorities.

India: India's effort to develop her economy to meet the needs of a rapidly expanding population of some 416 million, requires a major effort to expand agricultural and industrial production, public works, transportation, irrigation, conservation and education. To make possible increases in industrial output there must be a sharp increase in the supply of engineers, technicians, and other trained personnel, at the same time an adequate corps of technicians must be trained to back up the work of the engineers.

Much has already been accomplished through the ICA technical cooperation program. During an initial phase from fiscal year 1958 to 1960, 175 U.S. and Indian engineers were trained in the United States, primarily for teaching the courses. A new national school with a capacity of 1,000 students has been erected, and partially equipped, at Saligon, and another new normal school with a capacity for 50 students in a rural area. A new faculty of engineering education has been added at the Indian Institute of Technology, Calcutta, and 62 is estimated that there are 750,000 to one million children of elementary school age not attending school. As a means of attacking the problem, assistance has been given with the construction of badly needed buildings and classrooms. From 1958 to 1959, 2,156 elementary school classrooms and 192 secondary school classrooms have been constructed with U.S. assistance. Work drawings for 38 new science laboratories have been made and 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, at Saligon, and another new normal school with a capacity for 50 students in a rural area. A new faculty of letters building with a capacity of 1,200 students has been erected and partially equipped. Plans have been made for the construction of (1) a new elementary demonstration school, (2) two new rural normal schools, and (3) a new faculty for pedagogy building. Through the X. English training facilities for the new Phu Tho Vocational School have been completed except for the classroom buildings and the sanitation facilities. The mortar was deposited from the air with the aid of 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 Apprentices 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 approximately 1 million copies of approximately 57 new and improved books. In addition to the 38 science laboratories, 500 cases of reference materials teaching and learning are severely handicapped.

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. Eighty-three of the 129 Seoul National Student members have been trained in higher education training for training have been returned to the university and are actively engaged in using improved facilities and teaching the development of curricula, and general administrative leadership.

The abolition of illiteracy through education is a major concern to many countries in the Far East, including Thailand, Myanmar, Indonesia, and Japan. In Thailand, the emergency of providing some training for new teachers, who are greatly in demand,
a series of summer schools has been offered. Thus, about 20,000 teachers (fresh graduates from the sixth grade) have received their only training in these courses. As a means of providing more adequately prepared professional elementary teacher training for approximately 500 students was built and equipped.

The effort to improve education in Thailand has been an outstanding example of cooperation between United States and Thai authorities. The four phases of this project include the training of 11,000 teachers in regional centers, 12 countrywide conferences with 1,800 educators participating and 60 workshops and seminars. Among the 20,000 teachers received in-service training. A large number of these teachers had only a secondary school education.

Regional projects: A regional approach to the technical assistance in education was introduced first 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 numbers and standards of English-speaking persons in Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam. The four phases of the project are: (1) Analysis of the local language of each country, (2) preparation of teaching materials, (3) constructing or remodeling training centers, and (4) conducting an improved training program, for teachers of English as a second language, and for the regional staffs. In at least one major institution in each country.

Progress to date shows that No. 1 above has been completed and in step No. 2, 21 countries have completed drafts of tests and materials for teacher training in the three countries have been prepared, and a draft for a typical level of secondary schools in Thailand. Phase 3, the training of teachers to teach English as a second language, indicates the following accomplishments: (1) Curricula for teacher training programs completed; (2) 30 teachers of English trained in the regular course of instruction; (3) in-service training seminars held for 160 teachers in the rural areas; (4) instruction of 26 students in English at the Faculty of Letters in Saigon; and (5) four teachers have been sent to the University of Michigan for 2 years of study.

The SEATO Graduate School of Engineering, with a teaching staff and student body supplied by participating countries, will be the first school of its type in southeast Asia. The aim of the project is to meet the rapidly developing need for well-qualified engineers in the fields of power and energy sources, highways, sanitation, and hydraulic and structural engineering. This is an international graduate school of engineering which has been planned, established, and is now in operation. Basic classroom laboratories and administrative facilities have been constructed or remodeled and the furnishing of equipment has been largely completed.

Mr. DOWDY. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, as in former years, I am opposed to this foreign aid bill, and more so with the passing of the Mexican sugar embargo. I cannot justify nor rationalize giving away our resources, and putting this greater burden on American taxpayers, who are already suffering under an overwhelming tax burden. Furthermore, our national debt is so huge that only wastrels would think of making gifts of money that we do not have.

But I fail to see why anyone could vote for these gifts to Communist alien dictators, and actual as well as potential enemies, when there are so many needs and needy people here in our own country.

The special program for Africa is included in the special assistance authorized in this legislation. It is my understanding that about $30 million will be allotted to this program. In my opinion, it will prove one of the wisest investments we have ever made. It is wise because it goes to those that in the foreseeable future Africa may have as many as 30 or 40 seats in the United Nations. The wealth of Africa is tremendous. Its future is a challenge to imagination. If we lose Africa, the understanding friendship of her new governments, the hearts and minds of her people, we have lost the world.

The special program for tropical Africa is patterned to the need immediately for trained civil servants by the new nations emerging almost overnight. As the natives come into power, there is a need for trained civil servants. It is a situation comparable to our own when war came to us and we had to have officers but could not wait 4 years for their graduation from West Point and Annapolis. We established 90-day officer-training camps.

From this program now under consideration of 90-day training courses for African civil servants will come men and women reasonably prepared to operate the governmental machinery in these emerging African nations. Is there anything foolish about that? Help, too, was...
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 cloud the soundness of the special African program. We rejoice that lands long denied to civilization are enjoying the dignity 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 a continent of Africa. Now we are trying to do something, something sound and constructive which will reach into hearts and minds and create lasting friendship, and I do not like to see any of my colleagues into this well and give the impression that this is a case of spending the good money of the American taxpayers for foolish purposes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the question is not whether we should have a new policy for the United States but whether we should carry out the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States instituted by President Eisenhower. This is not the time or place to decide this overall foreign policy; this is the place to decide method of implementing a settled policy that has been tested through the past years.

We must look at the larger picture of our U.S. security, not just at the relatively few failures there have been considering the total size of the program. I would like to quote to you the remarks that were made before our House Foreign Affairs Committee by Thomas Gates, our competent and able U.S. Secretary of Defense, who appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee on February 23, 1960.

My last point—

Mr. Gates said—

concerns the return we receive on our investment.

Now know of no program which rewards us better. In terms of actual military strength, the results are impressive. In 1947 every nation had to go it alone for want of strong leadership which only the United States could give and therefore the entire free world was stronger than the weakest link.

Today we see in Asia a much better posture. The armistice arrangements have improved from 3⅓ to 5 million men added by our own efforts.

Adding my own comment, that 5 million men added to our own competent U.S. forces of approximately 2⅔ million men in the free world to defend us. Reading further—

900,000 of our own forces from 1,600 to 2,500 combat ships; allied air forces have increased from about 17,000 to over 26,000 aircraft, about half of which we rent. All allied forces are better trained, better equipped, and better able to perform their assigned missions in the framework of our total strategy. Their self-confidence is strong. Their determination to resist has become steadily firmer. They know that the United States is committed to defend them and, according, when the going gets tough—as it can be made tough by the Communsists even in time of peace—they do not falter or fall back.

Of course, it may be said that the program transcends the授权 of the military authorization, but it is part of our whole U.S. mutual assistance program. We must give various countries those support so that they can maintain their armies and maintain this defense posture with us. We American people must remember we are now not fighting a hot war, and that the United States is relatively prosperous in an uncertain world.

Our American people cannot sit with bulging warehouses and unused and growing surpluses and expect the other people of the world to love us, like us, and help us defend ourselves. We as a nation have to be part of the world with its mutual problems of progress and defense, and one of our world responsibilities is the continuation of this program. We must assume our responsibilities to our friends and allies regardless of party.

Do not listen 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 this at my colleagues, Members. There is not. This program passes this House by almost a two-thirds majority practically every Congress. This present bill to continue the same mutual security program was passed 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 demand that we not fall back to this point of view?

Mr. FULTON. Yes; that is a very good philosophic and religious comment. There are rare few 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 from 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 in 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 Suez Canal? Shall the U.S. people barricade everyone in his own house and in his own city and try to defend against all comers? Shall we in the United States be good citizens of the world and take just a little less than 1 percent of our gross national product in 1 year to help our neighbors and be a good Samaritan to help these fine people do the job necessary to be done for their security and progress?

Providing certain amounts in responsible universities for trained capable and able personnel, the answer is: We want and need people educated in this program. We do not want the program administered by the Red administration, 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 department choose the right people and there is danger actually from that standpoint?

Mr. FULTON. Yes; that is a very good philosophic and religious comment. There are rare few 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 from 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 in 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 Suez Canal? Shall the U.S. people barricade everyone in his own house and in his own city and try to defend against all comers? Shall we in the United States be good citizens of the world and take just a little less than 1 percent of our gross national product in 1 year to help our neighbors and be a good Samaritan to help these fine people do the job necessary to be done for their security and progress?

Providing certain amounts in responsible universities for trained capable and able personnel, the answer is: We want and need people educated in this program. We do not want the program administered by the Red administration, 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 department choose the right people and there is danger actually from that standpoint?

Mr. FULTON. Yes; that is a very good philosophic and religious comment. There are rare few 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 from 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 in 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 Suez Canal? Shall the U.S. people barricade everyone in his own house and in his own city and try to defend against all comers? Shall we in the United States be good citizens of the world and take just a little less than 1 percent of our gross national product in 1 year to help our neighbors and be a good Samaritan to help these fine people do the job necessary to be done for their security and progress?

Providing certain amounts in responsible universities for trained capable and able personnel, the answer is: We want and need people educated in this program. We do not want the program administered by the Red administration, 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 department choose the right people and there is danger actually from that standpoint?
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 on Rules. The Democrats voted that rule and no Republicans voted for it. Two Democrats did not vote for it. Four and two are six: six to now. I give one vote. My friends, in 30 States at least 5 million 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, let us get the facts true for 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 relates to conditions applicable to military assistance, is amended by striking out "1961" and inserting "1960". It is the sense of the Congress that inasmuch as "(1) the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations; and "(2) the purposes of this Act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under this Act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this Act, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways; convenience under this Act and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be administered to give effect to these principles, and, in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this Act or arising under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, these principles shall be as the President may determine, and he shall report on measures taken by the administration to insure their application."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this subject at the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the United States has consistently supported the principle of freedom of transit through the Suez Canal, which is an international waterway. I am here to see that the Foreign Affairs Committee has recommended an amendment to section 2 of the Mutual Security Act which gives the President more latitude to our position on this important matter. Certainly we do not intend that the United States should ever threaten to cut off mutual security aid because a country fails to support our position on a particular issue. This would not only bring charges of imperialism, but more important it would be alien to the whole spirit of mutual cooperation for peace and to our position on this important matter.

The continuing Egyptian action of preventing the passage of Israeli ships through the canal and of generally blockading Israel is contrary to the spirit of international law and endangers the peace in that tense area. We must use every proper avenue of persuasion to open the Suez Canal to the use of all nations. This amendment directs the President to give recognition to these principles in administering both the Mutual Security Act and Public Law 480. In whatever ways he determines best. I hope that Congress will adopt this amendment as an expression of our continued support of the freedom of navigation in international waters and for economic cooperation among the nations of the free world.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 1—MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Military assistance

SEC. 101. Section 106(b)(4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to conditions applicable to 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"

"SEC. 101. Section 102(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 in lieu thereof the following: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal years 1959 and 1960 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1961.

And reletter the following section accordingly.

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 open end. In conference with Members of the other body, the House conferences accepted a change in the language which in effect gave the Administration the discretion to give the appropriation for one year for military assistance. I would like to read to the members of the committee at this time the authorization language as it now stands in the legislation:

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal years 1961 and 1962 such sums as may be necessary for military assistance, by the terms of this chapter, which sums shall remain available until expended."

In other words, Mr. Chairman, what we did in adopting the conference report last year was to give the Executive a blanket authorization for whatever sums might be appropriated for fiscal years 1961 and 1962. That is one of the main reasons why today we are dealing with an authorization bill of only $2,120,000,000 while in the recommendation by the Appropriations Committee of this chapter, which sums shall remain available until expended.

And reletter the following section accordingly.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition 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 repeat those remarks.
1980 and such sums as may be necessary for 1981 and 1982. This compromise was accepted by the House and is now contained in the law.

Mr. BENTLEY. If the gentleman will allow me, it dates the 1983 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 branch officials to include the military assistance appropriation in the regular military appropriation bill. They said that waiving an appropriation and authorization would make this impossible.

Our Appropriations Committee has decided that the 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 before next year. He has been an outstanding member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I value his work on the committee. He has worked very hard on the subject. It has been one of the outstanding leaders in helping to eliminate waste and inefficiency in the program.

The gentleman knows that due to the preceding procedure 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 preceding 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 of us are well acquainted with much less with 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 in amending or reexamining any section of the 1962 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 defense bills and the authorization he seeks to eliminate this year 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 has been imposed in the 1962 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 Armed Forces, and that is a $40-billion-a-year program. The Committee on Armed Services does not impose before the House every year an authorization bill saying that the Committee on Appropriations is authorized to appropriate for our Defense Department not to exceed X billions of dollars. The 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 used for many years without 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. Admiral Felt who is in command of all of our forces in the Pacific, beginning on page 535; and one with General Norstad and his associates dealing with all aspects of our military assistance programs and the armed forces of our allies in the NATO or European Mediterranean theater. It begins on page 673. Our Committee of Representatives can at any time take action, either in this bill or in a separate bill, to modify the military assistance policies and programs and to put any limitation it wishes that that program can be appropriated for that purpose. In no sense do we lose control of the military assistance program by having this waiver in the bill.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Moya: 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 hereafter entered into under the Mutual Security Act of 1954 as amended.'

Whereupon 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 Bennet 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 aware of the use 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 answered:
‘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 authorization 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 authorizing action by this committee or the Congress. But this committee can take action on appropriations, if at any time it thinks there is something that requires such action. So, Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment should be defeated.'
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 believe the gentleman is involved 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, substitute for it the following: 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 knowledge and know-how 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 insecurity, because 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 at the least a risk, at other times may be so friendly. I say that it is risky to give this weapon assistance to other countries.

Furthermore, there is a growing understanding on the part of the public 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.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER] has expired.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER]?

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

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

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 this year 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. HOLFELD] 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 public debate 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 applicable 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:

"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 a nuclear war. I say in conclusion that this is not only a moral issue but it is also a practical issue, because there is no sense to having a nuclear war, because we cannot win it—no one can win it. The danger of spreading this weaponry to many countries is a risk we cannot afford to take.

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. MEYER].

The question was taken; and on a division demanded by Mr. MEYER there were—ayes 11, noes 46.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER II—ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Defence support

360. Title I of chapter II of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, as amended, which relates to defense support, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 131(b), which relates to general authority, strike out "1060" and "765,000,000" and substitute "1661" and "695,000,000" respectively.
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. FARBEINSTEIN. 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. Defense support is an extension of the amount involved, defense assistance, 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 various 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 is generally referred to. One is giving a man a gun 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, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FARBEINSTEIN. 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. Defense support is an extension of the amount involved, defense assistance, 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 various 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 is generally referred to. One is giving a man a gun 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, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FARBEINSTEIN. Defense support does not go for military hardware, that is true, but defense support is used for the soldiers' wages, and wages, and supporting 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. FARBEINSTEIN. 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 prepared to do it, and willing to do it, it is economic assistance, call it that if you will—but nevertheless, without this additional money in the way of defense support these 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 phase. One is defense support for specific economic purposes, and the other is for general financial support of the recipient nation. I am sure the gentleman does not contest that.

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 very special purpose, because here is 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 maintain 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 help them to become, as I say, as important as we are, and to provide them with the equipment, and to maintain them to the extent of their and our defense.

None of the 12 important countries receiving defense support can yet provide out of their own resources the funds or supplies necessary to maintain the size and kind of armed forces we want them to have, for our defense as well as theirs. These 12 countries now have, because of defense support, 3 million well-trained soldiers defending our free world.

If Members of the Committee will look at page 20 of the report, they will see what it costs to provide just the pay, allowance, subsistence and clothing of one soldier for one year, $1679 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.

This money is not used for the support of general purposes. The one purpose is for defense. When we ask the question, "Is it beneficial and essential defense support is for our national defense?" It has already been cut as deeply as prudence will permit.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. If I may quote from the committee report at the bottom of page 23, in answer to the question about the military users of this money, I will read the following:

Support is extended in two ways: One is by projects in major areas of the economy such as industry and mining; transportation, health, and sanitation; education; public administration; and community development, social welfare, and housing.

I find it difficult to discover a direct connection between that statement and the military aspect which is now being urged upon the Committee.

Mr. JUDD. Let us take the case of Turkey as an illustration. Turkey is a country whose location and whose superb armed forces make it vital to the whole Middle East.

The Turks were disciplining themselves to the limits of their armed forces. Unrest began to develop among the common people of Turkey because they could not make any headway or see any hope for improving their living standards. Obviously you cannot maintain good morale in a soldier at the front, no matter how many weapons he has, if he knows that the standards of living of his people at home are going down instead of rising.

Furthemore, loss of confidence in his government develops. So more defense support has to be provided. Some is for defense support; some is my friend from Indiana has read, and some of the aid is for nonproject support of the economy. Otherwise the country simply could not maintain the armed forces that we, ourselves, want them to have in our own national defense.

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 cannot 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 here as the gentleman suggests.

Mr. Chairman, this item has already been cut $180 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 more out of this fund involved in further reducing these funds.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.
Mr. ROWE. 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, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

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

"(a) In the first sentence of section 12(1)(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 documents, papers, communications, audits, reviews, findings, recommendations, reports, and other material which relate to operations or activities under this title are furnished to the General Accounting Office and to any committee of the Congress, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, charged with considering legislation, appropriations, or expenditures under this title, upon request of the General Accounting Office or such committees as the case may be.""

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 conduct any operations under this title unless full and complete information is given to the Congress.

Mr. MORGAN. If the gentleman will yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY]. I recognize that it is of vital importance that the committees of the Congress should have access to the data which will allow it to judge the operation of the mutual security program if they are to be able to discharge their function of legislative oversight.

There have been occasions in the past in which we have been kept in the dark by the Congress with the result that wasteful practices were allowed to persist. The most serious problem relating to the misuse of funds 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 President's refusal to produce the documentation of this so-called doctrine of executive privilege to which the gentleman has just referred. I do not fully agree with what the gentleman has said on this subject. It seems that 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 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—conditional 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. In the event that the law is not complied with, the President determined it to be in the national interest to use such funds pursuant to multilateral plans.

(a) The manner in which it is proposed to use such funds, (b) the economic and technical soundness of such use, and (c) the amount of funds to be used in any country under this title are matters of policy to be determined by the Congress itself. Congress can modify the Constitution.

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

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KYL: On page 3, lines 22 and 23, strike out the words "aggregating in excess of $100,000".

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, the language which is in the bill is obviously intended to safeguard funds from misappropriation and misuse in the loan program.

Mr. Chairman, if it is wise to so govern expenditures of $100,000, and I believe it is, then I see equal wisdom in protecting expenditures of $99,000 or $9,000. Two projects at $50,000 equal one of $100,000. It is too easy to separate one project into parts.

The amendment will make it much more clear that the Congress intends to inject better business management into this loan program, indicating seriousness of purpose and intensity of problem which exists. The amendment will make it much more clear that the Congress intends to inject better business management into this loan program, indicating seriousness of purpose and intensity of problem which exists. We will at least know the stated purpose of each project and will thereby have a logical basis for ultimate evaluation of that program. This amendment and similar practices also should help generate some respect among nations which have reached the status of economic responsibility at the point that I will seek to borrow rather than receive gifts.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.
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Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there has been a foreign loan issued since World War II. I know that one of the reasons why it was necessary to continue lending out money all over the world was because the last two wars were fought by dictators and not by free peoples. Hitler is dead—the Draft Act was passed some years ago; the old dictators remain and some new ones have been added. We have fought two wars since that 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.

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. Fico), if he continues to have more unemployed, there will be more coal miners unemployed. There will be more workers unemployed. Just continue to put up soft loans—loans that if they are ever repaid, will be in Yugoslavian dinars and Indian rupees and so on and so forth; currencies that cannot be taken out of the foreign country, to build more textile plants and more steel mills and more power-generating plants overseas. We are going to have more and more distressed areas in the United States. There will be more New England fishermen on the beach. There will be more coal miners unemployed. There will be more steelworkers unemployed. Just continue to put up loans—soft loans—loans that if they are ever repaid, will be in Yugoslavian dinars and Indian rupees and so on and so forth; currencies that cannot be taken out of the foreign country, to build more textile plants and more steel mills and more power-generating plants overseas. We are going to have more and more distressed areas in the United States. There will be more of you around begging for more of those countries to which we are making gifts and uncollectible loans and which are 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 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. Exr.: On page 3, line 22, strike out "$100,000, with the idea that they have been accomplished 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 go down to the figure of $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 at the same time, having the 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.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HARDY).

The substitute amendment was 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 "use" and insert in lieu thereof "reserved, earmarked, committed, or otherwise set aside."

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 Chairman of that Committee, Doctor Mosan, for inviting us. I think the kind of cooperation which has been developed between our two committees is likely to produce improved legislation, 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 read.

The amendment which I am offering now is essentially the same as my original recommendations to the committee, which I am now proposing by striking out 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 restrictions which Congress had intended. The committee in its action has departed from several of these terms which I feel must be included in the legislation.

Another alteration of my amendment which I have incorporated 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 in 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. CARNARHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of offering a substitute?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state.

Mr. GROSS. If 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 CHAIRMAN. The CHAIRMAN. Mr. CHAIRMAN. Mr. SARGENT. I am not sure that I agree with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNARHAN) as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. HARDY.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARNARHAN 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."

On page 4, line 5, strike out all that follows "President" and insert "personally determines with respect to each such allocation, reservation, earmarking, commitment, or set-aside, whether it is in the interest of the United States to circumvent technical restrictions which Congress had intended to keep this thing just as tight as I can and keep it on a businesslike basis, but at the same time, having the 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.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HARDY).

The substitute amendment was 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 as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Exr.: 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 "use" and insert in lieu thereof "reserved, earmarked, committed, or otherwise set aside."

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 Chairman of that Committee, Doctor Mosan, for inviting us. I think the kind of cooperation which has been developed between our two committees is likely to produce improved legislation, 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 read.

The amendment which I am offering now is essentially the same as my original recommendations to the committee, which I am now proposing by striking out 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 restrictions which Congress had intended. The committee in its action has departed from several of these terms which I feel must be included in the legislation.

Another alteration of my amendment which I have incorporated 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 in 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. CARNARHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of offering a substitute?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state.

Mr. GROSS. If 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 CHAIRMAN. Mr. SARGENT. I am not sure that I agree with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNARHAN) as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. HARDY.
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 Handy-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 or programs or work closely with the Fund's representatives in key countries. It should be noted here that just last year the Congress directed in Section 202(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 responsible attitude toward the Fund's economic, political, and social concerns of their people, demonstrate a clear willingness to take effective self-help measures." Obviously assistance to projects in 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 or 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 assurances that credits 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 insure 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. CASSAHAN).

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia as amended by the substitute.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FEIGHAN: Page 3, immediately after line 16, 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 under the Mutual Security 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 in the United States enjoy 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 manifestly disregard the basic elements of the foreign policy of the Communist dictator Tito and the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. I must say that there is no national communism.

I wish some member of the Foreign Affairs Committee or some Member of the House would explain why U.S. taxpayers' money should be used to support the cause of communism in Yugoslavia.

I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, it is with some reluctance that I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN).

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 be clear, however, 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 the Congress or some Member of the House that the money provided in this bill for Yugoslavia is not to promote Tito or communism. It is to assist the people of Yugoslavia.

In my opinion, this language is stronger than the gentleman's amendment.

Now, we are desirous of keeping Yugoslavia from reentering the Cominform. It is our desire to keep Yugoslavia independent of the Soviet Union.

The gentleman's amendment would discontinue all aid to Yugoslavia upon the enactment of this legislation and would very likely drive Yugoslavia into neutrality, which is the goal of the victory of world communism.
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 Yugoslav in the United States.

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

The technical cooperation program will include such things as industrial plants, training centers, a training and 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 nations in the European satellite countries.

The United States is not ready to go to war to liberate the satellites and it is not either in our interest or in the interest of the United States to go along with the Soviet Union.

All credits are at present expired. Mr. CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think this is an excellent time and place to put in the record some remarks I have been anxious to make regarding Yugoslavia. The gentleman from Wisconsin says we are giving them only a little aid. Let us take a look at this unclassified list of what we are doing under the Development Loan and Grant program for Yugoslavia. Here is a $5 million so-called loan for 20 diesel locomotives, $3 million. Incidentally, as I said earlier today, those locomotives are being built, largely, in this country, using our workmen, our coal, our steel, and so on and so forth. There is fertilizer plant, $22.5 million. A thermal powerplant, $9 million, and a hydroelectric plant, $15 million. Does the gentleman still say we are giving them a little aid? All of that is in addition to the military assistance and other handouts to Yugoslavia.

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 her 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 tell me that when the chips are down, Tito and his Yugoslavia will be on our side.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Not so long ago the gentleman says we are giving them only a little aid. 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. 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 wish to bring to the attention of the Members and also my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin that a careful analysis of the foreign policy of the Communist government of Yugoslavia, which is included in my remarks of yesterday, 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 along with the Communist conspiracy headed by the Kremlin.

By giving aid to Tito, we are strengthening his tyrannical grip over the people of Yugoslavia. That is why the United States should not contribute to the promotion of the independence of the satellite countries, instead it shows the Communist countries that they can still be Communists and still get assistance from the United States. 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. POFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. POFF. I am inquiring of the gentleman if he has any information relative to a gift of an atomic reactor to Yugoslavia.

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

Mr. POFF. I recently had occasion to read an article on that subject, and I wonder if the gentleman would yield further that that information is in the possession of the chairman of the committee. Mr. GROSS. Of course I yield for that purpose.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. POFF. 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 in Yugoslavia. Would he say that 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) direction for the Committee (Mr. Feighan) said there were—yes 30, noes 2.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I dem tellers.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORGAN

SEC. 203. Title III of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to technical cooperation, is amended by adding to the end thereof the following:

(a) In section 304, which relates to authorization, strike out "$197,600,000" and insert "$172,000,000" and "1961", 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 "$80,500,000" and "1960" and substitute "$83,000,000" and "1961", 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".

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

Mr. Chairman, 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, a member 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 as to gifts and grants which would be progressively reduced and terminated. The adoption of this amendment marked the first positive expression of congressional intent that gift and grant aid be reduced.

A report on the continuing study provided 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 the overall program cut down to size, that termination of almost half of the 22 defense support and special assistance programs can be foreseen within the next 5 years.

This year, as the result of the detailed study provided for in section 503(c), we have seen a $115 million reduction in this category. The report provided for these two 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 program 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 assert through the Mutual Security Act, as classified, but last week an unclassified report has been released. It has been a good beginning toward cutting down the program in 1960.

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. Herefore the full report on the implementation of this amendment has been classified, but last week an unclassified report has been released. It has been a good encouragement start, perhaps we can 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 can 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 President's request for funds is approved, the almost $6 billion in previously appropriated funds will make a total of about $10 billion that can be spent during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960. Despite these tremendous expenditures, the foreign aid program is still beset by many of the haphazard operations that have characterized it since the beginning. While progress is being made toward cutting down the program in some areas, waste and inefficiency remain large scale in others. Administrating agencies have built themselves into gigantic self-sustaining bureaucracies now numbering 45,000 permanent personnel with an additional 10,000 trainees.

Last fall, a study mission composed of members of our own Foreign Relations Committee, numbering 45,000,000 paid a world tour to study the effect of the foreign aid program in areas which have been receiving our aid. The report of this study is still forthcoming, but I am encouraged by further examples of lavish, unnecessary spending. It concluded by calling for an immediate 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 recommendations 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 going to have to be scaled down. Congress has dieted the program in terms of basic objectives. If it is not reaching the people the fault certainly cannot be attributed to any lack of funds. Our own Comptroller General has stated that the weakness of the program is too much money rather than too little. We have too often been placed in the anomalous 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 oppressor nations or to some modest aid that might attain some modest improvement in that nation's economy. We undertake, 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 ourselves by hard judgments on what we hope to accomplish or to whether there is a reasonable prospect of accomplishing it. This failure of discipline has given to the foreign aid program unattainable objectives, limitless cost, and accounts for practically all its trouble; the wastefulness and the distribution of the recipients with their benefactors.

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 program; perhaps we can devote our energies to methods of accomplishing our plans 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. Treasury is a perpetual fount, spouting forth tax dollars to every nation under the sun just because these nations are underdeveloped or in serious financial straits or happen to want some U.S. dollars. The long range objectives of promoting friendship for the United States among the lesser developed nations of the world has too often not been attained. It is estimated that the nations which have received 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 appropriated for this purpose.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 8523, line 23, strike out the following: "(c) Repeal section 308, which
Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the passage of this section without reduction of the amount requested 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 an arm's length, where we stand ready to meet our obligations to the rest of mankind.

I have listened to the criticism of the omission of this program on both sides of the aisle, who each year oppose the program. Some conscientiously oppose—others with a mea 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 this 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, but it is not 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 people should support this program. This is an area where we should increase the program rather than decrease.

The principal fields of activity are agriculture, education, public administration and health.

This is not a commodity program. Eighty-one percent of the funds are for the support of technicians, training of local participants in the United States and other free countries, and for contracts with American universities and business firms who aid in research of difficult problems to bolster economic progress.

A major factor and an extremely important factor in the field of this year's program is an acceleration in the African countries. This is in addition to the special program for tropical Africa that will be financed through special assistance funds.

The amount programmed for Africa in fiscal year 1961 is $24,300,000, an increase of $8,350,000 over the current year. This increase underwrites the funds for Africa since at the time the budget was prepared it was not apparent that the Belgian Congo, the Malai Federation, Madagascar, and other former colonies would secure their independence.

The $172 million recommended is several millions less than the field requests. The latter were screened intensively and overethe feasibility of recruiting U.S. technicians and otherwise implementing the program was considered before the executive branch made its final recom_

I urge the passage of the whole amount. Nations that we have helped in the past have indicated a readiness to join us in aiding the underdeveloped nations. Their participation should be encouraged. Our faith in the program is the best type of encouragement.

Let us act responsibly and maturely, with patience and understanding toward the old order, who has voted favorably in this program with no further cuts in these vital areas.

It is perhaps a great opportunity to demonstrate to all nations and all people that we are willing to stand in containing communism but that we are interested in making life more worthwhile for those who, but for the United States, would be without the chance to vote. Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE AND OTHER PROGRAMS

Sec. 304. Title IV of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act is amended by striking out the following:

(a) The last sentence of section 301, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and substitute "1961" and $3,350,000, respectively.

(b) The last sentence of section 302, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $2,300,000, and substitute "1961" and $2,500,000, respectively.

(c) The last sentence of section 303, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $5,200,000, and substitute "1961" and $5,500,000, respectively.

(d) The last sentence of section 304, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $3,000,000, and substitute "1961" and $3,500,000, respectively.

(e) The last sentence of section 305, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $10,000,000, and substitute "1961" and $10,500,000, respectively.

(f) The last sentence of section 306, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $25,000,000, and substitute "1961" and $25,500,000, respectively.

(g) The last sentence of section 307, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $38,000,000, and substitute "1961" and $38,500,000, respectively.

(h) The last sentence of section 308, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $20,000,000, and substitute "1961" and $20,500,000, respectively.

(i) The last sentence of section 309, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $3,000,000, and substitute "1961" and $3,500,000, respectively.

(j) Add a new section after section 309, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $3,000,000, and substitute "1961" and $3,500,000, respectively.

(k) Add a new section after section 310, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $5,000,000, and substitute "1961" and $5,500,000, respectively.

(l) Add a new section after section 311, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $1,500,000, and substitute "1961" and $1,500,000, respectively.

(m) Add a new section after section 312, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $1,500,000, and substitute "1961" and $1,500,000, respectively.

(n) Add a new section after section 313, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $1,500,000, and substitute "1961" and $1,500,000, respectively.

(o) Add a new section after section 314, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $1,500,000, and substitute "1961" and $1,500,000, respectively.

(p) Add a new section after section 315, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $1,500,000, and substitute "1961" and $1,500,000, respectively.

(q) Add a new section after section 316, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $1,500,000, and substitute "1961" and $1,500,000, respectively.

(r) Add a new section after section 317, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $1,500,000, and substitute "1961" and $1,500,000, respectively.

(s) Add a new section after section 318, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $1,500,000, and substitute "1961" and $1,500,000, respectively.

(t) Add a new section after section 319, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $1,500,000, and substitute "1961" and $1,500,000, respectively.

(u) Add a new section after section 320, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $1,500,000, and substitute "1961" and $1,500,000, respectively.

(v) Add a new section after section 321, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $1,500,000, and substitute "1961" and $1,500,000, respectively.

(w) Add a new section after section 322, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $1,500,000, and substitute "1961" and $1,500,000, respectively.

(x) Add a new section after section 323, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $1,500,000, and substitute "1961" and $1,500,000, respectively.

(y) Add a new section after section 324, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $1,500,000, and substitute "1961" and $1,500,000, respectively.

(z) Add a new section after section 325, which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and $1,500,000, and substitute "1961" and $1,500,000, respectively.

(Amendment offered by Mr. Bentley: On page 5, line 16, strike out all after "that") through the comma 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 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.
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. Savoy], I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan improves the bill and there is no opposition to it.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the author of the amendment, the gentleman from California [Mr. Savoy], 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 quotation marks and insert a semicolon. Following the clause "that no provision that required under the cargo preference laws for at least 10 years in the future to request actual use of the waiver authority.

The facts are brutally simple. Had the State Department known what it was doing in this connection in the first place, it would have been blatantly evident that the waiver authority requested under the so-called fifty-fifty act was unnecessary, particularly at this time.

Now, for a moment as to the principle involved, completely apart from the specific law that is asked to be waived. I have been impressed with the monumental burden undertaken by our taxpayers in supporting the foreign-aid program, and I am impressed with the monumental burden undertaken by our taxpayers in supporting these various programs. In part, this tax burden was compensated for by the stimulation of the American economy and job creation in the production of goods and services for shipment abroad. But recently, the emphasis has shifted to stretching the aid dollar by increasing procurement abroad. This may make our dollar go further, but it certainly does not bring anything back to the American economy.

Now, we are faced, in section 404 of the present bill, with an entirely new proposition. This runs to the effect that instead of using a portion of our tax dollars to purchase armaments for armaments, we would put a portion of our tax dollars into projects for economic assistance. This section may make our dollar go further, but it certainly does not bring anything back to the American economy.

Mr. BENTLEY. The amendment was agreed to.

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 $945 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,
necessarily, 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 bill and the funds which the World Bank has anticipated the possibility of a problem in administering one of the provisions of the Indus Water Treaty, the Department of State has anticipated the possibility of a problem in administering one of the provisions of the bill itself that this waiver authority, if granted, will not be used as a mechanism for avoiding the promised compensation from other mutual security programs.

It has been suggested that an appropriation for the administration of the present waiver provision would be to append a clause at the end of the present waiver provision to the effect that in the event of exercise of the waiver authority for the purposes of section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, resulting from the exclusion of this program will be compensated for to the extent possible from other funds available 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 he plans to do as a matter of administration.

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

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. MILLER, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. MILLER. I do want to express my appreciation to the chairman and to Mr. Judd, 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 it 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 to waste any of the important time that is a part of this project. 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 the work under this bill is done 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 Mississippi made the point that the present waiver provision in the bill is something more of the folly of this entire international program.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. We thank the gentleman for his statement.

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 working it out.

Some fantastic arguments have been used in support of the proposed waiver of the cargo preference law. It is as absurd for us as it is for the United States. 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 statutes 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 and our maritime authority.

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.

He further stated that the Department expected to be able to compensate within the regular mutual security program for the required proportion of the tonnage deriving from this multilateral project. We favor such an authority in the near future.

It is obvious that the Department expected to be able to compensate within the regular mutual security program for the required proportion of the tonnage deriving from implementation of the Indus Basin project. It is clear, then, if this adjustment could be made by the Department, a waiver is not needed at this time.

Moreover, the obvious result of such a waiver authority might well be construed to relieve 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 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.

If we do not agree to this amendment, course, we should certainly adopt this amendment, which will specifically require the kind of compensating administration under the law which Congress has provided.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman for his statement,
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 countries—Togo, Congo, Somalia, and Nigeria. Negotiations will undoubtedly be conducted now to mark the path of independence for the Federation of Mali—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 the high standards of living as necessities to sustain their political independence. Countries are becoming politically independent without adequately trained leadership and technical skills 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 abroad and to sow seeds of doubt, discontent, and the seeds of economic subversion 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 become alien to them in every sense of the word. There are many indications that the African people and leaders will be vigilant and uncomprising in rejection of all political subversion masquerading as friendship and assistance.

The United States has great ties with Africa. We are not alone. About one-tenth of our population 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 relationships with Africa are of long standing. We can look 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 aid are coming 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 technical assistance program, 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 expects to increase its activity. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—IBRD—now has in process a number of country and project proposals 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 plus $23.4 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 United States government and the private foundations are realizing that 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 educational exchanges, 400 of them to bring Africans to this country, 100 for American teachers, professors, and specialists to work in the African Continent. There 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 challenge. We are 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 hope that the amendment will be adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Wolf: On page 28, line 26, strike out 'United States' and 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 which begins on 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) industrial, commercial, and social projects including (but not limited to) community development projects, harbors, roads, canals, schools, churches, dams, and the like; (B) education and educational programs including, (but not limited to) school lunch and child care programs; (C) national food and fiber reserves.

"(2) the United States will pay the costs of transportation of such commodities to ports or other places of exchange from which they shall be exported, and shall not be reexported nor shall such commodities be used solely for commercial purposes.

"(3) such commodities shall not replace in the countries in which they are used the use of the same or similar commodities;

"(4) such commodities shall be used solely for agricultural and other development purposes and not for the furnishing of the same or similar commodities to which exported, and shall not be reexported nor shall such commodities be used solely for commercial purposes.

(b) Agreements shall not be entered into under this section which will call for the furnishing 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.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. 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 men who need them 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 from stocks of 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 germane ness.

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 leadership of 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 Faerber as Food-for-Peace Coordinator.

There is no question that in many of the underdeveloped countries the rate of population increase places a strain on the resources that would make possible be accelerated if the underfed people could be assured of adequate diets.

Lack of food and clothing undermines the health, morale, 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 living improvements including canals, bridges, roads, schools, hospitals, 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. Joiner] for his statement of April 3, 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.
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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 amendment makes the liberal's duty on this legislation very clear. The liberal measures legislative values invariably, though not exclusively, by social and human need. His sense of justice and morality is shocked by the very existence of food and fiber surpluses in a world which leave a majority of its people in deadly poverty from within.

And his same senses are shocked in the extreme by the knowledge that these surpluses rot in storage bins while many nations find economic and social progress impossible simply because their energies are wholly consumed in the quest for the food and fiber they must have to survive.

My friend the gentleman from Utah [Mr. King] goes on to say:

But I am equally certain the conservative, whose creed stresses fiscal expediency and whose program attempts to seek the economic justification in every legislative measure, also sees the merit of the bill.

One purpose is now so vast that its storage is a heavy economic burden. I would like to anticipate some of the questions that I expect will be asked.

What is the difference between this program and Public Law 480? Public Law 480 is a good program as far as it goes, but it was only a beginning. I, frankly, feel that we must do more. Public Law 480 from its very inception was a dumping program. We could not sell our high class language, but in the final analysis, it is a dumping program. This program does not give food and fiber for charity alone. This program creates a sense of responsibility. The recipient country must demonstrate its desire to improve its own economic well-being in order to get the commodities. Further, this program is not extended to any country unless that country exhibits a desire to create some economic development project.

Why the U.N.? Why not a strictly bilateral program?

I can answer this question in two parts: First, one of the main arguments used by those who have consistently opposed a food for peace program is that it would interfere with normal channels of trade. By working through the U.N. we take these competing nations and they sit down together and plan the procedure by which these commodities will be made available. This will obviously eliminate the friction and competition which would otherwise exist on a straight bilateral approach. This has been consistently demonstrated in the case of the real pilffalls in Public Law 480.

Secondly, I would like to point out, and perhaps the most important point brought out when I discussed this program with the gentleman in the economic section of the U.N., they believe that by our leading, we can encourage other nations with surplus resources to become part of this plan. We can pool our resources together collectively through the U.N. to further increase the program. This is just another method by which we can shift the burden, at least in part, to other countries with surpluses. I am thinking of countries like Australia—with wheat and meat, Argentina, France, and other northern European countries, and Canada, just to name a few.

Will not this create competition for our own industries?

The aid to be provided under this bill is to foster educational projects and commodity exchange programs. We believe this will increase the standard of living in the recipient country thus creating a demand locally for any increased output. And again we still have the power to stop the program if this should become a problem.

Why should we pay transportation costs for these commodities? If the nations want them, why should they not pay transportation?

It is costing us much more to hold these commodities here in storage bins, and they are doing no one any good. It is simply a question of cost analysis. Over a 10-year period we can save $1,540 million in storage costs alone. Our transportation cost to the farthest point in the world is only $460 million. Second, we are making these commodities available to countries who want to help themselves. We have the vessels available. The recipient countries do not have vessels available. Neither do they have the money to pay for vessels or transportation. Neither does the U.N. have the money to pay the transportation. The only way these commodities will ever leave our shores is in this manner.

If the U.N. handles this program, will not Russia get her hands into the program?

If the program should get out of hand, the President has the power to stop the program.

What about charity at home? Why do we not use these commodities for the needy at home?

I have been doing everything I can to get more of our surplus commodities into a bill here. In an effort to accomplish this purpose and will pursue it with all my ability.

What is the administration doing about food for peace now?

I understand that just a few days ago the President appointed Don Paarlberg as Food for Peace Administrator. I am very happy that this man who will make approximately $20,000 a year will have something to administer. My program would give him something to do.

Why were not hearings held on this amendment?

I would like to state that public hearings have been held on the floor of Congress at the time I introduced this amendment. We had a general debate on this proposal.

At the U.N. it was discussed with the leadership there for literally days.

The proposal was discussed at the World Food and Agriculture Organization. We had an opportunity to discuss ways to implement this program.

Last year the amendment was offered during the debate on the mutual security program, just as it is being offered to-day, and at that time there was strong support and a clear understanding of what this amendment would do. Hardly a day passes without some prominent Government leader mentioning the desirability of such a program. The President himself during his days has something to say about the need for food for peace both at home and in his many travels abroad. I think adequate hearings have been held before the American people. Let us hold the hearings here if the Congress on the need of a food for peace program.

Mr. Chairman, the hungry of the world cry out to us in their need. They are aware, our enemies have seen to that, that we have these bulging warehouses full of food and our apparent reluctance to share fully our abundance. We must expand greatly and soon our program of food distribution. Christian charity and humanitarianism demand this of us. Let us demonstrate to the nations of the free world our moral obligation to contribute to their progress. Mr. Chairman, I want to help myself. I want to help them help themselves. We have the vessels available. We have the money available. The recipient country has the desire to improve its economic well-being. All we have to do is to get the food to them. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, 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. WOLF. I thank the gentleman for his kind words but also for his many tireless 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, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Iowa for the amendment I support. The amendment has in it the outer form of foreign aid that we can give that can be more sure will actually help the people of the world. There is no form in which the United States can work better than the 10-year program against the year-to-year program under which we have been operating. I think this is an excellent amendment; I hope it will be approved by the committee.

Mr. WOLF. I thank my friend from Colorado for his very helpful statement.

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.
It is difficult for us in the United States, where overproduction by farmers creates Surpluses sufficient 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 event of droughts, floods or other natural disasters. Russia could be expected to oppose, in the international food reserve, for they know if food is available to this food reserve, they can grow less and benefit. Passage of legislation such as we have proposed today will demonstrate once more to the world the dedication of the United States to the ideal of peace.

Mr. JUDD. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I believe that this amendment is beyond the scope of this bill and I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] on the point of order.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I refer to volume 106, part 9, page 11298 of the Congressional Record, where the Chairman, Mr. MILLS, is quoted.

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

The Chair has had an opportunity to examine the amendment, also the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, particularly Title IV, which does to find uses for surplus commodities pursuant to the Agricultural Trade, Development, and Assistance Act of 1954.

The Chairman feels that this amendment is not 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; I believe it is germane because legally, if it does not have the same obligation or the same authority, then the mere statement of intent by the individual, or the amendment, 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 an opportunity to examine the amendment and finds it not germane to the bill 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 human 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 Congress 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 survive by food production and will have to meet this competition of free food. We have to use great care or we will do more harm than good. I have a great 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 different on a request from the Secretary of the United Nations to the President of the United States 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 there are any.

Mr. MORGAN. I read the letter, which the gentleman furnished to me, that he had received from the United Nations about the letter which he was addressing to 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 gentleman from South Dakota, 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 this legislative standpoint. 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 mutual-agreement program, the foreign aid program, if anything can. When food is here in storage and costing us money it is not doing the United States any good.

I also would like to say in connection with the deliberations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that last year I offered a similar amendment. At the time the discussion went briefly to the idea that we had not had time to consider this measure thoroughly. Therefore, I withdrew the amendment. I would have thought that in the intervening year there could have been time to consider it more thoroughly. Last year there were no objections raised to the amendment other than on the technical grounds. If that be the case, then this year, there is no objection raised. I should think that in the passage of a year we could have had that time. This most constructive proposal should be coming to the floor. With nothing done lot of good with it. I cannot see any harm that would come from utilizing its good features. Therefore, I wish to support this amendment strongly.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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 with respect to the second section of this amendment, which are not available through domestic programs to assist needy people within the United States, 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 in view of food for peace surplus to our needs in this country under Public Law 430. 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 been done. Last year there was no amendment to 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, and to be sure that 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 vegetables from our farms to our people at home first, and then to give them away under these foreign give-away programs next.

Mr. Chairman, I come from a district which has been visited by my members 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 10 before the Subcommittee of Agriculture or his deputy agreed with the Secretary of State on the rate of distribution of these products and their sales. There is a clear statement that they did 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. I think we are in a position to push this kind of operation through the United Nations. I know we are not going to get it through this administration in Washington because the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of State have both agreed that the rate we are pushing wheat now is the greatest that we should push it despite the fact that Russia is constantly training in their percentage of the world wheat market.

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

Nobody likes to oppose something that is designed for a good purpose. But that is not as simple or easy to do as it may sound. Near the end of World War II we adopted what was called UNRRA. That was for relief and rehabilitation and that is gone. We appropriated $33 billion to provide food, clothing, and all sorts of aid for hungry and needy people around the world. At that time the people who received it, it was one thing; if it was to be given to and through existing governments, including Communist puppet regimes being established in Europe and Asia, then it could become a weapon to defeat the objectives we had in mind. The latter course was adopted, and UNRRA became such a scandal that there was a terrible revulsion against that.

Food can be the most powerful political weapon in the world. Many a man who will stand up and face a machine gun himself, will waver if he finds that the only way he can get food for his children is by signing on the Communist dotted line. Our food helped entrench the Communist tyrannies in Eastern Europe. This proposal today could be loaded with the same dynamite—no one can be sure.

I commend the purposes of the gentleman from Iowa, but in proposing to turn so vast a program over to an organisation, the United Nations, which has no administrative machinery for handling such a complicated operation, I am convinced if he finds that the only way he can get food for his children is by signing on the Communist dotted line. Our food helped entrench the Communist tyrannies in Eastern Europe. This proposal today could be loaded with the same dynamite—no one can be sure.

I commend the purposes of the gentleman from Iowa, but in proposing to turn so vast a program over to an organisation, the United Nations, which has no administrative machinery for handling such a complicated operation, I am convinced if he finds that the only way he can get food for his children is by signing on the Communist dotted line. Our food helped entrench the Communist tyrannies in Eastern Europe. This proposal today could be loaded with the same dynamite—no one can be sure.

I commend the purposes of the gentleman from Iowa, but in proposing to turn so vast a program over to an organisation, the United Nations, which has no administrative machinery for handling such a complicated operation, I am convinced if he finds that the only way he can get food for his children is by signing on the Communist dotted line. Our food helped entrench the Communist tyrannies in Eastern Europe. This proposal today could be loaded with the same dynamite—no one can be sure.
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 it. Maybe a 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. JUNO] 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—aye 46, noes 93.

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

Tellers were refused.

The amendment was rejected. The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTEIII—CONTINGENCY FUND

Section 23(a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to the President's special authority and contingency fund, is hereby struck out, and the following substituted, and shall be in the first sentence and substituting "1961" and "$100,000,000" 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 by inserting "small machine tools and other industrial equipment, in the following: "$25,000,000 in the first sentence and substituting "1961" and "$100,000,000", respectively.

(b) In section 505(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 in discharge of assistance authorized by this Act, other than title II of chapter II, in accordance with the provisions of this Act applicable to the furnishing of such assistance, shall be in the first sentence and under the last clause of the second sentence of section 404.

(c) 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 451, of this Act, shall be examined by the Secretary of the Treasury, or the head of the Bureau of the Budget, and the conclusions reached shall be submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. No such program or project shall be undertaken until the expenditure for such program or project does not exceed the costs and which does not otherwise meet the standards and criteria established by the Congress for the control, reclamation, and other water and related land resource programs and projects proposed for construction within the continental limits of the United States of America. In all cases the budget recommendations of the House of Representatives and the Senate shall be in the first sentence and strike out "seventy-five" and "forty-five") in the first sentence and substitute "seventy-four" and "forty-nine", respectively.

(2) Amend 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 proviso: "The Service of Officers in the Civil Service, Reserve Officers appointed or assigned pursuant to this paragraph shall receive in-class promotion with such regulations as the President may prescribe.

(3) In subsection (d), which relates to appointment of certain officers outside the United States, strike out "State", at the request of the Director.

(3) Section 551, which relates to security clearance, is amended to read as follows: "Sec. 551. SECURITY CLEARANCE.—The standards and procedures set forth in Executive Order Numbered 10460, as amended or supplemented, shall apply to the employment under this Act by any agency administering nonmilitary assistance of any citizen or resident of the United States.

(g) In subsection (c) of section 553, relating to the Federal Personnel and Compensation Commission, strike out paragraph (9) and renumber paragraphs (10) and (11) as paragraphs (9) and (10), respectively.

(h) Amend subsection (a) of section 554, which relates to public sale, strike out "six months" in the first sentence and substitute "fiscal year".

(i) Amend subsection (a) of section 537, which relates to provisions on uses of funds, amend paragraph (3) to read as follows: "(3) Contracting with non-American suppliers for the purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, pursuant to amendments (b) and (c) of section 537(b) of that Act, and paragraph (a) of section 537(b) of that Act, in the furtherance of the purposes and policies of that Act, and for the purpose of using the funds otherwise available under this Act to promote the national and hemispheric interest of the United States."

(j) Amend section 537(c), which relates to construction contracts, strike out "in the continental United States" and substitute "in the continental United States and abroad, except for construction contracts entered into with the Foreign Commercial Service of the United States, except for such contracts entered into with the United States Office of Foreign Economic Affairs and the United States Agency for International Development", and insert "and under the last clause of the second sentence of section 404.

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

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

(2) Amend the section to read as follows:

"Sec. 517. COMPLETION OF PLANS AND COST ESTIMATES...

"(b) Electrical, engineering 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 451, of this Act, shall be examined by the head of the Bureau of the Budget, and shall be in the first sentence and strike out "seventy-five" and "forty-five") in the first sentence and substitute "seventy-four" and "forty-nine", respectively.

While next Monday is District Day there is no business on the District Calendar.

Tuesday: At the present time Tuesday is undetermined. Of course, there are three programs of which I have notes on Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. I see nothing for either Monday or Tuesday now.

Wednesday and Thursday: H.R. 10231, the Emergency Home Ownership Housing Act.

Thursday there will be another joint meeting to receive a distinguished visitor to our country, the King of Nepal. Friday and Saturday are undetermined.

I make the usual reservation that any further program will be announced later, and that conference reports may be called up at any time.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Page 11, line 15, strike the words "forty-five" and in line 16, strike out the words "and forty-nine, respectively.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because of a conflict in jurisdiction of this committee, in the Education and Labor Committee and the Civil Service Committee, of which I am a member. The subparagraph on page 11, beginning with line 11 and ending with line 16, provides for adding eight positions in the classified civil service which are now under the classification of the Civil Service Act. Four of these are supergrades which come within the classification act. It amends to abolish these four positions and to properly belong under the jurisdiction of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Prior to 1949 the grades in the classified civil service ran from 1 to 15. In 1949 the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported a bill creating 400 supergrade positions; that is, positions of grades 16, 17, and 18. These positions were created because the agencies called on Congress to provide some supergrade positions in which to place employees of the intelligence or security activities of the agencies.

Pursuant to that need, which the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee recognized and Congress recognized, there were created that year 400 of these supergrade positions, grades 16, 17, and 18.

In the time since the program was first begun, these supergrade positions have mushroomed. The agencies have besieged our committee constantly to give them more supergrade positions. We did give supergrade positions to them, as they are justified, and the fact we have increased the number from 400 in 1949 to 2,075 this year indicates that we have recognized the need for them and that we grant them when they are justified.

I want to say that we cannot control this matter of holding down the number of these positions unless the other committees just do the same thing in their committees and let us hold hearings and let these agencies come before us and justify these positions. If they do that, we...
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.

In 1960, the Congress has also created 275 positions under Public Law 313 of a scientific nature which also are above the old level of grade 15. These quantum 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 those positions.

I am proposing this 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 supergrade positions ought to be denied from this bill. Let the agency come before the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to heartily endorse the statement of the gentleman from Georgia, who is a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I agree with what is being chairman. This matter of supergrades should rest entirely with the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Our committee has never been consulted about this; is that correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is correct. I knew nothing about it until I saw the bill and the amendment.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Tennessee did not have any knowledge of the appointment of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Davis). The Post Office and Civil Service Committee will be unable to properly discuss or act upon the establishment of various positions unless every agency is required to present its case to that committee. Other committees should, in my opinion, recognize the great care that is shown by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to hear every request made by the various agencies. One committee should have the jurisdiction in this important matter. I think that the amendment will be agreed to.

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

Mr. CHATTERTON. I wish to point out that this section provides for four, not eight, additional supergrades and that the ICA and the Coordinator cannot draw from the Federal pool of supergrades. There is an unlimited number of positions filled by the Mutual Security Act. Congress has been urging more effective control and coordination and better administration of the program. If we desire to be consistent, if we desire to see a more effective mutual security program, if we desire to have administration and coordination of the program, it is necessary that we authorize at least four additional supergrades. This section provides four additional supergrades. The committee decided on 16 positions that require supergrade employees. Two in the Inspector General and Comptroller's office; two in the Office of the Coordinator; five in the Office of DEF; three in the Department of Defense, and six in the ICA. They suggested that they could use 16 and agreed upon 8. The committee allowed four. I think that in the interest of proper operation of the program that the amendment suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia does not prevail.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. 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. ZABLOCKI. Because, as I 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. ZABLOCKI. 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. The jurisdiction of the committee on supergrades has a tendency of letting agencies come in on bills like this and ask for supergrade positions and get them, our control over supergrade positions is gone and we cannot hope to do the job that we need to do in an effort to get the best qualified employees to manage it.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. 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 try to bring into being or in some way we want to destroy the control which that committee has over supergrade personnel.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. But we are not bypassing your committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Oh, yes. Mr. ZABLOCKI. I respectfully suggest to the gentleman that we are not.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. You referred to the gentleman from Minnesota. You also referred to the committee report to supergrade positions, and the act which creates supergrade positions is an act which places those positions with the Coordinator, Post Office and Civil Service, and that is the committee which has jurisdiction over supergrade positions.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is not my understanding.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. It should be pointed out that if all four of these new positions were filled by outside persons being employed by the Coordinator, the maximum cost would be $76,000. But very probably some or all of the positions would be filled by promotions within the Department. Therefore it could cost as little as $6,000.

Actually, when we are operating all over the world, a program costing several billion dollars, annually, and with the main criticism of it being its alleged inefficiency, bad supervision, waste, and so forth, it seems that this is almost the poorest place to try to economize. The more we want to eliminate whatever is not up to par, the more we ought to go along in an effort to get the best qualified employees to manage it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia. This is not primarily a question of what it costs or does not cost. This is a question of whether all committees of Congress have the right to write into bills that come to the floor of the House—appropriation bills and other bills—any numbers of supergrades. As the gentleman from Georgia has so well stated, if that can be done in this bill, there is no reason why it should not be done in every other bill that comes before the House.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield. Mr. TABER. I do not know whether the gentleman has noticed it or not, but there have been many bills coming into this Congress carrying an increase in the number of supergrades. A great many of them have gone by without the question being raised. If you are going to talk about this one, you have two on the Floor Bill that you can use in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I wonder if the gentleman does not think that is very bad legislative procedure?

Mr. GROSS. I do not agree. I am happy to yield. Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield. Mr. REES of Kansas. What disturbs me about the proposal is this. If you are going to do it in this case, then we may have to continue to do it. We have had this trouble all along the line with bills from other committees providing for employees; legislation that is outside their jurisdiction. I think the amendment ought to be approved.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is exactly right. The gentleman I am sure will agree with me that there is no way by which this sort of thing can be controlled. Bills for the purpose of getting made responsible for these supergrades.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is the view we have always taken.
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. 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, entitled, "Section 552: Classification of Records.

"SEC. 552. QUALIFICATION FOR ASSISTANCE.—No assistance shall be furnished under this act to any country or nation after the date of the amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1960 unless such country or nation levies and collects from its individual citizens, businesses, corporations and associations, tax costs. We can and should fix their tax rates in proportion to and on a commensurate basis with the taxes levied by the U.S. Government on its individual citizens, business associations and corporations.

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 $500 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 our Post Office and Civil Service has grown up, how much it is costing me more to maintain myself, my wife, and my children. They tell me each month that it has been going up at a percent, or something like that. If they had told me that that was going to happen, I think they can easily figure out whether or not a recipient country, under this act, is bearing its fair share with reference to taxing its own citizens.

I noticed on the ticker yesterday that the Development Loan Fund had just loaned to the India Finance Co. $10 million and the National Industrial and Finance Co., in turn is going to loan that money to individuals, I presume in India. I do not know what rate of interest they are going to charge, but you know what rate of interest we are paying and you know the pressure there is now to put it up higher. I just want to see that we make sure that these countries are helping themselves.

I recall the report that we have given aid to Japan in the way of technical assistance to help them step up their production and know-how. That is coming home to roost, too. I got a letter from a constituent the other day. He sent me these two hogs. He is in the hardware business. Look at them. One of them is 25 cents a pair and the other one 17 cents a pair. They are exactly alike. One is made in Japan and the other made in the United States. I know there is a difference in labor costs. There is also, I will bet you, a difference in tax costs. We can tax our citizens and keep giving know-how and assistance to other countries, but if you do not you will not have any corporations left over here to tax, because they will move overseas to manufacture there. I see nothing wrong with my amendment. 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 a section 552 adding a new section immediately after section 552. 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 Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. I do not see anything in that 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 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. CASKEY).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASKEY), there were—aye 36, no 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 10, insert "(1)" immediately below line 17, insert the following:

"(3) Add at the end of section 534 the following new subsection:

"Amendment offered by 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 really concerned about the security then I would insist that the program be as strong as we can make it. 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, those of us who by vote put the floor of this Congress as we sit in open session, then the democratic processes by which we through legislative action determine our country's course 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 knowledge and understanding to their vast audience of readers, viewers, and listeners. And, although I can go through these volumes and you can see through them and we can inform ourselves, this information which bears the label "secret" is not to be discussed with our constituency, I cannot discuss it with members of my staff, I cannot have the benefit of research done by outside agencies such as the Library of Congress, because it has been barred by the request. I cannot stand here in the well of this House and debate and discuss these specific areas with my colleagues. These members of the committee cannot thoroughly inform us here on the floor. The committee cannot answer certain specific questions projected by the member because of the official seal.

As I have listened to the debate I find that even the staunchest advocates of
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 surrounding 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 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, everywhere 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, I believe that, 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. ROUSH. Yes, they would.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Does the gentleman agree that the Communists would be the greatest beneficiaries if we declassified the nation?

Mr. ROUSH. Yes, they would.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the gentleman's amendment prevails, the secret information books will be available to Communist agents, would they not?

Mr. ROUSH. That is a fact.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Does the gentleman agree that the Communists would be the greatest beneficiaries if we declassified these documents?

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 better serve the American people. 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. RousH) 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 Communist agents 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 are pressing 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. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. Would not the opinions of our Ambassador's 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.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KYL: On page 11, after line 10, add the following paragraph and renumber accordingly:

"All nonmilitary flood control, reclamation and other water and related land resource program or project proposed for construction under titles I, II, or III (except section 501 of chapter II under section 400, or under section 481 of this Act, shall be specifically identified in the budget submitted for fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year for which such funds are approved and the aggregate gate cost is estimated at $1 million or more."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a minute. Mr. Chairman, I believe the intent of the amendment is clear to the membership. I am sure my colleagues understand the Mutual Assistance Act better than I do.

This amendment concerns only bilateral arrangements and nonmilitary arrangements. The Congress in its wisdom has for a long time exercised much greater control over this program in the United States. It is not difficult to envision what might happen if we were to establish a new agency in the United States to consider our domestic rivers and harbors problems and take this function away from the Congress.

This amendment is simply an attempt to make sure the Congress is kept informed of the majority of the Members seem to have deemed prudent in the last 2 days of discussion.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a minute. This amendment would do a great deal of damage to the program; it is not in the interest of the program.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a minute. This amendment would do a great deal of damage to the program; it is not in the interest of the program.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a minute. This amendment would do a great deal of damage to the program; it is not in the interest of the program.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a minute. This amendment would do a great deal of damage to the program; it is not in the interest of the program.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a minute. This amendment would do a great deal of damage to the program; it is not in the interest of the program.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a minute. This amendment would do a great deal of damage to the program; it is not in the interest of the program.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a minute. This amendment would do a great deal of damage to the program; it is not in the interest of the program.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a minute. This amendment would do a great deal of damage to the program; it is not in the interest of the program.
Third. Places the budget presentation and adherence on the same basis as our domestic budget.

When we think of the very strict requirements of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, it will be seen that in the agencies and departments dealing with the domestic problems, I feel we are compelled to wonder at the latitude and freedom given to the ICA in administering this Mutual Security program and its funds.

We have sat here during these past couple of days and heard of poor programs, improper use of funds, poor administration, and lack of planning. The amendment would give this Congress a greater say in how these funds— which we appropriated—are spent. It should lead to a more definite program. It will lead 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 to give 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 can claim our right to continue to 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 its emblems and efficiency. I have made this point before and I shall make it again and again.

The amendment before you will give us a certain set of standards in budget presentation—one for domestic agencies and a loose, lax, and indefinite standard for ICA.

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 mean that we will be responsible for all of the countries throughout southeast Asia to know how much money is given by this country to one country as against the other, Vietnam, Burma, Laos, and the others?

Mr. ROUSH. The gentleman supposes also that in the act there is not a knowledge of 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. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana offered this amendment last year. The amendment, of course, would add nothing of importance to what is already in the bill.

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

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

Mr. ROUSH. Does the gentleman say this amendment is already in the bill? This amendment is not in the bill. There is no thing 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 (Mr. FARBSTEIN).

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

There was no objection.

The balance of the bill follows:

CHAPTER VI—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

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 507(b), strike out the continental limits of "in the introductory clause.

(d) In section 537(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 (c) and in paragraphs (10) and (17); and strike out "the continental limits of" in paragraph (10).

SEC. 602. Title II of the Agricultural Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by inserting before the first sentence which relates to famine relief and other assistance, is amended as follows:

Sec. 202. (f) "Continental" in the definitions and in paragraph (1) of section 501(b) shall be defined as follows: "Continental" means that section of the world in which relations to famine relief and other assistance, is amended as follows:

In section 202, strike out "the" at the beginning of the proviso, substitute the following: "In order to facilitate the utilization of surplus agricultural commodities which are destined for the needs of foreign countries, and in order to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas in accordance with the purposes and objectives accomplished under title I of this Act, the".

(b) In section 203, insert before the period at the end of the third sentence the following: "and, charges for general average contributions arising out of the ocean transport of commodities transferred pursuant hereto may be paid from such funds".

Sec. 602. Section 501(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 356), which relates to international cooperation in health, is repealed.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. Church: On page 200 after line 23 insert the following:

"CHAPTER VII—JOINT COMMITTEE ON MUTUAL SECURITY

Sec. 701. (a) There is hereby established the Joint Committee on Mutual Security (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "committee") to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Not more than three Members shall be members of the same political party.

(b) The committee shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the policies and purposes of, and operations under, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. The committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its investigation and study, together with its recommendations, before February 1, 1961. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or adjournment, such report shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be. If the committee fails to make such report the committee shall cease to exist.

(c) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. The vice chairman shall act in the place and stead of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. The vice chairman shall be chosen from the House other than that of the chairman by the Members from that House.

In carrying out the powers granted the committee is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within or outside the United States, and have the power to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.
Mr. ZABLOCKI. 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 we are called upon to consider the statements made during the last 2 days must have convinced anyone in the House that there is probably more question about this program than about 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 batch after batch that we have the bill will be kept—by the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs that next year the committee will bring to the floor, 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 conscientiously—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 illegally, 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. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs would 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 such, has brought 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 to be reinvited, arguments on which better to urge continuation. Above all, it would make us intelligent about what we are doing. It would make us control of the executive 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. 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 in such detail with problems as this, profits from dissociation with previous trials and errors. The proposed committee will have not only perspective but fresh inspiration. It may find a new pattern of interest to 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 me to offer an amendment; a 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 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. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I must reluctantly insist on the point of order.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 8537, strike the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "Provided, That not less than 25 percent of the funds expended during the next fiscal year under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, shall be used to purchase and make available to the people of the United States agricultural commodities produced in the United States.

I would point out to you that in the 5-year period 1946 to 1950 we exported $3,378 million worth of agricultural commodities. In the same period we imported $3,787 million worth of very interesting commodities. In the decade following 1950 our exports dropped to about 20 percent. Mr. Chairman, I do not know if these exports back up and make available more food for the needy people in foreign countries.

I am interested in Iowa farmers, Mid-west farmers, farmers all over the United States. I am afraid some people who are voting for this bill are not greatly interested in some of their industries and in the welfare of those farming people. Our American farmers are in trouble, and I am going to help them if I can. I am interested in seeing that American farmers get their fair share of the spoils that are going to be dispensed under this bill.

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

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

Mr. JENSEN. I am very happy the gentleman has offered this amendment. Surely this amendment is proper and right, because it will not only help the farmers of the United States but also the farmers of America, who are in a bad economic squeeze today. Certainly if there ever was an amendment offered to a bill that should be adopted it is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross). I shall not take any more of his valuable time.

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

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

Mr. PASSMAN. Will the gentleman's amendment apply to the prior authorization and also the bill before the committee? The total authorization now on which the Appropriations Committee will make an appropriation will be in excess of $4 billion. Will it apply to the entire amount or just the bill before the committee?

Mr. GROSS. My amendment provides that not less than 25 percent of the funds expended during the next fiscal year under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended.
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 amendment. I have no idea what the language in the bill preceding my amendment is this:

In order to facilitate the utilization of surplus agricultural commodities in meeting the requirements of needy peoples 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 a motion to strike out the last word.

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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 giveaway funds go to hungry people in West Virginia. That would suit me fine.
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 of imported goods employed on public works type projects such as soil conservation and reclamation, tree planting and reforestation, and the construction of earth dams, firebreaks, and so forth. In many cases, the donated surpluses will be sold by revenue short countries and the proceeds used for public programs, such as in the field of education. And other programs in which the surpluses can be used in these programs.

The amendment will broaden the President's authority to donate surplus commodities so they can be given for economic development under other than emergency conditions.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania and yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consent of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the new mutual security legislation, and I am pleased to amend this amendment, or any other amendments, which have as their purpose the weakening of this strong arm of our foreign policy which has proved to be successful in stopping the spread of communism throughout the world these past 15 years.

Mr. Chairman, I call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the almost unanimous record of support of our foreign aid programs by the responsible officials of the U.S. Government throughout their inception from the President on through his Cabinet members, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and every advisory commission which has been appointed from time to time to study this problem. The evidence is overwhelming. No candidate for public office has ever been defeated because of his support of our foreign aid programs. This to me indicates that the American people agree with the decisions of their elected leaders that the foreign aid programs have been necessary and successful and that they wish them continued until such time as there may be assurance of peace and reasonable prosperity throughout the world.

We have heard time and again throughout this debate conscientious and expert witnesses who have analyzed the administration of the program in the past and in the present, and heard them express their fears of a continuation of waste and extravagance in the future. Many have prefaced their remarks by saying they are for mutual security and foreign aid and then proceed at great length to say why they oppose the inclusion of any portion of the mutual security legislation now before us. Not one have I heard offer any alternative plan which would take the place of the mutual security program to check the present administration's 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 commendations to the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for the fine work they have done on H.R. 11510 and the accompanying House Report 1146. 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 extend its benefits 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 and political environment of the underdeveloped nations struggling to create a stable economic base.

I refer specifically to section 204(e) which endorses the Indus River Basin project in Pakistan. I am particularly impressed by the realization of United States recognition of the existence of a great water surplus and the recognition of the potential benefits of this water on many other areas of the world as well. Let us remember that the development of this great river will prove of immense benefit to both India and Pakistan, and to the free world as well. It is a little known fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense have all praised 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 601(a) is closely relevant to section 204(m). This provision for a break-even of the food aid programs of Public Law 480 can prove of enduring benefit to the underdeveloped nations. The use of agricultural surpluses to relieve hunger and stimulate economic production, to fill gaps left when farm workers swing to industrial and urban occupations or into education, and to feed 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 functions from the military aspect to its political and economic stability to the carrying out of special programs. Its recipients include such countries as Brazil, Israel, Haiti, and West Berlin, among the many vital 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 should favor free trade and the carrying out of the food aid provisions in the international watersways.
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 seek mutual economic assistance under the act, wage economic warfare against other nations receiving such 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 22 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, 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 conciliatory 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 with mutually independent interests, it is these two; yet, the UAR almost pathologically insists upon maintaining a state of belligerency and in denying international law and denying mutual assistance contracts.

The continuation of the Middle East crisis condemns the area to be in constant ferment and affords Russia an open invasion. A real danger to the stability of the world is 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. I urge the Congress to support this provision overwhelmingly and thus strengthen the President’s hand in its administration. Its adoption will constitute notice to the world of our determination to uphold the principles of justice and equity among nations.

There are other aspects in the committee report which should be mentioned. One is the provision increasing the authority of our Ambassadors over the content, coordination and direction of our aid programs. This objective has been supported by numerous studies which show that recent 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 become 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 resources. This is not possible without the increased authority of our Ambassadors to become involved in activities 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 committee for its striking description of the pipeline problem and the need to maintain unexpended balances as an assurance of the continuity of our programs. Leadtime is a necessary factor in the administration of the program; the very core of the program depends upon continued adequacy of material shipments.

Continuity in the pipeline can be analyzed to maintaining a balance in a checking account. Unless deposits sufficiently exceed withdrawals, the balance will decline and the uselessness of the account will be destroyed. If we fail to keep the pipeline filled, or if we permit it to be broken, young, free nations will worse for want of a rain 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 increased where necessary to bring them into line with the recommendations of the committee.

More than ever, we need continuity, adequacy, and flexibility in the mutual security program. The occasion calls for boldness and imagination.

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 into modernity.

Mr. Chairman, these are the years that we can never call back. The consequences 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 cannot correct what might have been done.

I commend the committee for the fine advances it has made in the mutual security program through the provisions of H.R. 11910. I only regret that greater provision was not made to set the program in terms of the mutual security mission. I am sincerely hoping that these will be remedied and that free peoples everywhere will be enabled to fulfill their aspirations for growth and development as member nations in the free world.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, no man in this House has a greater respect for or a fonder friendship than I have for my colleague and fellow Pennsylvanian, the Honorable Thomas Morgan, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

However, all men are endowed with the mental faculty to form an opinion and express it.

So without reflection upon my friend, Dr. Morgan, or any member of this committee, I wish to again call for the defeat of the bill, which is opposed to the spirit 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 wonder if all this hate and cynicism over war and the 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 commodities. You can talk yourself into trouble a darn sight easier than shoot your way out of trouble.

Today this very morning the following editorial in the Financial Post from Toronto, Canada. Itought to show just what outsiders who are not Members of Congress, seeking election, nor are they Secretary of State, are thinking for President, think about our so-called peace offensive.

I quote the editorial dated April 16, 1960.

**Arms 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 should shame the President. The U.S. has doubled its own commitments.

Latest development: In the United States (reported on p. 13) is a concerted effort to cut down war-related stocks by 50% to $8 billion, a move which is highly respectable and much more efficient.

For years the United States has been accumulating war stocks, while Russia is killing 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 objection to this kind of defense. But now the U.S. Army Chemical Corps, backed by top military brass and independent experts, is out to make these ghastly weapons popular. They can kill far more people faster than any 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 storing of bacteriological and chemical killers.

And some of the militarists seem eager, ferociously eager, not merely to test these monstrous weapons but to commit the United States to using them first when, as they evidently expect, war comes.

Mr. Chairman, this shameful mockery when proposals of this kind are seriously made.

I need 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 armaments, is a political settlement of disputed issues.

But it is obtainable now, as always, only by patient diplomacy, an art that’s unfortunately 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, peacemaking approach. If the chance isn’t seized, if the political and diplomatic and other ambitious generals are to determine the course of American policy, the human outlook is frightening indeed.

"The latest news from Korea shows that the United States and the nations we supplied the Korean Government is working perfectly in the street riots against the government 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 about the disturbances in South America, Central America, Mexico, 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 plowshares 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 bomb and 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 friendly nation 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 benice and not fight "Poppa."

Personally, I must admit I cannot see any sense in giving mutual aid for economic purposes to so-called underdeveloped countries, to countries like Trujillo's Dominican Republic, to Cuba, and other Latin and Far East countries who spend as much or more than we give them to build up what they call military establishments.

Does anyone believe that any of these countries would be able to muster a fighting force in the new rocket-nuclear war planned for the future? They would not. In the meantime we go merrily along talking peace and handing out guns. If you watch the westerns on TV you find out that when a town was really a trouble spot a real tough marshal would make all the people "pack their guns."

Why? Simply because the only way to keep them from shooting up the place was to turn over their guns. But the powder do not mix any more than drinking and driving. You can get away with it until some unforeseen incident makes you have to act fast and—"wham"—it is all over but the shooting.

I have proposed before and say now that the only way I will ever vote for aid to underdeveloped countries will be with the understanding that the future getting aid cannot spend money for military purposes.

If people need food and economic security, how can they help either when they use the major part of their income for guns and powder? Peace cannot be achieved by doubletalk, and the United States is tied up by treaty and tradition to such an extent that it is futile to try to defend our neighbors whether they are standing armies or not.

Now for the developed countries—France, Germany, Japan, and so forth—they have long ago passed the berserk mark set up as a basis for aid. They are far beyond their present economy level. This was our original goal in foreign aid. We seem to have lost sight of both the goal and the players and appear to be sitting in the bleachers while the game is going overtime with the opposition in the lead. We are a score while our team is in the showers.

Let us cut out the nonsense and pure doubletalk. If we want to give military supplies to our friends, let us admit to this fact; but does anyone believe there is any difference in the British hiring the Hessian's 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. SCHWENGEL. 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 millions of dollars at that. If it 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? The truth is that 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 in the many millions of dollars, the 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 had 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 it is intended 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, he doesn't care. It is possible to do 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 housing 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 examining a self-help housing project in Chile. This project is the result of advice and assistance given through the aid program and 23,000 houses have been or will soon be 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, the 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 President Eisenhower. It is 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 chairman of the predecessor of the point 4 program was born. The most outstanding success is the Public Health Service in Brazil. It is called SESP—Cervico Especial de Saúde Publica. SESP started life much more North American than Brazilian—over 90 percent staffed and financed by the United States. It is now a self-sustaining health agency, larger in fact than the U.N. World Health Organization, and its more than 400 projects throughout Brazil are conducted financed and run by Brazilians. This is an example of the kind of institutional evolution which we encourage through point 4.

It is the kind of help that helps the people directly and in which many of them know about and appreciate our helping hand.

We have all heard opponents of this program say that our aid is not wanted—yet most nations say for more. We have heard them say that they have been betrayed by their opponents—and even some self-styled friends say—that
U.S. personnel are inept and stupid, clumsy in their relations with sensitive countries. Let 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 their interest to work with us just as we think it is to our interest to work with 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. They ask for more by a process of attrition given our President exceeded all excepted given our President exceeded all.

This does not mean that many grave problems do not exist. Iraqi peace efforts have failed. The U.S. ambassador to Berlin, Washington's presently unhappy relationship with Cuba and Panama, the sudden nature of the accessions of the Communist China, these and certain other unassisted questions indicate how difficult remains the road ahead.

Yet a great deal of world conditions, as they affect the United States and are affected by it, indicates that in many areas the United States could be both strengthened this country's international relationships and improved the picture held of this country.

TRADED TO 1968

Some students trace the beginning of this improvement, surprisingly enough, to the summer of 1958, when, in the face of civil strife in Lebanon, an extremely tense situation in Jordan, and the overthrow of the pro-British government in Iraq, Washington sent to the Middle East a powerful contingent of U.S. Marines into Lebanon. This helped and the strife and alleviated an already desperate situation and compromised between the warring factions.

But, equally important, the Marines were, through various elements in the Middle East, quietly withdrawn after a few months. Important segments of Asian America opinion, which had earlier condemned the dispatch of the Marines, even though the Lebanon government had requested it, were gratified at the speed with which this withdrawal was made. The Marines were a great tool in the situation but were not essential. The present administration does not have to rest on the past. It can create a new and better relationship.

This and other wise steps taken since eventually resulted in a lessening of Arab hostility toward the United States. It is evident that Moslem resentment over America's actions in Tibet, the United States has also been making a considerable effort to reduce Asian belief that the United States is seeing to this, and now is confident that the United States can avoid offending either the French or their Moslem opponents, has enabled 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 difficulties, 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 its relations with the Middle Eastern nations.

SYRIAN AID RESUMED

Within the past few months, the Syrian region of the United Arab Republic accepted American economic aid, an end the end of the Arab Crisis. 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 increasingly friendly atmosphere. At the same time, the United Arab Republic has quietly but effectively begun withdrawing a considerable number of students which it had earlier sent to the Communist countries of Eastern Europe and recruiting them to American and British universities.

It is undeniable that the relationship between the United States and the revolu­
tory regime of Premier Karim Kassem in Iraq is far from satisfactory, with the United States being frequently lumped with other leading Western powers as "imperialist." However, the United States has moved in a way which has made possible the assumption of unf avorable attention in Iraq, with the result that Baghdad is finding fewer reasons for alarm. The success of this is seen in the fact that Iraq has made no serious attempt to link the United States with the United States west kept that country in confusion and which resulted in a succession of sensational treaties and trials.

In fact, the Iraqi-American situation has improved so greatly of late that the Iraq Government recently asked the U.S. Ambas­
day to help it fill 200 teaching posts at Baghdad University so that it might avoid hiring further Soviet personnel.

In general, it is perhaps never to see how the United States could within the present context of political realities appreciably improve its international relationships with the United States. It is now more than a year since the United States and Cuba and Panama, the sudden nature of the accessions of the Communist China, these and certain other unassisted questions indicate how difficult remains the road ahead.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY REAPS GAINS

(February 1960)

The foreign policy of the United States, according to a great deal of available evidence, has been very successful in the sixties in a considerably stronger position than many of its critics would have thought possible a few years ago.

Indeed, an impartial observer might well argue that America's position in the world, despite certain obvious weaknesses, is good fates, contradicts those who claim that this position has continued to deteriorate.
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NORTH AFRICANS PLACED

In still another Arabic-speaking area the United States has also managed to steer a considerably more difficult diplomatic waters. This area is North Africa, where interest and emotion are focused on the best placed of the Moslem underground in Algeria to win local self-determination.

The former 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 in Tunisia, is now producing a considerable gain of economic aid without strings, Washington has succeeded to a considerable extent in creating a new and unfavorable image of the United States in those two countries.

Similarly, its shrill voting during crucial tests in United Nations, dealing with the Algerian issue, while not wholly satisfying either the French or their Moslem opponents, has enabled 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 difficulties, 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 its relations with the Middle Eastern nations.

One has to think back to the tense situation in early 1960 when the United States and the Republic of Indonesia on the occasion of the Sumatra incident, to recognize how great the improve­ment 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 in­nocence, by carefully refraining from actions that lend support, and by EEC, by the extension of post-revolt...
aid, and, above all, by the skilful and friendly diplomacy exercised by American Ambassador Howard P. Jones, Washington has converted its status from a mere neutral to a genuine ally and a considerable degree of mutual trust.

Another welcome improvement has been effected in American relations with Burma. Some 8 months ago, Burma's reconciliation with its former sovereignty at the moment, it should not be overlooked that the greater rights in the Canal Zone, although it has been sometimes doubted by many, may be, the move is almost certain to become an American prestige among the new nonwhite nations now coming forth in Africa.

AFRICA BETTERED

Of all the changes for the better wrought during the past several years, however, the most noticeable, in many ways, is that in the African scene. It is true that this is not an easy situation to evaluate, as it is susceptible to change overnight, should the Kremlin so wish. It is also true that the continuing crisis over Berlin remains a dark and somber cloud upon the horizon.

Yet it is undeniable that the present atmosphere of conversation is an improvement over the strained relations of a previous period. And in like manner, the exchanges of visits between President Eisenhower and French President De Gaulle cannot be dismissed as merely window dressing. The continued edging toward some kind of agreement on the control of atomic tests and armaments is a helpful and hopeful sign, even if it would be dangerous naivety to pin too great hopes thereon at the present time.

While this somewhat easier situation between the United States and the Soviet Union may be acceptable in light of Moscow's belief that it best serves Soviet purposes at the moment, it should not be overlooked that the greater rights in the Canal Zone, although it has been sometimes doubted by many, may be, the move is almost certain to become an American prestige among the new nonwhite nations now coming forth in Africa.

The foreign aid program should be under review on a daily basis, not on an annual basis. The State Department and the Department of Defense—administrations—have built vast bureaucratic organizations administering the foreign aid program. The program has become so complex, so diversified, and so inefficient as to require a complete renovation. Those administering the program no longer look for ways of making the program more economical for taxpayers since 1946. These countries and newer nations to protect themselves against the political and economic onslaught of Communist aggression.
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The foreign aid program should be under review on a daily basis, not on an annual basis. The State Department and the Department of Defense—administrations—have built vast bureaucratic organizations administering the foreign aid program. The program has become so complex, so diversified, and so inefficient as to require a complete renovation. Those administering the program no longer look for ways of making the program more economical for taxpayers since 1946. These countries and newer nations to protect themselves against the political and economic onslaught of Communist aggression.
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 and in other African nations. 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 absolute 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 the size of the nation's 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 the whole thing will be continued with foreign aid funds anticipated in the bill presently before Congress and those to be presented in future bills.

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 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 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, are given no hope. We see 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 taxpayers 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 past 30 years. The FHA guarantee 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 of the United States. It remains for 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 be sold at prices unduly expensive, and expanding amounts to sell 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 countries of Europe and is heard to say that this program is, in effect, a foreign aid program.

The gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman Fassman, 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 for storage and handling costs of this surplus food in the foreign countries and the farmers of America. When you add to waste which has characterized the program which will be reduced to provide more billions of American taxpayers' dollars to aid or assist the American people, here is the wasteful program in the hope that the American industry will be induced to expand and protest by voting against the entire 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 related 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 blesses our country enjoys. Millions of American children, and additional millions of people all over the world, have benefited through our surplus food programs.

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 world peace, to help the hungry of our own country and others.

Most of the objections made to the proposal are either technical or haggling in nature; there is no real heart in the opposition to this amendment, and no real reason for the vote of opposition.

I hope the amendment will be adopted, and commend its author for the fight he has consistently warded 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 599, 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 recommit the bill.

The Speaker. Is the gentleman opposed to the motion?

Mrs. CHURCH. I am.

The Speaker. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Mrs. CURRAN moves to recommit the bill H.R. 502, reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, to the Committee on the Budget, having resumed the chair.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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 previous question was ordered. The Speaker. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The Speaker. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 243, nays 131, not voting 57, as follows:

- The Chair called the roll.
- The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
- A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORRISON, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the Record on the mutual security bill.

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

There was no objection.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF NON-REFUNDABLE CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Mr. MILLS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 7947) relating to the income tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DEALERS' RESERVES

Mr. MILLS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8545).
8684) to provide transitional provisions for the income tax treatment of dealer reserve income.

PROCEDURE FOR ASSESSING CERTAIN ADDITIONS TO TAX
Mr. MILLS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 9660) to amend section 6699(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to transitional provisions for assessing certain additions to tax.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS ON CALENDAR WEDNESDAY OF NEXT WEEK
Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?
There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER
Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

There was no objection.

WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS
Mr. McMillan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 101) authorizing public hearings and recommendations on the bills S. 3193 and H.R. 11135, by the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives in concurrent meeting, That the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems, created by House Concurrent Resolution 172, agreed to August 29, 1957, is hereby authorized to hold public hearings and to make such recommendations as it deems necessary in the Committee on Rules.

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.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Federal excise tax on long-distance telephone calls is a continuing, discriminatory and deceptively 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 covering 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 this levy would be discontinued as soon as possible, once the war was over.

For 15 years, however, this temporary tax has increased 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 at 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 hurt of this Federal excise tax and would report 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 excise tax is not a matter of professional ethics. A local business and individual citizens must rely on the punitive excise tax on local and long-distance service.

We 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.

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 friendship 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 Oregon 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 Fort Umpqua, Reedsport, Oreg., Courier.

"Dick ought to get married," Bill often told me. "This was his solution, in part anyway, for Dick's many and in his opinion, somewhat irascible crusades.

Later Dick met and married a schoolteacher by the name of Maurine Brown. 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 student of the late Theta Chi student from the University of Oregon, who was in Cambridge as a Nieman fellow. He told me that Dick Neuberger and Monroe Sweetland were the leading Democratic politicians in Oregon.

I wrote Dick a letter and received a very friendly response. When I returned to Oregon, Dick and Maurine surprised me by having Oregon's leading Democrats over to their home in Portland and all in my honor. Dick's conversation then, as always, showed his wealth of pertinent data, his keen analytical powers, and his deep concern for the people involved.

In 1953, during the Presidential campaign, my law partner in Eugene was forced to appear before the State Bar. I called on Dick, to serve his connections with me because of an incident involving my public protest about the Vice Presidency running as a private fund. This action made Dick Neuberger indignant. He offered his personal assistance as a member of the State legislature.

In 1953, as I was beginning to establish my law practice, Dick decided he would run for the U.S. Senate. It was a
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 swing, according to a well-known adage. 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 tall young man 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 Oregon Senate than in the Congress. Dick was a superb mind and a warm heart. He was dead. He left us a rich heritage of knowledge and spirit that 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 single-mindedness for the conservation of our natural and scenic resources and his high sense of public service combined to make him not only one of the most revered of the Senate but also one of the most useful and most vital. His powerful pen and his persuasive voice gave life and point to many issues—notably 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]

SENIOR NEUBERGER’S UNEXPECTED DEATH

The death of Senator Richard L. Neuberger is particularly poignant. A man in his vigorous prime struck down by cancer, the same cancer that swathed the administration on foreign policy during the Eisenhower administration. He quickly proved himself a stalwart liberal though not hesitating to criticize ethical lapses in the press. His was a powerful pen and a persuasive voice.

Dick Neuberger contributed significantly to the popularizing of conservation and enlightened resource development, to intelligent discussion of political structure and to such specific measures as the bill to save the sand dunes. No more fitting tribute could be paid him than the approval given to his current projects dearest to his heart, particularly poignant. A man in his vigorous prime struck down by cancer, the same cancer that swathed the administration on foreign policy during the Eisenhower administration. He quickly proved himself a stalwart liberal though not hesitating to criticize ethical lapses in the press. His was a powerful pen and a persuasive voice.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Mar. 11, 1960]

DEATH’S SECOND CALL

The sense of death was no stranger to Senator Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon, deprives not only his State but the Nation of a valuable public service. At 41 the journalist and student of politics made political history by himself. When in 1954 he became the first Democratic Senator elected from Oregon, and the best measure of his quality is that after 4 short years he was a secure eminence of stature as a Senator.

The best measure of his quality is that after 4 short years he was a secure eminence of stature as a Senator.
But he devasted proof.!

He had meanwhile learned something else: how to combine how to fight back 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 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.

In service in the U.S. Senate, beginning in 1954, was complicated by the cancer operation. he wrote:

"It was only a few months ago that I was facing no major opposition in his forthcoming election."

Among his friends was a friend in the writing trade, the State of Oregon, and indeed, the Nation will be the worse off for his untimely demise.

He was on his sixth year in the Senate and gearing for reelection. His love of Oregon and the whole Pacific Northwest is reflected in his abundant writings and his progressive voting record in Congress.

We certainly don't advocate that Congress can stand more journalists in its hallowed Halls, but we do believe that Neuberger was a colorful writer, a crusader, a brilliant young man. His words will remain.

It was as he had left it 6 weeks before. It was a private office desk laden with impedimenta that told how much of his character—his philosophy. He had fought to what he would have written in the eulogy by Oregon's other Senator that "Dick Neuberger knew death was not long postponed.

The heavy leather desk chair of Richard L. Neuberger was symbolically turned toward a typewriter. It was found in the private office of a U.S. Senator.

He was a prodigal writer. After his cancer operation, his staff knew he would rest. They rolled in a black leather couch and set it in a room behind the screen upon which are the words of his death.

And now Mary Jane Cox, his receptionist, was saying: "He never used it. * * * Incidentally, he'd be at the typewriter." Under the glass on the desk lay a small picture of a woman, her name in capital letters in the bottom margin, Maureen.

Along the wall there were the customary color photographs, with pictures that the prominent spots went to his family. There was a picture of two of his nieces, in a frame that offered the empty Wall.

Even for those who simply passed by the morgue, they would have left something behind. It was a stimulation of their knowledge. Those who knew him well found him a man with unusual service in the corps should be considered as satisfying military service obligations. In the current cold war, we need persons with military service obligations. In the current cold war, we need persons with combination of personal and intellectual strength. It would add manpower to carry out economic programs in underdeveloped nations, in the achievement of the United Nations, of American ideals and aspirations, and provide American young people with an opportunity for personal and intellectual fashion. One of the questions to be considered in the suggested study is whether
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 books he had reviewed for the New York Times.

Strange 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 those who had sought after him. For 3½ hours the men and a lady of the Senate laid aside the bickering on civil rights to confer on the future of the great land the young man whose life had been spent in the cause. And then they adjourned.

The passing of Senator Neuberger also brought to an end the personal and painful assault against him by the colleague of his on the standing line for organized labor.

Now Senator Wayne Morse droned in eulogy for 25 minutes. Before closing, however, Senator Morse observed that when Dick Neuberger left Washington for a rest in Portland the young Senator must have felt he would never return—that he was going to die soon.

But even in death Senator Neuberger disagreed to the senior Senator from Oregon.

For on the Senator's date calendar stands this note: "Lunchon, Tuesday, April 1, Philadelphia."—(From the Trailman News, Mar. 14, 1960)

HALL BELL

Senator Richard L. 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 fight for the future and advancement of the little fellow.

The Oregon Democrat many times was found on the firing line for 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 at his home in Portland, Ore. Having won sensational 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 magazines for his abilities primarily were 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 ocean. His writings on these subjects, as well as his advocacy of these conservation matters in the U.S. Senate, will be of great value as the 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 pushing the hydroelectric power developments of the Northwest. He was a strong advocate of the public development of such resources because he believed 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 his participation in this work more effective: He conveyed in terms that people could understand effectively the story of this Nation's resources. Unfortunately, it is fair to add that he was effective enough in the 1930's to be a part of the huge governmental resource programs of that decade that had begun to work and even completed before he was old enough to work in their behalf. Yet, he was able to understand, appreciate, and speak about the importance to the American people, and, thus, write ably about them in proposing programs which are yet to come. The thing that he has been writing and saying since World War II will come to pass as the years on, and they will take place because of what he did and how he wrote before his death.

—from the Enginemen's Press, Mar. 18, 1960
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Neuberger, Mourned by IUE

When Senator Richard L. Neuberger, Democrat of Oregon, died last week of a cerebral hemorrhage the labor movement "lost an invaluable friend, counselor and brother," the IUE President J. B. Carey wrote Mrs. Neuberger.

"As a long-time member of the American Newspaper Guild, APL-CIO, Neuberger was a fellow unionist."—(From the Trailman News, Mar. 14, 1960)

"The world has lost a man mourned by the Nation's workers, whose welfare he served with unique idealism and selfless devotion, is expected to pick up where her crusading husband left off."

However, she will not be able to fill out her husband's term. Although recommended by the State Democratic organization, Mrs. Neuberger will not be appointed by Oregon's Republican Governor, H. H. Hatfield has said he will not appoint anyone who is an active candidate for the full term.

Mrs. Neuberger, who built up a distinguished record during three terms as a State representative, will be a candidate for the Democratic nomination.

Carey wrote the Senator's widow: "More than words can convey, I feel a deep personal loss in Dick Neuberger's death; and the Democratic labor movement, I know, must also feel a sense of personal bereavement.

"Dick's passing is a tragic loss for the U.S. Senate and for the nation, particularly the Nation's working men and women whose welfare he served with unique idealism and selfless devotion.

"Dick was one of the most sensitive and articulate liberals of our time, but most important this liberalism was animated not only by logic, reason, and vision, but also by a pervading compassion and humanitarianism. He was his brother's keeper and he loved his fellow man, as his writings so frequently revealed. He felt a debt not alone to his country and to the world he lived in, but also to the generations to come—the children, the men and women who will inherit the world we build."

"We of the labor movement have lost an invaluable friend, counselor and brother. The Nation has lost a superb leader endowed with the rarest qualities of heart, insight, and devotion to justice, human dignity, and the brotherhood of man."

"Dick Neuberger made our world a finer place to live in; his departure from our ranks should inspire us to more vigorous advocacy of the cause of fraternity and democracy to which he devoted his fertile mind and great heart."—(From the Enginemen's Press, Mar. 18, 1960)

Oregon's Senator Richard L. Neuberger long a supporter of liberal legislation 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 political history in 1954 when he became the first Oregon Democrat to be elected to the U.S. Senate since 1914 in the progressive days of Oregon, WAYNE L. Mossa. Both were extremely liberal and only in the field of foreign policy did Mossa and Neuberger differ. Vice President, National Legislative Representative A. M. Lempley, upon hearing of Senator Neuberger's death said, "He was one of the finest men in the U.S. Senate. You could always depend upon this man being on the liberal side of every issue. At no time in his senatorial career was he found wanting when legislation designed for the workingman was before that body. His leadership will be sorely missed by those of us who learned to respect him as a man dedicated to the service of his fellow men." Neuberger served as manager of the Democratic nomination for the U.S. Senate from 1949 until 1954 when he elected to the U.S. Senate. Before that time he served as Assistant Majority Whip and his articles and books have been widely published.

Senator and Mrs. Richard Neuberger had often been described as a political team. He, whether it was known or not, was the better half of his senatorial team." She is a proven vote getter and probably this accounts for the fact that many influential Democrats are anxious to have her appointed to serve out the unexpired term of her husband.

She has indicated that she would do so. Under Oregon law, the Governor must appoint a Democrat to serve in the interim until the coming November elections.

—from the International Woodworker, Mar. 23, 1960

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Oregon's late Senator Richard L. Neuberger was a man of many talents and skills. He was determined and forthright in his beliefs. His untimely death is a loss not only to the people of Portland, Oregon, and to his Nation and to his many friends abroad.

He was grossly criticized by some Republican political hacks for articles that he had published in his columns in this country. Yet the fact that he was well known and highly regarded as a writer lent luster to the man and his achievements.

He was killed on July 28, 1954 in a plane crash while returning to his home in Portland from a labor movement meeting in Butte, Montana.

There can be no more appropriate tribute to this man than to rename the John Day Dam now being constructed in the Columbia River Gorge in memorial to Senator Richard L. Neuberger who during his lifetime believed in and worked toward the conservation and development of the nation's natural resources. He had the vision to transmit the needs of the generation of his time to the next.
ADL, AMC MOURN SENATOR NEUBERGER

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 persuasiveness, learning from experience. He had even broken with his old mentor, Senator Wayne Morse—an event which alone improved his stature. However, 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 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—United States senator to study such communities and at one time advocated formation of a device of the people’s government. 

He praised the Canadian family allowance program as a great social experiment for the United States to study such a development and at one time advocated formation of a polio 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 form 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 action by the two countries to pave 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 Mr. Neuberger did care something about Canada, and he did know something about the people—enough to be able to say 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 in Richard Neuberger and the Nation a great statesman. So said Sheldon Steinhauser, ADL regional director, who voiced the shock and regret of ADL leaders at the sudden passing of Senator Richard L. Neuberger at 47.

Funeral services were held Sunday at Temple Beth Israel, Portland. One thousand five hundred attended.

Senator Neuberger’s last appearance in Denver, November 19, 1960, was at the American Medical Center Eleanor Roosevelt Cancer Institute and at ADL’s “Torch of Liberty” award banquet. He was accompanied by his wife, Maurine, a candidate for his Senate seat.

SICKENED INJURY

Unknown to all but a handful of ADL leaders, the Senator’s very presence in Denver was an example of his courage and resilience to his championing of causes which were important to him, said Steinhauser. The Senator had suffered a painful injury only a week before the meeting but insisted upon fulfilling the commitment although encased in a heavy brace to protect several fractured ribs.

Steinhauser recalled the Senator’s obvious sincerity in urging the ADL leaders to focus on behalf of the human rights of mankind. “The history of the protection of civil rights,” Senator Neuberger emphasized, “is a saga of resistance through the continuing abrasive action of organized and articulate groups such as the Anti-Defamation League.”

ADL REGRETS

The Eleanor Roosevelt Institute for Cancer Research of the American Medical Center lost an avid supporter with the tragic death of Senator Neuberger.

A sponsor of the institution and himself a sufferer of cancer, Senator Neuberger participated in ground-breaking exercises November 16, 1956, for the $2 million institute building.

Leaning heavily on his experience with cancer, he stressed the need for funds to carry on medical research at an institution such as American Medical Center.

Senator Neuberger was a member of the development committee of the international institution headed by Representative James Roosevelt.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Mar. 10, 1960]

RICHARD NEUBERGER

Senator Richard Neuberger was a liberal Democrat, a man avidly interested in government service, and committed to the cause of civil rights, said a warm friend of rail labor.

But Neuberger had two sterling traits: He possessed unusual personal courage, as witness his determined fight against cancer. Moreover, he believed in people paying attention to politics since politics is the device of the people’s government.

He wrote us: “Intests were broad. He added something of himself to the Senate, and to American public life. His death from cerebral hemorrhage properly is cause for sincere mourning.”

[From the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal, Mar. 11, 1960]

SPECIAL REPORT

After Senator Richard L. Neuberger, Oregon Democrat, had successfully undergone a cancer operation he so beautifully and touchingly said: “A brush with cancer tends to place many things in true perspective. My battle was a disease that may be lost, and I am grateful I did not lose. How other heroes have transformed political disagreements into any feeling 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 legislator. He had voted against his own party with his service in the Senate. Oregon editors also mellowed. Many fought him heatedly in his 1954 campaign. In recent months they had praised him.

At one time Neuberger and Wayne Morse, companion Democratic Senator from Oregon, were close friends. But Neuberger’s credit that he parted with the vindictive Morse. Morse once had even threatened to campaign against Neuberger. Now Senator Neuberger’s death removes one stone from the scene a distinguished Senator and citizen.

[From the Tarpon Springs (Fla.) Leader]

TRAGIC LOSS OF BRILLIANT LEADER

The death of Senator Richard Neuberger, of Oregon, from a cerebral hemorrhage and at the age of 47 is doubly sad because of the Senator’s gallant fight, and apparent victory, against cancer.

Since the closing date to file for Senator in Oregon ends tomorrow, Mr. Neuberger’s death has lessened than into an even greater confusion. So popular was Mr. Neuberger that even the Republicans were entering only token opposition to his candidacy.

But the greater loss is the Nation’s. Senator Neuberger had that precious combination of unswerving liberalism and level-headed pragmatism which is trying to remake all our social and political institutions in a day. There are all too few such statesmen in Washington. The people of every State have lost a wise and good friend.

[From the Locomotive Engineer, Mar. 25, 1960]

LOSS OF A FRIEND

First in the Oregon Legislature and later in the U.S. Senate, 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 New York Times correspondent in the Pacific Northwest.

He wrote many fine travel articles for popular magazines and many of them were good boosts for rail travel. His trip from Australia to South America came as an extra shock because of his seeming victory over cancer two years ago.

But the Great Basin in Portland was far too young to die. Although he left a splendid record of service, he had much more to contribute.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Mar. 11, 1960]

NEUBERGER’S DEATH CALLED GRIEVOUS LOSS TO OREGON

GARDNER, ORE.

TO THE EDITORS: This is the first time I ever have written a letter to the editor. I hope it may be the last.

In my many years in Oregon, this State has never suffered a greater loss than in the death of Senator Richard L. Neuberger—at the peak of his public service.
1960
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Dick and I differed politically, but we worked together on many occasions and earned each other’s respect.

The first of these occasions was the great fight in the Oregon Senate of 1958 over the student tuition fee. I was in the Senate that year as a member of the majority, and Dick as a member of the minority. He was in the leadership, and I was in the minority leadership. We argued heatedly and worked very hard for our respective causes.

In 1960, I was in the Senate and Dick was in the House. We worked together on the student tuition fee bill. Dick had introduced the bill in the House and it was referred to the Ways and Means Committee. I was the chairman of that committee and we worked hard to get the bill through. Dick was a very effective legislator and he knew how to work the committee.

There were some tough votes on the committee, but Dick always managed to get the majority on his side. He was a very persuasive speaker and he knew how to make his points. He also had a good sense of humor and he could always get a laugh out of the committee.

The tuition fee bill was reported out of the Ways and Means Committee and it was ready to be voted on by the full Senate. The vote was close, but Dick managed to get the majority. It was a very important victory for him and it was a big boost for his political career.

Dick is a very bright and able man. He is a good lawyer and he is a good legislator. He has a lot of talent and he has used it well. I am sure that he will continue to be a successful politician and I wish him well in all his future endeavors.
**CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - HOUSE**

April 21

Those who said the change was phony were either talking through political purpose or through their hat.

For example, Neuberger called a Republican congresional candidate he knew, the Republican candidate 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 an a more successful outcome than either candidate deserved.

There's no doubt Neuberger wanted the park more than he wanted the political point.

He has a bit of gratuitious editorial advice. We pointed out that the Senator worked too hard on too many things (the Senate, politics, writing, speaking) of minor and major illnesses. We wondered if he could slow down and guessed that he had a bad case of Potomac Fever—that he couldn't stop running.

But he did stop. Soon thereafter he settled down at home for a rest. But it was too late.

The job takes a lot out of a man, even a man who like Neuberger is apparently immune.

Neuberger, as a writer, appreciated the dramatic. And the end of his career came dramatically, almost on the eve of the death of a man who like Neuberger had been a keen feels for reputation beyond the present. One of his dreams of his life's history as one of the great American historians he had a keen feeling for reputation beyond the present. One of his dreams of his life's history as one of the great American historians.

Even though Senator Neuberger died in the prime of life, he had achieved fame in two separate careers. Long before he came to the Senate he was recognized as a writer by the American University Press.

The printed word was unusually good.

As a political writer he had a keen feeling for the Nation's outdoor resources. He fought for the multiple use concept, and, within its framework, for single-use of resources which justify such treatment.

No public official of today is more responsible for what success this Nation has had in this field.

But his interests ranged wider than this. He was also a champion of education, health research, and of a better chance for a happy life and a higher standard of living for the Nation, no matter what their station in life.

And now, just as his growing maturity was about to bring him to what could have been his most useful and most influential years, he was felled by a stroke—brought on, in a small measure, by his drive and by his health, which had been more popular, and that popularity had nothing to do with party affiliations.

[From the Ashland (Oreg.) Tidings, Mar. 11, 1960]

**SENATOR RICHARD NEUBERGER**

Senator Richard Neuberger, of Oregon, is dead at the age of 47, struck down by a stroke after apparently successfully fighting off cancer.

Even though Senator Neuberger died in the prime of life, he had achieved fame in two separate careers. Long before he came to the Senate he was recognized as a writer by the American University Press.

In his recent effort to win a national sea-shore recreation area on the Oregon coast, he was extreme lengths to get the cooperation of the State's senator when it first seemed hostile to the proposal.

In his role as a freelance writer, Neuberger made more efforts to publicize Oregon nationally. His writings were eagerly accepted in the top publications, and reflections of his love and sympathy for and his understanding of his fellows, their hopes and problems.

Dick Neuberger will be remembered for his wide sympathies, for his love and sympathy for and his understanding of his fellows, their hopes and problems.

Dick Neuberger will be remembered for his wide sympathies, for his love and sympathy for and his understanding of his fellows, their hopes and problems.

Dick Neuberger's death this morning at the age of 47—what should have been the prime of life, he had achieved fame in two separate careers. Long before he came to the Senate he was recognized as a writer by the American University Press.

Dick Neuberger's experience with cancer heightened an already held interest in the public health field. He wrote and worked tirelessly on the Nation's outdoor resources. He fought for the multiple use concept, and, within its framework, for single-use of resources which justify such treatment.

No public official of today is more responsible for what success this Nation has had in this field. But his interests ranged wider than this. He was also a champion of education, health research, and of a better chance for a happy life and a higher standard of living for the Nation, no matter what their station in life.

And now, just as his growing maturity was about to bring him to what could have been his most useful and most influential years, he was felled by a stroke—brought on, in a small measure, by his drive and by his health, which had been more popular, and that popularity had nothing to do with party affiliations.

[From the Ashland (Oreg.) Tidings, Mar. 11, 1960]

**SENATOR NEUBERGER'S DEATH TRAGIC LOSS**

The untimely death of Senator Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon, because of a stroke which came after it seemed he had won a victory over cancer, which had once before taken him into the shadow of death.

Cancer was not the direct cause of death, though one might assume that it contributed 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 partition lines, for Dick Neuberger had countless friends at National, State, and local levels whose political beliefs were different from his, but who shared his love and sympathy for his countrymen, his understanding of their hopes and problems.

He could be militantly independent and tough minded in a fight for a principle. But he didn't want to hurt anyone personally, not even his severest critic. He wanted instead to encourage and to encourage and to deplore the privileges, the ill, the aspiring. No matter how great the demands upon his time and energy, no matter how complex the issues he tried to resolve, he always found time to think of his friends throughout his State and Nation, especially those in trouble. To them he was foremost a true friend with a great heart.

Dick Neuberger's death this morning at the age of 47—what should have been the prime of his useful life—robs the State of one of its outstanding public servants.

Since his high school and university days, Dick Neuberger has been a controversial character, loved by some, devotedly admired by others. But he would always call out, "neutral" about him.

Few days when, as editor of the Daily Oregon at the University of Oregon, he battled student leaders, administrative figures and faculty members, raising blood pressure and tempers at the same time that he had relished a fight.

Even in the last few years of his life, when he was fighting hard to save the Klamath Reservation from destruction, he was able to win a majority of the Senate.

We profoundly regret his loss to the Nation.

Dick Neuberger was a master of political disagreement into any feelings of partisanship no longer less strident, less combative, less convinced that his own omnipotence.

And, following the successful drive to save the great pine forests of the Klamath Indian Reservation from destruction, he was acknowledged as a statesmanlike approach to matters of concern to the people of this Nation.

He went to the Senate as a champion of conservation, and he remained one. He sought increased appropriations for the Forest Service, the national parks, and the other Federal agencies charged with the responsibility for the conservation and protection of the Nation's outdoor resources. He fought for the multiple use concept, and, within its framework, for single-use of resources which justify such treatment.

[From the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., Mar. 10, 1960]

**SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER**

Richard Lewis Neuberger, 47, will go down in the State's history as one of the great political 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 greatest credit which will be accorded him for years to come.

[From the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., Mar. 10, 1960]

**RICHARD L. NEUBERGER**

It isn't easy to write of a friend who has been taken by death. This is so very difficult because my friendship with Dick Neuberger goes back to the days when we were kids.
learning to be newspapermen. It was a friendship that came, over the years, to mean much more than journalism.

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 other man seemed able to do.

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 for his clear, basic, grasp of the state for his intellect, his capacity to see 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. He said: "I have done what I can do that because there was a lot of unfinished business in the Senate he wanted to have a hand in. He wanted to have a hand 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 year writing and enjoying life with close friends.

Dick Neuberger had an almost unbelievable capacity for work. He fulfilled his duties 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 in to a month.

His personal correspondence was of amazing magnitude. Children of his friends al­ways wrote to him to ask him to write back and sent them gifts. So many letters to parents on important matters contained special paragraphs for the grandchildren.

He loved young people. When he went to the Senate he was offered patronage rights. When he declined them he invited the young to a meeting 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 resources was as deep rooted as his love for young people. When he 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 watershed, and a wildlife sanctuary. The threat had arisen from a Republican-sponsored act ending Federal ownership.

Neuberger decided, he said in 1957, that Oregon could not afford to have two fady Senators. He did not begrudge Sen­ator Morse this role nor challenge his seniority. He only said he would do that he observed a useful purpose; but as for 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. He voted the most time and effort toward conservation of natural resources. He voted with the party leadership, but his judgment was so well recognized throughout Oregon that it was not only the party leadership that benefited from it. It was the people of Oregon and the people of the nation.

His belief in the Conservative-Socialist middle was so solid that he was elected with one of the largest majorities ever a candidate for the Senate from this State.

I could write much, much more about Dick Neuberger than I need write. 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]
squirrels were being trapped and shipped to Washington; because they dug up the presidential golf green.

But Neuberger learned the ropes rapidly, if with some awkwardness. He even wrote an article about the mistakes he had made as a freshman. In another article he said the key was to nurture his ideas, to keep in mind that the other fellow might be right. He frequently prefaced comments with, "I may be wrong, but I think..." He displayed a tolerance in debate that was uncommon in a chamber where headstrong and willful men sometimes create the image 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 truly a public man. He yearned to communicate his ideas to the public, to persuade

...times create the image of absolute certainty.

business, would respond intelligently even to...political process.

were no preparation for his tragic week at the age of 47.

since I first met Dick back in the gloomy and bright young man became interested in poli...

They will shed little new light but they agree this change has been beneficial.

arrangement. Prior to the great depression...newsmen of my most distressing experiences...

...difficult may be mistaken, but...critics claimed. These editors were, I believe these observers were mislead by Dick's...stature and ability, be appointed by Gover...

The man 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...Black nor white, that the civil rights view...must now be recorded for posterity...Honor, Oregon, Mar. 11, 1960"

Many at the Oregon State Capitol were...as a writer. These two men for many years and considered...a successor to his seat in the Senate and, as much as I...gave him even more humanity...integrity and...the Democratic...practical methods of political accomplish...an...south, as Senators, to judge.

He was a loyal native son of Oregon who never missed an opportunity...defender of the unfortunate and aged, the in conservation of natural resources, the...assigned to grow into a truly great...vigorously one in Oregon, there are a number who could fill it. But none could fill the...he frankl y said, that all is not...thought it all...And when I appreciate more fully that he...the civil rights...Senator Morse, and maybe the appointment should be...to and it was all the...dates who would be able to serve the people of Oregon as conscientiously and as...I had admired...someone they were stuck with, for Dick's re...

Dick Neuberger, a prodigious worker and enthusiast for each cause he embraced, was a product of the great depression and this was reflected in his prolific writings and in his politics. In his earlier days he was, to some extent, a prisoner of his own campaign techniques. He was an enthusiastic admirer of W. Norris and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a New Dealer and liberal, an inheritor of the...long before the devastating diagnosis of cancer gave him even more...inexorably coming upon us and cannot be ignored.

It is ironic that this useful man, who struggled so hard for better health for others and himself, who never missed an opportunity...The Senate, 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...he was...on the verge of crossing over...when he was becoming most...judge whether his life would...at the other end of the state of Oregon...many in the political world have...time...money which he saw no partisanship. He...were not so very far apart on the larger issues they were called upon, especially on whether he...the voting...and who never missed an opportunity...decisions...It is only hoped that both political parties will be made to welcome up to recent dates who would be able to serve the people of Oregon as conscientiously and as...as Senator Richard L. Neuberger has done.

[From the Oregonian, appearing in the Lebanon Express, Mar. 10, 1960]

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 Guyordon, the Oregonian's editorial comment began: "Someone—perhaps it was Woodrow Wilson—once observed that when men go to Washington, D.C., he either grows or swells.

A man 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...Black nor white, that the civil rights view...must now be recorded for posterity...Honor, Oregon, Mar. 11, 1960"

Dick Neuberger, a prodigious worker and enthusiast for each cause he embraced, was a product of the great depression and this was reflected in his prolific writings and in his politics. In his earlier days he was, to some extent, a prisoner of his own campaign techniques. He was an enthusiastic admirer of W. Norris and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a New Dealer and liberal, an inheritor of the...long before the devastating diagnosis of cancer gave him even more...inexorably coming upon us and cannot be ignored.
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[From the Oregonian, appearing in the Lebanon Express, Mar. 10, 1960]
DEATH CUTS SHORT A BRILLIANT POLITICAL CAREER

Oregonians and thousands of others the Nation over are mourning the passing of Senator Richard Neuberger, whose untimely death at the age of 47 cut short a meteoric rise to the state of a brilliant political career.

Oregon-born, a product of Portland's schools and the University of Oregon, Dick Neuberger loved his Oregon and the Northwest above everything. His effective voice, as he eloquently spoke in behalf of Oregonians who were his uncle's favorites, we offer heartfelt sympathy. Dick, as he liked to be called, will be remembered as 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, now 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 not to delay on his account in proceeding with the work in which he so vitally interested.

For the great service Senator Neuberger has rendered to Oregon, we can show our appreciation in no more fitting way than to elect his wife, Maurine, to the Senate to carry on the unbroken record of things done and a portfolio just as unattainable.

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, no less than his appetite for political battles. As Richard Neuberger's widow, she feels she should be elected by an overwhelming majority in the coming election.

The forests and marshes of the Klamath basin improvements self-financing. The country needs visionaries. Most of the established programs, public and private, were not born to it, did not have it thrust upon him. He was a political liberal who was not born to it, did not have it thrust upon him. He was a personal friend to thousands. That is not a political foe than any man we can remember.
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Oregon newspapers today paid editorial tribute to Senator Richard L. Neuberger who died Wednesday.
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The untimely death of Senator Neuberger, who was only 47, has been a shock to us all. But, now 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 not to delay on his account in proceeding with the work in which he so vitally interested.

For the great service Senator Neuberger has rendered to Oregon, we can show our appreciation in no more fitting way than to elect his wife, Maurine, to the Senate to carry on the unbroken record of things done and a portfolio just as unattainable.

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, no less than his appetite for political battles. As Richard Neuberger's widow, she feels she should be elected by an overwhelming majority in the coming election.

The forests and marshes of the Klamath basin improvements self-financing. The country needs visionaries. Most of the established programs, public and private, were not born to it, did not have it thrust upon him. He was a personal friend to thousands. That is not a political foe than any man we can remember.
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history as one of the great public servants of this generation.

He returns to the world called Neuberger a man of driving energy and possessor of a bottomless well of ideas. There was simply 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 ideas and exponent of discussions to be factors are forgotten, his vigorous advocacy of democracy, education, charity, and tolerance is gone.

Oregon Journal: "Dick Neuberger will be remembered for his flashing mind, his restless energy, his widespread interest, his remembered for his communication. But Oregon historians will recognize him, from any personally, not even his severest political year, when Dick called my home early on that historic November morning in 1954 before all his admirers remarked those who serve only one term.

Dick Neuberger first was elected to the U.S. Senate, by a very close margin of victory, 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. He was voted quickly into the 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 an extreme partisan earlier in his political career. His maturity, plus the fact that his health was precarious 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 accorded to serve in high office in or from this State.

The man is dead, long live the (new) King. The man who had blackened quicksilver juggling over the political faith of many appointees.

The balance of Neuberger's term will be filled by a man appointed by Gov. Mark Hatfield. The question now is whether he will be given the same appreciation.

Dick Neuberger's death occurred only a little more than 48 hours before the final deadline for filing for nominations for the May primary. And it creates the biggest shuffle ever down in Oregon political scene.

Neuberger was assured of the nomination. He faced no serious opposition. Now that it is completely changed, and serious Democrats—probably led by ex-Gov. Robert D. Holmes and Congresswoman Ennis Smith and others who have made the serious maneuvering and real soul-searching in the next 48 hours.

Republican too, had been hard put to find a serious candidate. One mentioned was ex-Gov. Elmo Smith, Albany newspaper publisher. If others were interested in the race, the word of political leaders.

Neuberger and his wife, MPEG-a charming lady who stood stanchly at his side, made with one of the Nation's more prominent political teams. It is broken up now, and Oregon and the Nation are the losers.

[From the Wallowa County Chieftain, Mar. 24, 1960]

-richard neuberger—a friend

The death of Senator Richard Neuberger takes from the national and international political and literary field an illustrious man intensely devoted to the task of making the lives of people everywhere richer and more secure. His heart was warm toward all men. And he was always generous with his time and his talents where there was an opportunity to give some worthy person or cause a helping hand.

With all his many interests and the very heavy demands upon him he managed to keep his personal friends, with his most devoted friends, finding time somehow to write countless notes and letters of explanation, greetings, and words of praise. He never forgot a friend.

He hated injustice; and for the weak and oppressed, in their efforts to secure justice, he was always an ardent champion.

What was politically wise and expedient meant nothing to him. His decisions were reached after careful weighing of all available information tempered with a feeling that no one should be unnecessarily hurt and that there is a right way for all men. Even in his bitterest political foes he found many friends, many personal friendships and never hesitated to say kind and complimentary things about his adversaries when they made noble stands.

Like all mortal men he had his faults and his weaknesses. He could be muddled in his judgment, but he was always an ardent champion.

What was politically wise and expedient meant nothing to him. His decisions were reached after careful weighing of all available information tempered with a feeling that no one should be unnecessarily hurt and that there is a right way for all men. Even in his bitterest political foes he found many friends, many personal friendships and never hesitated to say kind and complimentary things about his adversaries when they made noble stands.

Like all mortal men he had his faults and his weaknesses. He could be muddled in his judgment, but he was always an ardent champion.

One of the great, unheralded heroes of the Civil Rights movement was the man who, in the arena of national politics, was the champion of the Negro. He was a man intensely devoted to the task of making the lives of people everywhere richer and more secure. His heart was warm toward all men. And he was always generous with his time and his talents where there was an opportunity to give some worthy person or cause a helping hand.
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Overjoyed that he had been found free from malignancy, after surgery, Neuberger recently had suffered from several ailments, including heart failure. A hard worker, worried by his physical condition, driving himself to serve in the office of the Senate, he was a victim to virus infections and a nervous disorder. He had taken a brief vacation in an effort to regain his health, had failed for release and, apparently, was preparing for a vigorous campaign, when he suddenly was stricken by cerebral hemorrhage.

Neuberger brought a unique freshness to politics. Coupling his political philosophies with a masterful ability for press agency, he stirred public interest in political affairs, in party organization, and in competition. He made many valuable contributions to politics, not the least of which was his influence on the affairs of his party and more widespread appreciation of political activities by the whole public.

The political philosophies he advocated were under attack on many occasions in this column. I was often critical of the Senator’s brand of politics and of some of his methods.

On the other hand, I held him in high esteem because of his dedication and sincerity of purpose. Neuberger had an uncanny ability to seize upon the weaknesses and frailties of men and to use them to good end to “nail” 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 power. In such cases I have been unquestionably harsh in my criticism. But I have also felt that many of the Senator’s proposals were good, and have so stated in the column and in personal correspondence.

RESOURCES SAVED

A monument will be his work in connection with saving for the public benefit the timber of the Klamath Indian Reservation.

The Klamath Indians are to be freed from their status as wards of the Government. He was also a champion of education, of health research, and of a better chance for Indians of today is more responsive to the weaknesses and frailties of men.

Efforts were made by some interests to get timber into private hands. In such cases I have been much too rapidly, and with inadequate financial returns to the Indians.

Neuberger advanced a proposal to put the timber under Federal control and on a sustained yield program.

He withdrew his own legislation, however, when an administration bill was presented because he felt the issue was one in which there should be no partisanship.

By his action he promoted accord and, apparently, was preparing for a vigorous campaign, when he suddenly was stricken by cerebral hemorrhage.
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and my respect had grown into warm ad-
miration for the man himself and for the
work he was endeavoring to do in represent-
ing 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-
posing letters to editors, writing in the ar-
reas of his interest, government, politics,
conservation, human welfare, education, and
literary health. His mind was seminal, orig-
inal, an inspiration in the state of the pub-
lic interest. Moreover he was amazingly
inventive. How he turned out the volume
midst of his work in Washington, he found
his circle limited to a few close friends. It
was wide for he took every good citizen into
their was a partnership, with hopes and am-
relationship; and now that the partnership
was a partnership. With</p>
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 that 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 or necessary 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 the surplus products in abundance. This sort of operation does little more than rob the taxpayer as well as cripple the farmer.

The taxpayer and the farmer demand a more effective family 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. WOLP. 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.

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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

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 little evidence that the program would provide a down-the-road cure for the surplus glut which the Department of Interior and its relationship to the mobilization 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 add a small amount of coal to 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 year.

Now the status has been summarily upended. The Department of the Interior now offers a consideration of the importance of the coal industry and its role in the mobilization base. We are 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 mobilization 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 add a small amount of coal to the coal industry and its relationship to the mobilization base.

The import levels were created to prevent foreign oil from enervating the American coal industry's emergency potential. For more than a decade inexcusable, that the Department of Interior is inviting public distrust unless it hereafter returns the quota limitations to the originally published levels and pledges that there will be no further concessions to oil importers under any circumstances. It is a solemn duty to the many families who have suffered the consequences of the loss of their livelihood and to the industry whose very security is interlocked with the ability of the coal industry to maintain the capacity that would be required in an emergency.

PHASING OUT OF THE NAVAL WEAPONS PLANT AT WASHINGTON, D.C.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I find it necessary to address the House on a matter which has a deplorable and unnecessary; inexcusable.

The question of foreign oil imports has been the subject of debate since the beginning of the war. The restrictions on the import of foreign oil were necessary. I understand, that while I was at the White House on April 1, 1959, I was not at all satisfied with the import levels decided upon. Using 1957 figures to establish the criterion reflected a generosity toward importers that was unduly influenced by 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 areas as a consequence of the rising tide of residual oil from foreign refineries, I favored a cutback of the import levels which, in my opinion, could at least provide an indication to the industry of just how far the importers are allowed to go. The coal industry's emergency position will be improved as a consequence of the import limitations set by the Cabinet Committee on Defense.

The 1957 figures were established at $1.922.50. While it is not possible to give an accurate estimate of the cost of establishing the criterion hereinafter referred to, it is possible to indicate the magnitude of the sacrifices that are necessary if the import levels are to be reduced from 173 million to 131.5 million barrels of residual oil.

The three alternatives that presented themselves were to base the import limitations on the basis of 1957 figures or on the basis of 1955 or 1956 figures. The White House order initiated December 10, 1958, referred to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the second session of the 85th Congress.

Deterioration and taken inactive state of the job situation when their allocations had been cleared for delivery. Now the status has been summarily upended. The Department of the Interior now offers a consideration of the importance of the coal industry and its relationship to the mobilization base. We are 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 mobilization 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 add a small amount of coal to the coal industry's emergency potential. For more than a decade inexcusable, that the Department of Interior is inviting public distrust unless it hereafter returns the quota limitations to the originally published levels and pledges that there will be no further concessions to oil importers under any circumstances. It is a solemn duty to the many families who have suffered the consequences of the loss of their livelihood and to the industry whose very security is interlocked with the ability of the coal industry to maintain the capacity that would be required in an emergency.
I would like to review briefly my relationships 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 in Radford, Va., I have been concerned with the subsequent layoff at both of these facilities. When I was first introduced to Government operations in 1955 I was confronted with a continuing series of layoffs at both installations, which were quite obviously tragedies to the individuals and to the communities affected. With the rapid change in weapons development, with emphasis shifted to missiles, many of these reductions in force were unavoidable. However, many serious questions have been raised as to contractual decisions, whereby Government installations were being bypassed in order to place work with private industry.

Until the past year and a half, I have always found the Bureau of Ordnance, now known as the Bureau of Weapons, to be cooperative, and believe that the Bureau recognized that I was genuinely interested in assisting the Department of the Navy in this conversion from obsolete conventional weapons to those demanded for the missile age.

But yet we are doing just that with the Naval Weapons Plant.

I, for one, will not apologize for defending as fine an installation as the weapons plant. In fact, I am proud to associate with the hundreds of dedicated employees of the plant. This installation has proved itself time and time again since its founding in 1917, when a group of skilled craftsmen and engineers are known throughout the entire industrial establishment for having the capability of doing the best possible job in the shortest possible time.

Some have acquired the impression that we are dealing with an obsolete facility that is dying on its feet, with a very minor contribution being made today to the defense effort.

Incidentally, I might add that the same objections of obsolescence and lack of knowledge of what to do with the Naval Propellant Plant. Located at Indian Head, Md., the Bureau of Ordnance in 1958, under the distinguished leadership of Mr. Vorse, directed the investigation of the plant, the employment level at the propellant plant was 1,379. As of March 1, 1960, the level had been reduced to 500. Without the Special Subcommittee on Investigations began its investigation of the plant, the employment level at the propellant plant was 1,379. As of March 1, 1960, the level had been reduced to 500. Without the Special Subcommission on Investigations began its investigation of the plant, the employment level at the propellant plant was 1,379. As of March 1, 1960, the level had been reduced to 500. Without the Special Subcommission on Investigations began its investigation of the plant, the employment level at the propellant plant was 1,379. As of March 1, 1960, the level had been reduced to 500. Without the Special Subcommission.

To sum up, the gun factory still has a role to play in today's propellant business. I am pleased to say that such was not and is not the case, and that this fine installation is contributing significantly to the defense effort on the Nation's No. 1 weapon, Polaris.

Now, in chronological order, let us examine what has transpired at the Naval Weapons Plant, formerly known as the Naval Gun Factory, since mid-1956.

On September 26, 1956, the Superintendent of the Naval Weapons Plant, Rear Adm. David M. Tyree, in announcing the layoffs of 160 employees, stated:

The factory expects to reach its low ebb in both production and employment in this, the 1957 fiscal year.

Officials at the factory went on to say that they expected this to be the last major personnel shakedown that has seen the agency shrink from a Korean war high of 11,500 employees to 7,776. This reduction was understandable and I believe it was unavoidable.

But from this period on, the unwillingness or inability to make decisions that would assist the plant in its conversion from the old role as an important segment of our economy, is to present-day situation. I was informed in 1957 that by the start of the 1958 fiscal year employment at the gun factory would begin in force and also create economic havoc in the local communities affected. With the rapid change in weapons development, with emphasis shifted to missiles, many of these reductions in force were unavoidable. However, many serious questions have been raised as to contractual decisions, whereby Government installations were being bypassed in order to place work with private industry.

When a decision is made that virtually all Members of this body were aware of the capabilities of their own agencies,
In the April 11, 1958, edition an interesting article appeared describing a large fluctuating 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 performance the Navy had 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, when further r.f.'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 DECADES**

The Naval Gun Factory, now in its 159th year, is about to take on a new look. The Navy has decided not to scrap it along with its old role in the guided missile age.

The gun factory will become primarily a plant for research, design, and the prototype manufacture of the missile age's defenses. Capt. H. M. Buirer, NOF 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 any fears of workers there. They have been living 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 that the factory can improve, some have been living 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.

**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. We must try to make this right away today. Today the Naval Gun Factory can be said to be in a period of saturated workload. What I mean by this is that our gun factory is not just busy with our shop capacity and we don't watch it, it will bog us all down.

In keeping with a policy outlined during the previous year, we have had a balanced plan for work for when we still had too many direct and indirect workers to handle the jobs being assigned us by the Bureau of Ordnance and our customer. This year, after completing our reduction-in-force actions of last spring, we have slowly managed to shift over to a year of continued growth.

Our major problem now is not that of getting more work, but how to get the already heavy commitments into the shops. We have said, the Navy has said, and Mr. Higgins, the Secretary of the Navy, has said what the Navy wants is to shift toward the guided missiles.

This has happened mostly because of the major programs started in the last 6 months. In the guided missile launcher programs some design problems have been difficult and the schedules are now really tight. Our job is to keep the missiles coming. We have no present plan to move the major launcher programs back to the direct labor to get the major defense equipment programs started.

We now have the best and most optimistic work situation that the gun factory has had in years. The program is "hot." We are confident that the plant 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 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.

Capt. CHARLES E. BIRNER
U.S. Navy.

It was during the month of December 1958 that the Hebert Subcommitteee's Special Investigation. At my request, investigated the conflicting statements concerning the outlook of the gun factory. During testimony I attempted to determine if 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 is my view that the survey in question would have a great bearing on the future workload 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, of course, that this plant would be buying 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 Hebert subcommittee, significant questions were asked of Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bantz and Admiral Stroop. During the course of this testimony an informal survey was made for the first time. A very interesting history will follow as 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 survey referred to by the Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, were rebuffed by the Department of the Navy.

During the course of the hearings, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bantz again responded 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 complete 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 a mockery of these words.

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 overhead costs. Admiral Stroop readily admitted that "if you want to play with overhead, you can get any kind of a price you want."
of the plant, on December 2, 1958, during a conversation with Admiral Stroop after his testimony before the committee, I requested that I be furnished a copy of the survey.

It became necessary for me on December 12, 1958, to make a formal request of the Secretary of the Navy, which was denied. For the first time it was regretted by the Chairman of the Committee, and the term "officially classified document" was employed. I protested this designation directly to the Secretary of the Navy and, after a delay of 5 weeks, I received a reply to my protest signed by Assistant Secretary Fred A. Bantz, in which it was stated that my approval of such a step. His comments certainly led all of us to believe 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 Hbert subcommittee, the long-range outlook for the Naval Weapons Plant was adversely affected. On February 23, 1959, the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, in a letter to the superintendent of the plant, advised the plant of the implementation of a program to be known as Project Fire Control. I quote from this letter:

1. In order to provide a needed "in house" capability in the fire control area, the Bureau of Ordnance is planning to assign manpower to the above program from the Naval Gun Factory. This step, being one of major proportions, will require the highest and most effective type of management 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 as an active producer of naval weapons. Late in October 1959 rumors began to appear concerning the possible loss of the aforementioned fire control contract. The plant was 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 electronic control, in the absence of Secretary of the Navy, was acknowledged by Under Secretary Fred A. Bantz, and I quote from his telegram of October 28:

1. In the absence of Secretary of the above program, was awarded by the Secretary of the Navy on the basis of a recommendation presented by the Bureau of Weapons. To date I have received no information whatsoever officially from the Department of the Navy concerning the recommendations of the committee.

On January 15, 1960, I discussed this matter by telephone with Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Materiel Milne, and was informed that the report by the four industrialists had not yet been completed. There is no doubt that the report is now under active consideration by the responsible 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 a degree to ignore the carefully prepared 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 Terrier guided missiles would be withdrawn from the plant. I was informed 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 no reduction in personnel was being made to find additional future workload for 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 6 to 12 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. "We don't have a problem about doing the job."

But Briner said the Bureau had promised him again that week, this was in October, that the plant would get the contract eventually and that there were 20,000 employees to train to fill the job. And Briner said the Bureau had promised him again that week, this was in October, that the plant would get the contract eventually and that there were 20,000 employees to train to fill the job. And Briner said the Bureau had promised him again that week, this was in October, that the plant would get the contract eventually and that there were 20,000 employees to train to fill the job.
Weapons Plant to take the place of the guided missiles fire control program.

On December 10, 1959, a lengthy meeting was held at the headquarters of the Navy, with Secretary Bantz, Chairman of the Navy, and Mr. Butler, the Naval Architect of the Navy. The purpose of these meetings was to discuss the cancellation of the weapons center and to explore the possibility of transferring the work to private industry, and that every possible effort would be made to find additional work for the plant.

By December 1960, it was clear that the most regretfully must 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 January 8, 1960, the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade brought the matter to the attention of the Senate, Secretary Bantz, and Under Secretary Bantz, and the Subcommittee on Preparedness Investigation of the Committee on Armed Services.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the entire letter at this point in the Record:


The Honorable CHAIRMAN, Subcommittee on Preparedness Investigating Committee, on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chairmen: Senator Byrnes: We understand that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has referred to your subcommittee Senator Byrnes' letter to him of December 8, 1959, requesting an investigation of the Navy's policies surrounding the cancellation of programs in the shore establishments of the Navy. Senator Byrnes is, of course, immediately concerned with the naval weapons plant here in Washington.

Undoubtedly, the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade is also deeply concerned about the future of this installation which has been for more than 150 years this State's primary industry and income. This task involved considerable 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 reviewed the condemnation estimate that, in addition to the approximately $30 million payroll of the more than 6,000 military and civilian employees, the weapons plant supports 8,250 gainfully employed people in the Washington metropolitan area with a total 1960 payroll of $35 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 families and $450,000 in sales tax revenue to the government annually.

We estimate that total retail sales attributable to the weapons center and supporting employment is about $45 million a 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. By May 29, 1958, the then president of the board of trade, Mr. Gunther H. Byrnes, in a letter to the Honorable Thomas S. Gates, the then Secretary of the Navy, transmitted to him information concerning the threat of possible closure of this plant in this community 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. Byrnes, the then Secretary of the Navy William B. Franke at the Pentagon. We inquired of Mr. Franke if the employment level of the Naval Weapons Facility would be reduced and if so, to what extent. He assured 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 be demonstrated that it was not in the best interests of the country to continue operation of the weapons plant. We requested him to advise us if such a determination was made and if so, we would sell this to the Navy Department that would then be willing to declare all or part of the plant surplus to the needs of the Navy.

The Navy Department on July 29, 1958, advised us that the present level of employment was 8,250 and that the facilities at the Naval Gun Factory are surplus 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 programs which had been assigned to the naval weapons center to this board, later to be reorganized by the responsible officials of the Navy Department. We were advised that there were no such plans.

Understanding, therefore, that there were no such plans, this is 1.6 percent of all Washington area employment is about $45 million a year. This is not a negligible sum. The employment level would be held and understood.

We sincerely trust that the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee will carefully review the information which will come the opportunity of furnishing additional information and appearing at any hearing which may be held.

Very truly yours,

E. K. MORRIS, 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 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 150 civilian individuals have expressed interest in the annihilation of 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 would be lost to the community and their skills and their training would be lost.

On February 17, 1960, the Navy Department announced the large-scale reduction in force, one of which is currently taking place.

I was 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 problem should be submitted to the Senate and that the Senate, 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 cannot afford the type of facilities that are here, and important that we can afford to lose for 1 day the highly skilled crafts and highly trained engineers available to our defense effort.

During this period, as a result of usual 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.

On December 10, 1959, the House of Representatives, at the request of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, began an investigation of the situation which seems to be in progress.

Introduction of a bill which would provide for the establishment of a national laboratory for the experimental investigation of guided missiles fire control systems and the installation of experimental electronic countermeasures equipments. This task involved considerable engineering effort and required completion in a minimum time.

2. Engineers assigned by the Naval Weapons Plant accomplished this project expeditiously and with the highest quality of workmanship. This cooperation and coordination with the Naval Research Laboratory scientists resulted in very quick reaction capability 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 commands the 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. BEAKLEY, 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 Northrup Aircraft Plant no longer turns down work that could be assigned to the plant.

One specific example, which has been recently brought to my attention, involves what was, it is true, a small concern of the Naval Weapons Plant today is actually involved in. This situation was first brought to my attention when the plant was turned down daily. While I do not have the exact figures concerning work orders placed by the Northern Aeronautics and Space Administration that had to be fulfilled on time. However, I have been informed that there will be acceptance of work orders from this agency by liaison personnel. Now, what has brought about this situation?

Another recent case which has been brought to my attention involved the attempted placing of an approximately $1 million contract with the Drydock Co. for the manufacture of handling and loading equipment. I have been advised that the Navy has now included in the contract for both the Maryland and the Army, would have ultimately led to an additional $10 million contract for the Navy. Immediately after this contract was directly placed, officials in the Bureau of Weapons issued instructions that there would be no more direct solicitation of work for the weapons plant. This work had previously exceeded the contract amount by an excess of a certain amount, which has fluctuated from $25,000 to $50,000. I do not contest the right of the Department of the Navy to control over work currently being placed in the plant; but I do question the reason behind the interdiction of weapons plant officials as to whether or not they actually solicited the work in question. In the case of handling and loading, a 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. In any event, there is no reason to prevent the Navy from placing an order for 200 Tartar missile booster sustainers. This was not an act of charity on the part of the Bureau, but was a necessary production requirement that had to be fulfilled on time. There is only one other facility to my knowledge that is in the production of this most important item.

I have further advised that as a result of adverse publicity and uncertainty demonstrated by the Bureau, many skilled employees of the plant have volunteered to leave. In recent weeks, making it impossible for the plant to schedule certain items that they otherwise would have been able to schedule. Frankly, inasmuch as this uncertainty has hung over the heads of the employees of the plant since this time, it is true that the plant knows that work is being turned down daily.

During the recent conference, held by representatives of the plant and the Bureau of Ships aboard the U.S.S. Howard H. Row, he expressed considerable surprise to learn that recruiters are still touring the country looking for engineers and technicians to staff the plant.

So here we have a situation where apparently the Navy is officially encouraging recruiting of certain engineering skills for what the Navy has termed a special function and that is to be reduced considerably and, in my opinion, is to be deliberately phased out completely as an industrial entity.

As recently as March 3, 1960, Admiral Stroop, the Appropriations Subcommittee of the Senate, assured the committee that if there was enough work to keep the plant open through calendar 1961, but that there was not enough work to keep the plant open through the predicted October level unless new orders are forthcoming, and none are in sight. This statement appears to be inconsistent with the aforementioned turn-down of work orders.

What has brought about this situation? Most assuredly a partial answer to that question stems from the official policy of the Bureau of Ships. As you may therefore, if we accept this policy, then we need not be surprised as to the condition that faces not only the naval weapons plant but many Government installations throughout the United States.

I would like to quote from the Bureau of the Budget Bulletin No. 60-2, dated September 21, 1959:

The Federal Government will not start or carry on any industrial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such a product or service can be secured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels.

The bulletin further states:

Continuation of Government operation on the ground that procurement through commercial sources and higher costs may be justified only if the costs are analyzed on a comparable basis and the differences found are substantial and disproportionately large.

The bulletin continues:

The admisibility of large and disproportionately higher costs as a possible compelling reason for continued Government operation does not alter the general policy of establishing a presumption in favor of Government procurement from commercial sources and does not prohibit procurement from more costly commercial sources.

What this policy states is that there should be no commercial-industrial activity in the Federal Government. All such existing activities are illegitimate, and what has been done without regard to cost, human factors or technical skills that would be forever lost to the defense effort.

As a practical matter, if private industry cannot make an economic profit from Government work, then it is for the Government to go ahead and perform it. Now I have another specific example in connection with the weapons plant, which, although a small one, illustrates perfectly what I have just said.

Last week, during an inspection of the weapons plant and its facilities, a prototype of the Talos missile was delivered to the plant. During a recent test run off the east coast in the New England area, this test vehicle was damaged. Attempts to find private industry in the area to make the necessary repairs proved to be of no avail. Thought was given to shipping the vehicle back to Lockheed on the west coast and at this point someone thought of the Naval Weapons Plant. As I have stated, during the inspection the vehicle arrived at the plant for repair.

In recent days, a statement was issued by the Secretary of the Navy concerning the replacement of the weapons plant's dilemma. In effect, he said that the Navy is in the business of ships, planes, and missiles. The naval weapons plant is a job ordering from the weapon's dilemma.

I think you can well imagine the effect a statement of this sort has upon the employees of the weapons plant who are considering whether or not to accept a government order or to accept a commercial order. I submit that it makes absolutely no difference that is being turned down daily.

The bulletin in question stems from the official policy of the Bureau of Ships. As I have stated, this bulletin was issued at a time when the Navy was in the business of ships, planes, and missiles. There is no longer a need for weapons. This bulletin would be of no avail.

I would now like to add at this point in the Racoon a listing of those projects that are now under way in the Naval Weapons Plant, Washington, D.C., which I assume is made available routinely to the Secretary of the Navy and his staff. This list reveals direct application to the manufacture of ships, planes, and missiles:

- Under the title of "Major Program Description," I will read only a sufficient number to indicate the great variety of programs that the weapons plant is now participating in or has participated in in recent times:
  - Talos molds.
  - Rangefinders.
  - Radar antenna mounts.
  - Computers.
  - Rocket Launcher Mark 98.
  - The Mine Mark 67, the 58, so necessary in ASW warfare capabilities today.
  - Point four and launchers.
  - Truck handling and loading equipment for the Marine Corps.
  - Metal optical tracking unit for Patrick Air Force Base.
  - Ground ceramic cylinders for RCA.
  - Tiros satellite fabrication for NASA work.
  - Associated with the weapons plant is the handling of Shipping containers for liquid explosives.
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 functioned various telescope produced by one of the most outstanding optical shops in the country, either private or government; Sidewinder, various rifle components; and propellant grain immobilizers.

How effective has the plant been in the manufacture of the items just mentioned? Let me read more letters that the Navy personnel always hold in their heart. 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. It is too bad to point out that this has not been disclaimed as a local situation, and I realize fully that many of you have experienced similar reductions in force in government installations in your home districts. It is with emphasis understood that the Naval Weapons Plant is situated in Washington, D.C., and, hence truly belongs to the entire Nation in every respect. Admittedly, approximately 40 percent of the employees of the plant are residents of the Fifth District of Maryland, primarily living in Prince Georges County. During the past 4 years that I have been intimately associated with the problems that the Naval Weapons Plant has had to confront in connection with the administration and operation of the Naval Weapons Plant, I have come to know many of these individuals well and can assure you that I have taken the time to inspect the facility time and time again, and can state unqualifiedly that here we have men possessed with some of the finest skills anywhere in the world's labor markets. These are men in some cases with 20, 30, 40 and even 50 years of dedicated service to our defense effort, who are now being told that their plant is obsolete and can no longer be used to function at the very time when they are working on crash project after crash project for programs necessary in arming the fleet or in providing material for our space test vehicles.

The following statements will clearly show that these fine workers have met every challenge. They should expect in return capable administration of the facility on the part of the Department of Defense. If this is not supplied, then Congress has a duty—yes a duty—to act.

Atlantic Missile Range, Cocoa Beach, Fla. Required delivery date for the launcher was December 20.

2. The initial contact by this Office with representatives of the gun factory was October 22; shop work started on October 24 and finally the launching was made with an estimated on-site arrival date of November 20.

3. I strongly suggest that you extend my sincere appreciation to everyone who participated in the expeditious handling of this element of the Navy's top priority program.

CHAS. E. RABORN,
Director, Special Projects.

FIRST ENDORSEMENT
DECEMBER 16, 1958.

From: OOO. To: NGF personnel.
1. I want to express my personal appreciation to all gun factory personnel whose efforts contributed to the success of this project. The completion of this vital project ahead of schedule demonstrates the capabilities of the gun factory. It shows teamwork from the engineering department, the supply department, shops C-6 and R-1, the manufacturing department, and shop 11 of the Public Works Department.

2. I am certain that continued performance at this level will insure the future of the gun factory.

CHAS. E. RABORN,
Director, Special Projects.

Early in 1959, the gun factory very justifiably 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 work from the engineering department, the project superintendent of the weapons plant, the manufacturing department, and shop 11 of the Public Works Department.

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 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 Lockheed request 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 reomtry 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 and space operations."

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 that capability.

On March 4, 1960, a letter of commendation 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 important project called Project Piggbyback. One of the most praising sentences in the letter is as follows:

It is now evident that without the close supervision, cooperation, and support of the Naval Weapons Plant, the project would have been delayed by at least 6 months.

Here again is another of many examples which emphasized the quick reaction capabilities of the plant.

On July 31, 1959, the industrial control 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 outstanding, and through your remarkable efforts we have been able to hold the line on deliveries and came 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 Navy's Director of Special Projects, Rear Admiral Raborn. The praise was for the plant's expeditious handling of the Polar Star program. In his letter, Admiral Raborn began by saying that during January 1960 an "urgent requirement developed 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 Polar Star handling device was needed. The weapons plant proved its quick reaction capability by delivering the Polar Star handling device on time and where it was needed. In concluding his letter, Admiral Raborn asked that his sincere appreciation be extended "everyone who participated in the expeditious handling of this material 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.
Fla., on February 5, 1960, and the sub-committee 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 is, in effect, an offer to pay costs of the buildings and equipment of a company already involved in the national defense program, would be to force defense agencies to allocate enough manpower to maintain the personnel workload money that has been happening throughout all defense installations, and there will be, 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 1965.

The effect of this rider on the program might be catastrophic. I have been informed that the plant can maintain its present work force with manufacturing orders totaling approximately $40 million per year. This figure represents less than one percent of the amount spent each year by the Navy Department alone on aircraft, ships, guided missiles, electronics, and communications. It is impossible for anyone in congress to comprehend that there are not sufficient component parts suitable for the Naval Weapons Plant to handle.

Once again, I wish to impress upon you the importance of this body that my remarks are not to be construed as local in nature. What is happening here can happen and has been happening throughout the entire United States. It is, indeed, unfortunate that the District of Columbia does not have its own representative. If one of its representatives should happen to be a Republican, there is reason to believe that a little more consideration would be given to the Naval Weapons Plant than appears to be the case today. My reason for making this statement, as distasteful as it is to me personally, is that I do not wish to have the taxpayers of the State of Washington, D.C., have to bear the burden of this proposal.

The entire article follows:

GOP Group To Supervise Military Base Closings
(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)
WASHINGTON—The White House is acquiring a new adjunct—a so-called clearing committee.

Its purpose is to consult in advance with Republican Members of Congress regarding military and other Federal Installations in their States and districts which are slated to be shut down during this election year.

The special "clearing committee" that is to cope with this politically explosive problem consists of Vice President Nixon, Senator Taxiworax B. Morrow, of Kentucky, who is also GOP Floor Leader, and Army Secretary McElroy, on the White House assistants, and an official of the Defense Department and Budget Bureau.

This special "clearing committee" was formed to avert shutdowns that might be embarrassing to Republican election prospects.

Authorizing for the 40 contemplated military closings is former Defense Secretary Neil McElroy. He disclosed them at a budget conference in December before he quit. McElroy explained these installations would have to be axed because the $41 billion ceiling on the defense budget for the fiscal year would require funds being shifted from conventional weapons and units to missiles and other areas.

Although this was a private Pentagon meeting, Republican congressional leaders got wind of this politically bad news in a few days.

Subsequently, the Democrat also not only heard about it but got hold of the list of 40 bases that have to be closed. It was leaked to Senator Pat. Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee.

The former marine, whose left hand was severely disabled in the Pacific fighting, explained to the senators why the closing of these installations would be disastrous to the country in the all-out, farm-out-at-any-cost policy that is, indeed, unfortunate that the District of Columbia does not have its own representatives. It is, indeed, unfortunate that the District of Columbia does not have its own representatives. It is, indeed, unfortunate that the District of Columbia does not have its own representatives.

I have the machines; it is not because we do not have the machines, it is not because we do not have the talent, it is not because we do not have the facilities. Then why? Have we not at the Naval Weapons Plant come through and every time the Navy has given us a job to do? No matter how tough or complex the job was, we have come through. Our past performance record speaks for itself. Then why?

And that is exactly the question that I believe these employees, and indeed the taxpayers of the United States, are entitled to have answered. I have dwelt, I realize, at great 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 is a completely new design, turning down work needed by the Government, as well as private industry, and is there ready and willing to do a job. The basic report, together with all component parts 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 concerning his own personal problems in connection with the deplorable conditions existing at the plant. Perhaps this is far too close to home to emotions. For this I make no apology.

Dear Sir: As one of your constituents, I may take a moment of your time to voice my fear and anxiety over the present working conditions existing at the U.S. Naval Weapons Plant.

Capt. Charles E. Briner today made the final closing announcement to the employees by February 1960; this was bad news. But his statement that there would be other closings, unless he gets the White House to follow, who, Mr. Lawrence, I don't know what to say at this point. It just makes me sick inside. I can't eat or sleep. I cannot even think straight. I come home in the evening and tell my wife, the Naval Weapons Plant to my own, 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 have I done to the Navy? I have the machines; it is not because we do not have the machines, it is not because we do not have the talent, it is not because we do not have the facilities. Then why? Have we not at the Naval Weapons Plant come through and every time the Navy has given us a job to do? No matter how tough or complex the job was, we have come through. Our past performance record speaks for itself. Then why?

And that is exactly the question that I believe these employees, and indeed the taxpayers of the United States, are entitled to have answered. I have dwelt, I realize, at great 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 is a completely new design, turning down work needed by the Government, as well as private industry, and is there ready and willing to do a job. The basic report, together with all component parts 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
internally and externally, is in order, and I realize in saying this that there are bound to be certain individuals and groups whose attention will be attracted. I fully recognize that bü must be. Not only should there be a clean sweep and reorganization of the plant, but assurances should be given that the plant in try­
celerating through the difficulties and that an operational point of view will be given every possible bit of cooperation from the Defense Department and the Congress. It is my intention to keep up the momentum and fair play are obtained for the plant's employees and that this $290 million investment of the taxpayers is economically utilized.

The above-mentioned material follows:

PROPOSAL FOR THE REORGANIZATION OF THE NAVAL WEAPONS PLANT

I. INTRODUCTION

Management at the Naval Weapons Plant is faced with the fact that, as the plant may be phased out of existence. Historically, this industrial and engineering complex has been the major weapon in the Bureau of Ordnance primary support to the fleet. In recent years, however, the plant has apparently declined in prestige and stature to the extent that its contributions have diminished in importance.

Changing trends in weapons technology, accelerated through the past decade, have in general emphasized a decreasing importance of the position formerly held by an "in­house" defense manufacturing establish­ments. As a result of these changes, it is imperative that the Bureau of Naval Weapons and the Naval Weapons Plant adopt a new organizational arrangement and definitely establish itself as an independent agency in direct con­formance with present and anticipated re­quirements of the Nation, the Navy Depart­ment, and the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

This is the only approach which will permit a compelling justification for continued exist­ence of the Naval Weapons Plant. To at­tain such an objective requires the concerted effort of all, the elimination of long­standing jealousies and newly built-up activity pires, a hard and realistic look at what it is, a sincere desire to fill a need and a determina­tion of the desired objectives.

The transition from what it has been to what it must be, is a major undertaking in which many reallines are necessary.

To reiterate, defense establishments are no longer the prime sources for manufac­ture of weapons. Mounting costs of to­day's glamour weapons have skyrocketed, defense spending to the point where overlaps have been observed. This national problem accentuates the necessity for the Naval Weapons Plant to restrict its activities to those tasks which:

(a) Are not readily or willingly supplied by industry.

(b) Provide specialized in-house engi­neering and manufacturing capabilities in the areas of optics, fire control, light compo­nents, heat treatment, equipment evaluation, environmental test, and field services.

In order to insure the proficient accom­plishment of these tasks, the Naval Weapons Plant will be reorganized according to a well-balanced organization of skills and fa­cilities capable of swift support to the fleet. Thus, a searching review of manpower, facilities, and the manner of operation at the Naval Weapons Plant has been conducted.

In order that this activity continue as an essential organization providing vital sup­port to the Bureau of Naval Weapons, a positive program of action must be initiated to accomplish the following objectives:

Improve efficiency.

Improve liaison between the Naval Wea­pons Plant and the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

Reduce costs.

Improve schedule performance.

Improve research and development and test and evaluation capabilities.

These objectives may be achieved by a functional reorganization and consolid­ation of facilities as proposed herein.

II. PROPOSED REORGANIZATION

The current organizational structure of the Naval Weapons Plant will be drastically revised in order to accomplish the afore­mentioned objectives.

Proposed organization 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:

- Establish the position of executive di­rector of the Naval Weapons Plant.
- Establish the position of deputy director for the manufacturing department.
- Redesignate the engineering department as the research and engineering depart­ment. Establish the position of deputy director for the research and engineering depart­ment.
- Establish an office of decentralized services in the administrative department.
- Redesignate the quality control department as the quality control department with in-process inspection responsibility.
- Establish the industrial control department.
- Establish a customer relations staff.
- Transfer the engineering functions formerly under the design office to the depart­ment to the industrial management department.
- 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.
- 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 have a degree in engineering or science education in addition to a manufacturing background.

Chart No. 2. Manufacturing department organization—Recommendations:

- Establish the position of deputy director for the manufacturing department.
- Establish the production engineering division and transfer its responsibilities to a manufacturing engineering division and a production planning and control division.
- Establish a manufacturing engineering division.
- Establish a production planning and con­trol division.
- Disestablish the metal processing division, the light machining and assembly division and the forging division and transfer their functions to the manufact­uring division.
- Establish a manufacturing division.
- It should be noted that the revised or­ganizational structure provides for one pro­duction manager instead of three, and three separate divisions.

These recommendations also deplacem­en the heavy machining and assembly opera­tions which are so traditional at the Naval Weapons Plant and recognize the fact that Northern Ordnance is the lead organiza­tion in the field of missile launchers and other heavy equipment.

Chart No. 3. Research and engineering depart­ment—Recommendations:

- Establish a technical advisory council com­posed of consultants on a rotating basis.
- Disestablish the engineering administration division.
- Disestablish the engineering research and evaluation division.
- Disestablish the functional design division.
- Establish the applied research division.
- Establish the technical evaluation division. Transfer the fabrication engineering func­tions to the manufacturing department.

IV. PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION OF FACILITIES

The recommendations contained herein for consolidation of facilities are designed to centralize the entire industrial effort west of Isaac Hull Avenue. This rearrangement will simplify operations, effect economies and provide a facility that meets the needs of the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

Chart denoting consolidation of facilities is submitted herewith. Recommendation relative to the consolidation are listed below.

Chart No. 4. Consolidation of facilities—recommendations:

- Move all optical equipment from buildings 167 and 169 to building 159 and dispose of machine tools.
- Move selected heavy machine tools from buildings 122 and 123.
- Convert building 160 into an electric, elec­tronic, and plastic facility.
- Move all optical equipment from building 156 to building 160.
- Move all plastic and rubber molding equipment from building 167 to building 160.
- Establish a limited press facility in building 159.
- Move all security facilities to building 160.
- Establish a transportation center for the public works department.
- Convert building 187 into a storage area for use by the supply department.
- Convert building 183 to a complete fabrication facility.
- Move machining and welding equipment from building 173 to building 158.
- Establish a limited plating facility in building 158.
- Establish a sheet metal facility in building 158.
- Move all sheet metal equipment from build­ings 113 and 119 to building 158.
- Move fabrication equipment from build­ings 73 and 104 to building 183.
- Establish a light machining and assembly facility in the annex of building 157.

A number of these recommendations have already been formally submitted to the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

V. DISPOSITION AND UTILIZATION OF VACATED BUILDINGS


Buildings 157, 173, and the upper floors of buildings 125 to 129 need be scheduled for con­version to administrative office space.

VI. UTILIZATION OF VACANT LAND CREATED AS A RESULT OF RACING BUILDINGS

Recommendations: Reserve land for parks and parking areas as indicated on chart No. 4.

There need for adequate parking is a grow­ing one and is a situation that must be pro­vided for by regard to the future use of the Naval Weapons Plant buildings.

VII. PROPOSED LEVEL OF OPERATION

The proposed reorganization and consolid­ation of facilities functioning with a total management staff of thirty. Each of the six departments, excluding tenant and tenant related activities, will permit a proficient,
effective, quick reacting capability for the Naval Weapons Plant, thus resulting in increased operational efficiency, decreased operating costs; and improved schedule performance.

VII 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. This recommendation recommends that-

The Naval Weapons Plant perform those tasks for the Bureau of Naval Weapons that are clearly or willingly supplied by industry.

The Naval Weapons Plant provide in-house engineering and manufacturing capabilities.

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 these functions, it is proposed that:

The functional organization of the Naval Weapons Plant be significantly reoriented.

The facilities of the Naval Weapons Plant be expanded.

It is further recommended that the Chief of the Bureau of Naval Weapons direct the Assistant Chief, Readiness and the Assistant Chief of the Bureau for R.D.T. & E. to provide adequate support for this program. The Department of the Navy is requested to add the following to the Bureau for R.D.T. & E.

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 processing rate; 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. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and 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. MACHTROWICZ) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MACHTROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 13, I addressed the House on the very urgent question of health of the Navy to execute its mission. I pointed out in these remarks that a new proposal the Javits bill was being peddled which was designed to stop the tremendous demand for legislation 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 the Javits bill was being referred to the "tie-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 the House. The bill would do a lot for almost all of our older persons, these Republican promissory notes. people just could not wait any longer for their administration leaders to come through with any proposals at all to meet the tremendous demands that exist among 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 Congressman 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 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 others. The great grants 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 people who did not have the opportunity to become part of the social security system would at least be provided with the minimum degree of medical care. And we are not satisfied with the present program. While the administration is urging cutbacks in medical assistance, we are advocating greater Federal participation on 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.
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Third, Mr. Speaker, the Forand bill was specifically designed—and properly so—to broaden the OASDI benefits to include health insurance. It is still with ill grace for those who do not even want to go this far to criticize us for not going further.

Fourth, it is simply not true that there are 4 million older and neediest people who would be totally ignored if the Forand bill were enacted. This figure has been used because it represents the difference between the approximately 16 million persons who are over 65 years of age and the 12 million who are in the OASDI program. However, among these 4 million are 500,000 veterans who are receiving compensation and pensions of some kind, and 1,000,000 who are receiving old age public assistance as a matter of Federal State programs. There are several hundred thousand additional persons who are to be found in Federal, State, and local government retirement systems. It is then, in the light of these facts and a determination to assert glibly that the Forand bill fails to do anything for the 4 million older persons with the lowest incomes.

All of this, however, I want to make it just as clear as possible that I share with my Republican colleagues the concern for every senior citizen of this country, regardless of whether in the social security system or not. Some way will be found, I am sure, to provide adequate health benefits for older persons.

We must not for a minute, however, lose sight of the principal difference between the OASDI system as the only proper social security system and the one we have been discussing. It is obvious, therefore, that if we cut back on the urban sections of the Interstate System, we will be cutting the heart out of the highway program; we would be defeating the very purpose for which it was created.

The fact is, that if we are building roads to eliminate traffic, then we must determine the cost of these roads on the basis of the vehicle miles traveled thereon. This is the only true test for evaluating both need and cost. If we use this formula, then the urban sections of the Interstate System will be less costly than the rural sections.

The necessity of preserving the integrity of the urban sections of the Interstate System is even greater when we realize that in a few short years, about the time this system is completed, the need for adequate urban sections of the Interstate System will even be greater, because 75 percent of the people will be then living in urban areas.

Today, even with the high dollar cost of the urban sections of the Interstate System, the people in the cities are getting their share in Federal road money a little less than they contribute to the trust fund.

During the 6 months that consideration was being given to cutting back or deemphasizing the Interstate System in urban areas, considerable uncertainty in the whole situation and confusion reigned. The highway program has existed throughout the United States. This past week I have been tremendously pleased to learn that failure in highway construction has been there will be no such cutback in the plan.

On April 12 I wrote the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Frederick H. Mueller, as follows:

DEAR MS. SECRETARY: As you know I have been greatly concerned since I spoke to the American Association of State Highway Officials last October about the possibility of the administration recommending cutbacks or deemphasizing of the Interstate System in urban areas.

I will not restate in this letter why I feel that the adoption of such a policy would be a serious mistake since I have discussed this matter in many occasions with Under Secretary Allen and Highway Administrator Talbany. The fact that such a cutback and other proposed changes in highway construction standards have been under consideration has caused much uncertainty throughout the country with reference to future plans.

In order to eliminate this uncertainty, I am wondering whether or not you are able to advise me if any conclusions have been reached with respect to this matter and, if so, the nature thereof.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON H. SCHEER.
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 entertained whatever of abandoning any of the routes presently designated as general corridors of traffic or 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 better 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 roadway 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 which is the purpose for which this system has been designated.

I know you are aware that current revenue estimates for the highway trust fund are only slightly in excess of 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 one-half cent increase through fiscal 1964. This tax would provide increased amortizations 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.
to the then retired individuals benefit increases which 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 increased benefits or for the first time based on increases based on a combined total employer-employee contribution of as little as $6.

At this time while the Committee on Ways and Means is considering benefit increases, it is only simple justice that these further increments to the neglected people who would be benefited under my bill should receive some measure of consideration. It is inconceivable 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.

In introducing this bill it is my intention to seek favorable consideration of the suggested change in connection with any social security legislation approved by the Committee on Ways and Means this year.

SECRETARY OF STATE CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Curwen] 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. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago on this date one of our most distinguished former colleagues, who served in this Chamber from 1943 until 1953, then served his State of Massachusetts as its Governor from 1953 until 1957, was appointed Secretary of State by our great President. The opening of the current session, Mr. Speaker, has been characterized by a degree of devotion and dedication with which he has discharged the duties of his office. In my opinion, the President's choice of Christian A. Hertel as Secretary of State is well merited.

Faced with monumental problems of world crisis, fomented and complicated by ancient prejudices and hatreds, he has during this brief period earned the respect and admiration of all nations for his ability, honesty, and sense of fair play in dealing with the affairs of both national and international standing. The House will, I am sure, feel that it is both fitting and proper that it should express its heartfelt congratulations to our Secretary of State on this occasion.

The EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE MOHAWK ASSOCIATION OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS IN SCHENECTADY, N.Y., DISCUSSES THE PROPOSED BAN ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS

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

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has never hesitated in the past to make available to the Treasury General fund to the OASl 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 personnel blanketed-in-category would be 12 percent of the value of the benefit, which is relatively 150 percent as much as was contributed by the employer and the employee for a person who paid the maximum into the fund and is now receiving the maximum benefit. The special-category payment into the general fund of the Treasury for the first 10 years of blanketing-in will be minimal because the level-premium value of the Federal and State public assistance costs to the Treasury General Fund for the first 10 years of blanketing-in will be $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 State Governments will be substantially lower than under present law.

Mr. Speaker, I have had an analysis made of the cost to the general fund of the Federal State trust fund under my bill for the first 3 years of blanketing-in and the first 10 years of the State trust fund. 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, these blanketing-in cost to the Federal and State Governments 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 Federal State savings on public assistance.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of the current hearings on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, especially the hearings now being held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I am pleased to bring to the attention of Members of both Congresses the principles of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty which is the result of the U.S. and Soviet negotiations. I believe that it is in the interest of all nations to ratify the treaty, and I urge all Members of Congress to support its ratification. The treaty will help to ensure that non-nuclear nations will not be threatened by nuclear powers. It is an important step in the reduction of nuclear tensions and the prevention of nuclear war.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.
agreed upon at Geneva would be able to correctly identify roughly 90 percent of seismic events of 10 kilotons or more. It will undoubtedly take several years to get this inspection system into full operation once a treaty is ratified; vigorous research in seismology and instrumentation during a moratorium of similar duration will certainly permit reliable identification of events substantially below this magnitude. For the Russians to substantially alter the balance of military force by extensive development of small nuclear weapons would be a serious strain and significantly increase the probability that some tests of such a series would be detected, we doubt that the Russians would take such a step. We remain convinced that there is nothing synthetic or phony about the problem. Every one of these events above the magnitude of 20 kilotons is captured and cataloged for our senior citizens, geared to our social security program. My bill H.R. 5216 is identical with the Forand bill, which I have long advocated, and I was one of the first to sign the pending discharge petition, in which the Congress is being asked to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from further consideration of the Forand bill, and to pass the bill without delay.

We are the only country in the world which lacks a system of medical insurance. Our isolation upon this regard is palpable. The time has come when immediate action is necessary. Those of us who have, for some years, been in favor of providing hospitalization to our senior citizens through our social security plan find some satisfaction in the fact that this problem is, at long last, beginning to receive the attention it deserves. For too long, we have been beclouded, however, with the fact that the issue has too often been presented in the form of labels. It has been called a "hot political issue." It has been described as the "entering wedge for socialized medicine." We have been told that voluntary insurance can do the job, or that the doctors will take care of the situation by lowering their fees. But it has been seldom been presented in terms of those facts of our time which require such legislation.

It is refreshing, therefore, to find that a hard-headed conservative publication such as Business Week has recently concluded:

"One thing about the issue is clear: Although, some people may see it as a vote-catching device, there is nothing synthetic or phony about the problem. Everyone who has examined 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 customers. Their health needs can be met only by themselves when they are young or by other younger people who are still working. The only way to handle their health problem, therefore, is to take the risks and costs widely. And that can best be done through the social security system to which employers and employees contribute regularly.

"We do not pretend to know all the answers to the problem of enlarging the social security system to include a health insurance program for the aged.

"Nevertheless no democratic government can refuse the benefits of such demonstrated urgency and importance.

"Contrary to some impressions I have encountered, this important addition to our social security plan is not an idea of the people in Washington. On the contrary, 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 service, for each of the 20 million or more persons 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 items as bed and board, nursing, laboratory, ambulance, operating room, and all other services as are customarily furnished either through hospital or through personal or persons with whom the hospital has arrangements would be included.

The proposal represents the combined wisdom of many experts in the field of health care and social security. It was presented during the hearings conducted by the Ways and Means Committee on the 1958 amendments to the Social Security Act and aroused so much interest that they were put on record.

Your committee is very much aware of the problems faced by the aged in paying for hospital services and nursing home services. But let us not forget that small nuclear weapons.

Accordingly the committee asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct a study on the practice of the costs of providing this kind of protection through various methods. This study was completed about a year ago and, although it contains no recommendations, it does contain much valuable information indicating the nature and extent of the problem. One important result, in my estimation, is the fact that the data assembled therein seems to have convinced the present administration that the problem cannot "be swept under the rug" but is one which requires some kind of answer. Their answer has not yet arrived although the press has reported a number of about every important proposal.

During the last session of the Congress, my proposal along with others were the subject of a full week of hearings before the Ways and Means Committee. Clearly, the time for study and deliberation has been ample, and the time for action has arrived.

We are, then, here concerned with a carefully worked out and carefully considered proposal using our time and energy to provide a practical and effective social security mechanism which, as I will try to show, recognizes that the essential problem grows out of the fact that our senior citizens are high-cost, high-risk, low-income customers.

One of the most important features of this plan, in my estimation, is that it will enable most Americans during their working years to provide a partial health insurance protection which will take effect when their income is reduced by retirement.

Those who argue that voluntary insurance can do the job simply ignore the fact that the voluntary plans which attempt to provide the kind of
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Moreover, I believe the advantage of using the well-established social security plan as the mechanism for providing these services is one of the most important aspects of my bill. The money to finance the covered costs will be collected in the same way, and at the same time, as other social security taxes are paid, so no new administrative setup will be required for this phase of the program. In fact, the billing, collection, and payment of the increased social security tax will serve as an ideal means for financing the proposed program. The Social Security offices already established throughout the country to serve the entire population with regard to the other aspects of our social security plan. Care will be furnished on a national basis, thus overcoming the objection to some existing plans under which benefits accrue only within a particular State.

The fact that our social security plan is designed for practically all Americans who are dependent upon earnings, emphasizes another advantage which will be of growing importance. Increasingly, as the life expectancy population continues to grow, the expectation of social security will be synonymous, for all practical purposes, with the total aged population. It is estimated that over three-fourths of the aged population will be eligible for social security benefits in 1970, and over 80 percent in 1980. This is, then, a plan from which all of us can benefit in the same way that we can now look forward to a social security benefit when the time comes for us to retire.

Moreover, the fact that the proposal applies to people now eligible for benefits not only means that they will be spared the handicap of being under any insurance protection. In addition, the creation of a national health insurance plan will be beneficial. For instance, an individual who is not covered by an insurance plan will be able to purchase comprehensive protection at a reasonable rate. This will provide a means for the retired, the self-employed, and other groups who are currently without insurance protection, to obtain coverage at a competitive rate.

I am confident that this Congress will face up to the great improvements which have occurred in modern medicine which enables it to save lives. These are costs added by such modern miracles as the laboratory and radiographic procedures now available for diagnostic purposes; for such necessities as the oxygen tent, the blood bank, the state-of-the-art operating room. I would argue, I am sure, that we should cut down on costs such as these.

But increasingly, I believe, we shall have to experiment with other means of caring for some of the ill, the aged, and that is the reason my bill contains 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 equipment 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 facilities.

Finally, let us examine the charge that my proposal represents "nose-under-the-tent socialism"—a charge, by the way, which was made when Social Security was first passed back 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 is generally opposed to 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 are, 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 the years when 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 as well sensibly oppose as socialistic the Nation's public schools, fire departments, and parks, because these represent communal enterprise and therefore "socialistic" in 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 problem has been studied repeatedly and 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 that I and my colleagues are here to urge the House to consider and pass.
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. CABLES, 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. AUGUSTINELLO, at the request of Mr. CANNFIELD, 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 calendar was granted to:
Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, for the remainder of this week, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:
At the request of Mr. MICHAEL, and to include extraneous matter, the following:
Mr. FINO.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
At the request of Mr. WOLF, and to include extraneous matter, the following:
Mr. ANFUSO.
Mr. MCDOWELL.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:
H.R. 8601. An act to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.
Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.
The motion was agreed to; accordingly, at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m., under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 25, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 119. A bill to prohibit the severance of a service-connected disability which has been in effect for one or more years, except when based on fraud; with amendment (Rept. No. 1529). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 276. A bill to amend section 1111 of title 38, United States Code, to establish a new effective date for payment of additional compensation for dependents; with amendment (Rept. No. 1531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 113. A bill to pro­vide for equitable adjustment of the insurance status of certain members of the Armed Forces; with amendment (Rept. No. 1537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 9788. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the furnishing of veterans' home administration to any child on account of the death of more than one parent; with amendment (Rept. No. 1538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 9789. A bill to amend section 410 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of managers of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers, without amendment (Rept. No. 1539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 10108. A bill to authorize reimbursement of certain Veterans' Administration hospital attendants for ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls; without amendment (Rept. No. 1540). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 10985. A bill to amend section 315 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional compensation for those disabled on active service, who have more than one dependent; with amendment (Rept. No. 1541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 11046. A bill to amend section 501 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional compensation for those disabled on active service, who have more than one dependent; with amendment (Rept. No. 1542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 11048. A bill to amend section 1111 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. 1543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 11049. A bill to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for equitable adjustment of the insurance status of certain members of the Armed Forces; with amendment (Rept. No. 1544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 11050. A bill to amend section 1111 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. 1545). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.
Mrs. POST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8226. A bill to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida; with amendment (Rept. No. 1546). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.
Mr. THORNBERY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 506. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 1111, a bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1959 who were computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; without amendment (Rept. No. 1547). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.
Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 10495. A bill to authorize the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1548). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.
Ms. WHITE: Committee of conference. H.R. 7647. A bill relating to the income tax
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 deferral of taxation of amounts withheld by a bank or finance company from a dealer in personal property or from a real estate 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 6659(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additional 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. 11858. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide minimum benefits under the old-age 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. GLOBE:
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 fruits and vegetables be labeled where such fruits and vegetables were grown; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:
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 the procedures for providing 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 thereunder, 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 (pursuant to provided for) of the tax on local telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11863. A bill to amend the Service men's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to dispose of property, 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 substantial return of funds from rental 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 104 of the Public Housing 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 Port 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. OSTERTAG:
H.R. 11868. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with regard 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. Taxpayers of target price and income stabilization programs, to provide means by which producers may balance supply with demand at a profit, to reduce the volume and costs of maintaining Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, to provide for distribution to eligible producers 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 may 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 of themselves and family from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of earning a living 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 Com merce Committee.

By Mr. UDALL:
H.R. 11876. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Port 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 the establishment, or continued existence of antiblacks used 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 relief of Horace Amos Bicknold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:
H.R. 11879. A bill for the relief of Pietro DiGregorio Bruno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:
H.R. 11880. A bill for the relief of Anna Catania Fuglistil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCFAE:
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 Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:
H.R. 11883. A bill for the relief of Arthur Bibb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:
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 198 residents of Charles City, Council, 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 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 Mr. SPEAKER: Petition of Robert H. Smaltz, 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 attempts to curb our freedom; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPEAKER: 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.