There were about 40 committeemen there—that would give a good average for the northern part of lower Michigan. I personally have long thought something that would reduce the acreage of grain in a nongrain area and withdraw it from surplus would help.

Your reports on your approach to agriculture problem are much appreciated and it is heartening to know the farmer has a Secretary who is sympathic to agriculture.

Respectfully yours,

STANLEY VORCE.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there has been a slight delay in the consideration of the feed grains bill in the other body, and after discussing the subject with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate the possibility that tomorrow, after the morning hour, we may, with the approval of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the ranking minority member, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], lay aside the feed grains bill temporarily until action has been taken in the House, and in the meanwhile take up the depressed areas bill, on which there will be no vote tomorrow.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if the Senator from Montana could throw some light on what he means by a slight delay in the other body. Are they not going to act on the measure today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my understanding. They have finished debate for today and have gone into special orders, if they have not already adjourned. They will take up the bill tomorrow. They have two or three amendments to consider, and on the basis of what information I can get, which is very tentative, it may be around 4 o'clock or so before they finish consideration of the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Under the suggestion proposed by the majority leader, we could still hope to finish the consideration of the feed grains bill in the Senate tomorrow, could we not?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Because, as the Senator from Louisiana said earlier today, time is of the essence on this measure. This is planting time somewhere in America every day, and to make the bill workable with as many people as possible, the sooner we pass upon it—accept or reject it—accept it, I hope—the better the farmers can plan their planting.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct. As soon as the House completes action on the bill we will displace the depressed areas bill in the Senate and return to the consideration of the feed grains bill.

The purpose of my statement was to announce to the Senate that there was a strong possibility that this would happen tomorrow. It has been cleared with the minority leader and with the chairman of the committee and with the ranking minority member of the committee.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 9, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 8, 1961:

The following-named persons to the offices indicated:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Philip Elman, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1956.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Martin W. Oettershagen, of Illinois, to be Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Boisfeuillet Jones, of Georgia, to be Special Assistant on Health and Medical Affairs to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Howard Bertach, of Oregon, to be Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Richard James Murphy, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

Ralph W. Nicholson, of New York, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

UNITED NATIONS

Avery F. Peterson, of Idaho, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 17th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

J. Graham Parsons, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Sweden.

Miss Frances E. Willis, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ceylon.

Frederick E. Nolting, Jr., of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Vietnam.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Charles S. Murphy, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture.

Message received from the government of the District of Columbia, March 8, 1961:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a) of Public Law 592, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, the following-named person for reappointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency:

Neville Miller, for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1961.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 8, 1961:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Charles M. Meriwether, of Alabama, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. Gladys A. Tillett, of North Carolina, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Lee Loevinger, of Minnesota, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Robert A. Bicks, resigned.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 8, 1961:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Earl W. Kintner, of Indiana, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1960, which was sent to the Senate on January 10, 1961.

Withdrawal message received from the government of the District of Columbia March 8, 1961:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Mr. Neville Miller to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, to succeed himself for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1961, which was sent to the Senate on January 3, 1961. The nomination of Mr. Miller for reappointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency was resubmitted by the new Board of Commissioners under date of March 6, 1961.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Thessalonians 5: 21: *Prove all things; hold fast to that which is good.*

O Thou who art the source of all truth and wisdom, of all hope and peace, grant unto us the listening ear and understanding heart as each day Thou dost seek to reveal Thy will and Thy way unto us.

May our faith and our works be fruitful in the service of humanity as it struggles to gain a freer and fuller life.

Fortify us against those moods of doubt and discouragement when the forces of evil seem to impede the progress of our most earnest efforts to establish the kingdom of peace and good will.

Show us how we may help to break down all the walls and barriers of suspicion and selfishness among the nations and let justice roll down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream.

Thine be the praise and glory forever. Amen.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1173. An act to authorize the appointment of Dwight David Eisenhower to the active list of the Regular Army, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT TO RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a House joint resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 289

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4(b)(2) of Public Law 86-89, July 13, 1959, extending the Renegotiation Act of 1951, is amended by striking out "March 31, 1961", relating to the time for filing a report on Renegotiation by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1961".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the joint resolution.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HIGHWAYS

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special subcommittee on the national highway program be permitted to sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 10]

Ashmore	Green, Oreg.	Rabaut
Bailey	Harsha	Reece
Blitch	Hoffman, Mich.	St. Germain
Cahill	Jensen	Scherer
Celler	Kearns	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	Landrum	Watts
Dawson	Lindsay	Weis
Diggs	Macdonald	Willis
Dooley	Miller, N.Y.	Wright
Evins	Pfost	
Fallon	Powell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 399 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE SESSION DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Unemployment may sit during general debate in the House this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

FEED PROGRAM FOR 1961

Mr. COOLEY. 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. 4510) to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961.

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. 4510, with Mr. IKARD of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, before resuming debate on the pending bill I would like to take this opportunity to announce to the Members that this is National Peanut Week. In the House Ways and Means Committee Room in the New House Office Building, a delicious peanut luncheon is being served. All Members of the House are urged to experience the tasty delights of that wonderful nut—the peanut—at this luncheon being given by the organizations associated with the National Peanut Council.

We present for you a menu out of the South where we make an art of fine food. It is a menu that exalts your sense of taste. Here it is: Peanut soup; peanut-fed ham; sweet potatoes with peanut sauce; green salad with peanut oil dressing; peanut-buttermilk hot biscuits; peanut cake; coffee.

I invite all of you to attend this luncheon and join in a salute to the peanut.

I remind the House, as I have upon previous occasions, that the peanut is more closely associated with fun and pure enjoyment than any other crop.

It is as American as baseball.

I ask you: "What would a circus be without a peanut vendor? Who would care to go to the zoo if he could not get a bag of peanuts?"

The peanut—or goober or ground pea, as we often call it down South—is a symbol of America at play—with children and grownups alike. It tempts the palate. It gives us energy. It is a solid food on our table. It is a constant companion of good appetites and good humor.

It is the most versatile of all crops.

Its flavor is beyond challenge in the crunchy whole nut, or in spreads and confections. Throughout many areas of the world it is the most common substitute for meat, answering also the need for oil in the diet. The oil also is used widely in chemistry and in commercial enterprises. Not only is the peanut a direct human food, but fed to hogs it makes the tastiest hams; and when the hay of the vine is eaten by cows, we get the sweetest milk.

The peanut has many other aptitudes. It is the basis for many cosmetics, shaving creams, and hair lotions. I am told that the energy value of 1 pound of peanuts equals 4 pounds of beefsteak or 21 pounds of cheese or 10 quarts of milk, or 33 eggs.

During World War II in response to the vast need in this country for vegetable oil almost 5 million acres were devoted to peanut production. Much of the problems of the peanut industry today stem from the necessity for reducing this wartime level of production to that required to meet peacetime domestic demand.

Peanut production is an important source of cash income to almost 200,000 farmers. It is particularly important in areas of Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Texas, and Oklahoma where soil and climatic conditions favor its production. The national production last year had a value of $165 million.

I hope each of you will be able to attend the luncheon now being served in the Ways and Means Committee room, and I appreciate your joining, with your attention, in this salute to the most versatile, the most convivial of all the products of our farms—the peanut.

Mr. Chairman, I now come to debate on the pending measure and at this time yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill as reported by the Committee on Agriculture. This bill comes from our committee after hearings on and consideration of a bill sent to us by the administration. This bill is the first effort of the present administration to attack the complex and difficult problems involved in some of our agricultural programs. The bill as drawn in the administration and as amended by the Committee on Agriculture follows a study made by a feed grain task force composed of a number of eminent Americans. The task force was appointed to determine whether it would be possible before the next crop of grain is planted to bring about corrective legislation that might do two things: first, to prevent a continuance of the piling up of unmanageable feed grain surpluses. And, second, to undertake, while doing so, to sustain and, if possible, to improve the income of feed grain farmers.

Now, of course, the situation with respect to feed grain is in some respects analogous to the situation with respect to wheat. We have large surpluses of both commodities in the warehouses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The wheat crop, however, for 1960 was in substantial part planted last fall. The winter wheat crop is already in the ground; already growing in the fields. It is too late to amend the law with respect to the 1961 wheat crop.

We should and we can, if we act quickly, attack the feed grain problem

this year. And, why are we undertaking to attack this problem? In the first place, we have on hand now in warehouses under Government ownership and stored at Government expense 2.7 billion bushels of feed grains. It is anticipated upon the basis of experience that unless we do something about existing legislation we will add another quarter of a billion bushels to present Commodity Credit Corporation stocks at the end of the present season.

In order to get at this thing, it was necessary, of course, to take into consideration the time element. This bill must become law within a matter of days or it will not be possible to make it applicable to the 1961 crop. For that reason it was necessary that the program be made a voluntary program, and this bill provides for a voluntary program.

But, in order for a voluntary program to work, it was the judgment of the Department and of the committee that we would have to do two things. First, we would have to make a voluntary program attractive enough to induce participation. Second, we would have to avoid, what we have failed to avoid many times before, a situation where the noncomplier, the noncooperator, could come under the umbrella of the producer who was willing to cooperate with his Government in trying to bring down these huge surpluses. It was for this reason that we sought to give the Secretary authority to increase price supports on the part of cooperators. We have also given the Secretary authority to provide land retirement programs as provided in the bill.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANTANGELO. In regard to section 3, which would authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell corn at 17 percent less than the 1961 price support, would you say, sir, that this is a stabilizer which would protect the consumers and prevent a runaway price in the consumer market and at the same time not hurt the farmer and get a fair price for his corn?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman's statement is accurate, but I think, too, that that provision is a part of the second point which I was just getting ready to make; namely, that if we would allow this umbrella of $1.20 support to be extended to noncooperators, we would encourage extensive planting by noncooperators.

The second thing we undertook to do was to take noncooperators out of the price support provisions of the law. Those who do not limit their production must risk the market price. Regardless of how much or how little they grow their production will not be supported at any price.

Of course, the point the gentleman from New York makes is correct. Section 3 will, I think, protect the consumer. If the price should run away the Secretary would have discretion under the bill to sell corn or other grains out of Commodity Credit stocks. Now, I do not want to mislead the gentleman. The main purpose of this bill is to try to get down the tremendous and expensive stocks which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns, to prevent an increase in those stocks which already, if we include all commodities, are costing the taxpayer something like $400 million a year. Everybody is interested in that, I am sure, because everybody is a taxpayer.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. The gentleman, I am sure, will agree with me that an equally important purpose of this particular bill is to raise the income of and bring additional buying power to agriculture.

Mr. ALBERT. That was my first point; there is no question about that.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Those two points are the major ones. May I ask the gentleman a question relative to section 3? Are you not in this section simply turning over to the Secretary of Agriculture—and I say this as a lifelong farmer—are you not turning over to the Secretary of Agriculture the power, from now on until 5 years from now, until we get rid of 2 billion bushels of the CCC corn surplus, to hold corn in my area down to about 90 cents a bushel? I am sure you are. There is no question about that, in my opinion, I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma. I have great respect for the gentleman and I will agree with him that there is much good in this bill. But I think that the two major purposes of the bill have been destroyed entirely by bringing into it section 3.

Mr. ALBERT. On that point, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman knows that my record in this House is one of favoring fair prices for farmers.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I will say right here that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] has one of the best agricultural records in the Congress, in behalf of the farmer; but in this particular instance, in my opinion, the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. ALBERT. I am not mistaken. Under the provisions of the bill every farmer who cooperates in the program will be guaranteed about 15 cents a bushel more than the present market price. If you do not give some incentive to those who intend to cooperate under a voluntary plan, then we might as well abandon the bill. The gentleman knows we cannot afford to make this program a windfall for those who refuse to cooperate.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I agree entirely with the gentleman. But is it not sufficient penalty for a noncomplier to take away all price supports from him?

Mr. ALBERT. No; I do not think so, when we are encouraging widespread participation.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Is this supposed to be a voluntary program?

Mr. ALBERT. It is.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. It is far from it. It is something under which the Secretary of Agriculture holds a sledge over the head of every corn farmer, including myself. He says, "You either join or I will keep CCC corn pouring into the Chicago market and hold the price of corn down for the next 5 years to $1 a bushel.

Mr. ALBERT. Let me say to the gentleman that this House, on many occasions, in many bills that have become law, has given Secretaries of Agriculture authority to sell commodities which the Secretary takes over. That is true under this and every other law. And any Secretary who would abuse that authority under this or any other law, should not be Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Never has the Secretary of Agriculture had this kind of authority, however, to sell at 17 percent below the 74 percent of parity.

Mr. ALBERT. But he has had discretionary authority in many fields to sell many products.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NELSEN. The gentleman mentioned the task force. I notice that the task force report suggested as point 2 to free CCC stocks except for payment-in-kind program and limit price supports to those who participate. These must reduce acres in corn and sorghums by 24 percent.

That was the recommendation of the task force, I think.

Mr. ALBERT. I think the administration has undertaken to follow the outlines recommended by the task force. I think the proposal the administration has made is in many respects more conservative than the report of the task force. I think it is more attractive and should be more attractive, as far as the land retirement program is concerned, than that recommended by the task force.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. I do not think the administration was bound by the recommendations of the task force. The committee was not bound by the recommendations of the administration. This bill is an effort on the part of your Committee on Agriculture, by more than a 2-to-1 vote, to give the farmers of this country an opportunity in an emergency situation to develop a program that will help make the farm program more acceptable.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Suppose the bill is defeated, what will the effect be on the farmer?

Mr. ALBERT. If the bill is defeated it will mean that every farmer anywhere in the United States will be entitled to price supports at $1.06 a bushel on all the corn he wants to grow. He can grow it anywhere and get $1.06 per bushel from the Government for his entire production. That is one of the reasons why the President told us in his

message that the present law has failed. That is why we must do something.

I hope we can have a better bill within the next year. I hope we can have time to work out something on a more permanent basis that will be more acceptable. But we are facing a time situation. The only alternative to higher surpluses and higher costs is this bill.

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

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

Mr. LANGEN. In order that we may clarify a point which I do not think has been mentioned in the discussion up to this point, it has been suggested that the Secretary's suggestion is to raise the price of corn to approximately $1.20. Our present regulation says that if that is given action it is logical to assume he is also going to raise the price support on oats, barley, and rye, which are not under compliance agreements.

Mr. ALBERT. I will say to the gentleman that with respect to commodities already planted it was the considered judgment of the committee that it would be impossible to bring them in without creating very difficult administrative problems. With respect to all other commodities within the program, of course, there is a support relationship between them and corn.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. As the price of corn goes up to $1.20, it will push up the price of these other grains.

Mr. ALBERT. I think the gentleman's statement is a very important one, because I believe that section 3, which will discourage the planting of corn and other grains covered by the bill, will be of value to those who have planted barley and other crops, because they will have less competition in the marketplace.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask also if the vote in the subcommittee on section 3 of this bill was not unanimous, and then the vote of the full committee on that section of the bill was 25 to 8, better than 3 to 1. We have had a lot to say about section 3. Section 3 was put in there to prevent the market going below a dollar a bushel. The only fluctuation would be between the price of a dollar a bushel and $1.20 fixed by the Secretary.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. I think the gentleman's statement is correct.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, in the debate yesterday, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, made the statement that we have a responsibility. I agree with that statement and I accept my responsibility. My interpretation of this word certainly calls upon me to do everything I can to make this program work. It seems to me that with that responsibility, there are things I should call to the attention of the Members of his body, which I propose to do, and I shall offer some amendments to this bill. I hope I may find the proper words to make it crystal clear. It is my intention to do everything I can to assist in making the proposed farm program work. As a farmer, I know it is necessary that something be done regardless of whether we have participated in farm programs in the past and regardless of whether or not we believe a farm program should exist or not exist. We do have a problem caused by a program which did not work to reduce surpluses. If ever agriculture is to get back on its feet, the depressing surpluses that hang over our heads must be systematically reduced, and if that is not done, we take the chance of a catastrophic result that would certainly come if the surpluses are dumped on the market without regard to what happens to our total economy.

Congressman POAGE graciously permitted me to sit in on the hearings the day the Secretary of Agriculture appeared, and I noted that the new Secretary repeatedly made the statement that he would be willing to accept the recommendations of the Congress, and would like to have its suggestions relative to the bill. I take him at his word and, therefore, I propose to offer some amendments—that in my judgment will bring greater land retirement which is necessary to the success of the program. I would like also to comment that certainly those of us in this body who know CARL ALBERT know he has been a sincere and hard worker in the interest of agriculture. We certainly thank him for his efforts. At this hearing I stated that to me there seemed to be evidence of progress in proposals that were submitted, and I think all of us recognize for many years we have been battling about 90 percent of parity, assuming that that would be the answer. This proposal suggests 74 percent of parity, but it also suggests that a land retirement program is necessary in order that farm prices may be restored. A year ago, several of us introduced bills with the idea in mind that in order to restore prices we had to reduce surpluses by retiring tillable acres. While this bill is confined to the commodities of corn and grain sorghums, it does accept the idea of land retirement as necessary for the success of any farm program. A year ago we made a careful check on the total acres in production in the United States, and as nearly as we can determine, we found that we had in the United States about 338 million acres of land in production. We have about 182 million acres that are producing cash crops, some of which goes into the Commodity Credit Corporation and some of which is sold on the cash market, but this group is the group that produces a surplus. We have 156 million acres of land in the United States operated by the family farmer who everyone talks about in political campaigns. The 156-million-acre group produces crops that stay on the farm. They are seldom sold on the cash market and there is no incentive in this bill, in my judgment, that would encourage the 156-million-acre group to participate. If we are to retire adequate acres, we must have the total agricultural economy of the United States harnessed to make this bill work. I can assure you, it is my sincere intention to try to do everything I can to get the proper land retirement to reduce surpluses and to restore the prices. I might say in Minnesota, 75 percent of the farmers are not involved in a farm program of any kind. They do not sell on the cash market. They have dairy cows or feeder cattle or hogs. My farm is one of them. I have never negotiated a commodity loan on my farm in my life. But, I am under a burden of a surplus that depresses the agricultural economy of the country, and I need to help to do something for the benefit of the program, and here is what I would like to call your attention to.

The point I want to make is that if land retirement is to succeed, the 156-million-acre group must be encouraged to retire land and absorb some of the surpluses. At the same time, this group cannot be encouraged with the present program because the group does not sell on the market. High supports would not be an incentive. The only chance to encourage their participation is to replace feed that they would have raised on their land, if they take it out of production. The same group is largely dairy farmers. Under the provisions of this bill silo corn is considered to be corn. If the dairy farmer is going to get payment of any kind, he must reduce his corn acres by about 40 percent, which means he cannot fill his silo. There is no way he can get any silage in payment in kind. Therefore, you have closed the door on the dairy farmer in the provisions of this bill, which means you will not have adequate land retirement to do the job.

Another factor that seems obvious under the provisions of this bill: The Secretary of Agriculture has stated that the support price level for corn would be set at $1.20, while the bill would permit the Commodity Credit to sell corn at 17 percent less than the support level for 1961. This means actually that the market price for corn will be 62 percent of full parity. Full parity has always been considered to be the cost of production plus a reasonable profit. Under these conditions the speculator would move into the market, buy the cheap feed at a price which no producer or family farm can compete with.

The farmer cannot sweep his farm under the rug when the assessor comes around. He must pay his taxes. He has his fixed costs, and he cannot afford to participate and he cannot compete under the provisions of this bill.

I have prepared an amendment to exempt silo corn from the provisions of the bill. The gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. THOMSON], has indicated he is interested in it; Mr. LANGEN is interested in it. Silage does not go into the terminal markets. It does not go into the Commodity Credit. It is fed on the farm. On the other hand, if this farmer could keep his silage and go into the Commodity Credit market and buy some of the surplus and retire some acres, he could continue with his normal farm operations.

I have prepared another amendment which would give the farmer a chance to take his entire payment in kind. If the farmer took payment in kind, he should agree not to put the commodity on the market in competition with the market. I have been told that amendments will be offered to calculate production on a 5-year average, which I think is good. I shall support it.

I will suggest another amendment that will give the farmer a part of his payment on signing up, which I think will encourage participation.

Finally, section 3 of the bill is too great a price to pay for the enforcement provision. While in some cases it will encourage participation in dealing with the 182-million-acre group, it will be disastrous in dealing with the 156-million-acre group. What you achieve on the one hand will be offset by the speculator who moves in in competition with the family farm. Not only that, but every little country elevator, including many of the small private and cooperative elevators, would be out of business under such a provision.

I hope the committee will accept the amendments which I will propose, because in my judgment this will make it a better bill. I hope I have convinced this body that it is my wish to make this a better farm bill in the interest of agriculture.

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

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. In the gentleman's amendment will he allow the Secretary to pay part of the amount at the time?

Mr. NELSEN. Part payment.

Mr. POAGE. You will leave it to the discretion of the Secretary?

Mr. NELSEN. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. I see no objection to that at all, as long as we leave that discretion.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman. And I hope the gentleman feels the same way or gives the same thought to the silage provision, because many of these little details that will improve this bill I do not believe there should be any objection to.

I think we could make this a better bill and I want to do that sincerely.

I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Would the gentleman want the Secretary to pay the entire amount at the time of signup? Because if he did, thereafter the person involved might still violate the program.

Mr. NELSEN. I understand. I think it should be only part payment at the time of signup.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to set forth in the RECORD at this point the names of the individuals appointed by Secretary Freeman on January 26 to serve as a task force in connection with the legislation we are now considering. It is a long list mostly comprised of farmers headed by Mr. Fred Heinkel, of Columbia, Mo., chairman. Mr. Heinkel is the President of the Missouri Farmers Association.

This committee also has a very distinguished citizen member, Claude Wickard, former Secretary of Agriculture. Also on the committee is Dr. Willard Cochrane, who is now associated with Secretary Freeman; Mr. Dorsey Kirk, Master of the Illinois State Grange; and there is a long list of farmer members of this task force including: Ralph Cole, Lincoln, Nebr.; Al Diamond, Pana, Ill.; Walter Geoppinger, Boone, Iowa; A. Jack Hall, Windsor, Va.; D. G. Harwood, Albemarle, N.C.; Charles Hearst, Cedar Falls, Iowa; Earl Hogan, Hope, Ind.; Hans Jensen, Lincoln, Nebr.; Fred Ludwig, Laurena, Iowa; Frank Nutter, Corinna, Maine, Orlando Odegard, Buxton, N. Dak.; Joe Russell, Piper City, Ill.; Lail Schmidt, Lamar, Colo.; Arthur Thompson, West Des Moines, Iowa; and Don Wooten, Crosbyton, Tex.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] on yesterday referred to the fact that in the operation of the price-support program certain payments have been made to individuals, payments in large sums, when actually he meant to say that large loans had been made to individuals and corporations; and the record will show the intent of the gentleman from Texas. I have obtained information from the Department of Agriculture on the loans which were the subject of yesterday's discussions.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], mentioned 10 large price-support loans on barley, corn, and grain sorghum made in 1959. I had the Department check the records. These records show:

Loan No. 1 for $1,136,667, paid in full; No. 2, $1,017,500, paid in full; No. 3, $923,991, paid in full; No. 4, $435,046, paid in full; No. 5, $270,836, paid in full; No. 6, $263,142, paid in full; No. 7, $182,988, the Government is holding the collateral of 161,936 bushels of corn placed against this loan; No. 8, $164,817, paid in full; No. 9, $151,938, the Government is holding the corn and grain sorghum on which this loan was made; No. 10, $137,207, the Government is holding the corn put up as collateral for this loan.

Going back to the 10 largest 1958 crop price-support loans, which were a part of the discussion by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], the Department records show:

Loan No. 1, $1,140,432, $840,091 repaid, with the Government holding barley as collateral on the remainder of the loan; No. 2, $1,115,861, paid in full; No. 3, $951,077, of which $334,438 has been repaid, with the Government holding barley as collateral for the remainder: No. 4, $398,667, paid in full; No. 5, $340,347, $333,361 repaid, oats held as collateral for the remainder; No. 6, $314,990, $246,758 repaid, barley held as collateral for the remainder; No. 7, $313,681, paid in full; No. 8, $267,085, paid in full; No. 9, $257,553, paid in full; and No. 10, $208,718, no repayment, but corn and grain sorghum held as collateral against loan.

Of the 10 largest feed grain loans made in 1959, 7, including the largest 6, have been repaid in full, with interest. The Department reports to me that the Government not only lost nothing on these transactions, but that the producers paid some $65,000 in interest and some $25,000 in service fees on these loans. In addition, about 85 percent of the grain under another loan has been redeemed, leaving only 2 out of the 10 loans in connection with which the grain—mostly corn—was delivered to the Government or placed under the reseal program.

I do not have a similar overall analysis of the 10 large grain loans in 1958. The Department had to go to field offices to obtain the figures.

I would like to say to the House that from the standpoint of a sound market price structure, it is just as important for large farmers to follow orderly marketing practices as for small farmers to do so. The primary objective of the Commodity Credit Corporation since it was established in 1933 has been to assist producers in orderly marketing. There is nothing wrong with the large growers utilizing this program for that purpose. And I repeat that the six largest feed grain loans in 1959, two of which were for more than $1 million, cost the Commodity Credit Corporation not one penny, and in fact, resulted in a net gain to the Government.

There are some smaller loans which apparently were not paid in full, but the grain securing the loans was turned in to the Government; the Government now has it and it will be liquidated.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Chairman, because I believe that this is such an important bill and because I come from a State which will be decidedly affected I am taking the floor for the first time to urge your careful consideration before voting on it or on the amendments, at least one of which I shall present later.

I listened carefully to the debate yesterday and was amazed at the variety of opinions on the measure and gratified at the clarity of many of the speeches, particularly those of my colleagues from Maine and North Dakota. One colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] however, indicated that this was an emergency panacea—a cure-all, which would increase farm income, decrease production, decrease surplus supplies and cut costs to the taxpayers. It seems apparent an emergency bill of this type and of this scope cannot accomplish all those things, although we all agree they are worthy efforts. But certain facts about the bill should be emphasized.

Agriculture has been under governmental controls for 30 years and is still sick. While you cannot drag a sick man out of bed and make him run a race, nevertheless you don't make him well by keeping him in the operating room of a hospital. In my opinion this bill would do the latter by granting to the Secretary of Agriculture unprecedented powers to control the whole corn and feed grain market. And I say the latter advisedly.

It has been said that this bill will not affect oats and barley. But this is not exactly true. It took them out of the front end of the bill and brought them back in the tail end of the bill. If you will look at the second part of section

1 of this bill you will see that in order to get support prices on oats, rye, barley or other small feed grains, if during any time in 1959 or 1960 you have grown any corn for silage or otherwise you must comply with this program or you do not get your support price on oats, rye, barley, and the other feed grains which are not supposed to be covered by this bill at all. So, on the one hand it is taken out and on the other hand it is put back in.

I have an amendment to propose which I hope will take care of that at a later time.

Yesterday the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], pointed out that on retired acreage a producer would receive only 50 percent of the average production of the farm for 1959 and 1960. Ordinarily a longer period is used and there has been talk about a 5-year history, but in this bill the question of what is going to be done in hardship cases created by weather is left to the Secretary of Agriculture. There are no guides set forth.

In order to determine what we are doing I might call your attention to the following points. If this bill is passed we are giving to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to determine what the support price levels are going to be, floored at 65 percent of parity. We are requiring participation in the corn program before a farmer is eligible to get support on oats, rye, and barley. We are giving him power to determine what hardship relief shall be given and we are asking him to establish a program under which the diverted acreage must be kept free of weeds and rodents, as well as insects. We say nothing in this bill about what is going to happen if it is not kept free of those things. Is the Secretary going to withhold payment for the diverted acres? Does the producer go to jail? Is he fined? We have nothing in this bill which says how he is going to implement that provision.

Then in section 3 he is given the power to undersell the market in order to force participation. I do not believe that Members of Congress want to abrogate their powers to this extent.

I venture to say that never before has Congress turned over such broad powers to the Secretary of Agriculture, and since 1933 has not been asked to establish such a system of administering prices.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I just wonder if the gentleman does not think it better to let the Secretary determine what he would do in these hardship cases, let him make these rules as to just how he must handle these details, than to have us attempt here on the floor or in the committee to write details. We can never get them all in line at one time. It has been my experience that when you attempt to write these kinds of details in legislation you always find that you have forgotten something that you wanted to put in there.

Mr. DOMINICK. I agree.

Mr. POAGE. And you have failed to take care of some of the very hardships for which we find there is need, whereas if you leave it flexible so that the Secretary can care for them from day to day, you can take care of these things. It was because of that that we gave this flexibility.

Mr. DOMINICK. Provided you give a sufficient area as regards historical production in order to determine an average production yield.

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman is now talking about the question whether we should have a 2-year history or 5-year history, that is a vastly different thing. But, I think what I am talking about is applicable whether you have a 2- or 25-year history. You better leave your details to the Secretary rather than to try to write them out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the colloquy that just took place, I think, emphasizes one of the things about this legislation that should be considered here. It was somewhat disappointing to me to find out that after your subcommittee had worked a week and we had heard from all of the leaders of farm organizations from all over the United States, and on a Friday the subcommitee having voted without a single dissenting vote to adopt this bill and on the following Monday the whole committee having voted 25 to 8 to adopt and recommend this bill for passage, that since that time many of the Members who approved this bill in its present form have departed from it and are now opposing it. Of course, that is their privilege.

But what I would like to talk about for just a few minutes is just some commonsense, directed particularly to those people who do not come from farm areas, to those of you who come from city areas, who represent what we might say is the consumer segment, the taxpaying segment, and to ask you to consider the circumstances under which this bill came to the floor.

For the last 8 years our farm programs generally have not worked. I think most people recognized that the job of Secretary of Agriculture was going to be one of the most difficult jobs in this new administration. I will say quite frankly that the choice of Secretary of Agriculture at the time of his appointment was not the choice that I would have made. I will also say that the appointment of the Secretary of Agriculture was not the job that I think Governor Freeman might have preferred to have had. But I will say that, after he has taken office and after his appearance before our committee, I think he has made a very favorable impression on our committee and on the leaders of agricultural groups throughout the country.

Also, I think the public generally has confidence in him, because he is smart enough to admit that he does not know some things, that he is relying upon the judgment of people in whom he does have confidence and who have had experience, who can bring some good sense to an agricultural program that will work.

I think the Secretary of Agriculture has already demonstrated that he is going to be aggressive, he is going to try to do something to help the agricultural segments of our economy.

I think with reference to the bill we have before us today, there was almost unanimous opinion in the committee, at a time before we received a lot of pressure from various sources to amend or to take out; and in that bill we gave the Secretary some authority, in section 3, which many people have criticized, have said is too much authority for any Secretary to have. But I want to call your attention to the fact that we are in an emergency. This is an emergency measure, it is a temporary measure for 1 year. We are trying to solve one of the most difficult problems we have. It has been pointed out here the great investment that we have in corn and other feed grains, running up to more than 4 billions of dollars. But I want to point out to you, Mr. Chairman, this fact. I think most of you can understand why the people who operate warehouses, the people who operate elevators, the people who are dealing in grain—of course, I am not criticizing them for taking exception to section 3. I think if I were in their place, I would take exception, too. But I think those people who are not well acquainted with the agricultural program but who have a genuine desire to do something to help the farmer, to help correct a condition which has built up over the years, and which has become progressively worse during the past 8 years, if they want to do something for the farm economy and for the farmers of this country, they are going to have to make up their minds today, when I presume the vote will come to take out section 3.

Whether you are interested in trying to perpetuate this system of unlimited storage of commodities that we have in long supply is a question you will have to answer. One of the greatest surpluses we have is that of storage facilities. They have accumulated, they have been built up over the years. We have more than we need.

People who have invested in those facilities have received a good return on their money. I do not think the taxpayers of this country have any obligation to continue them in business at the expense of the farmer and taxpayers. So when you vote today on section 3 I think you are going to have to make a determination: Am I trying to do something to help the farmer, to help the farm economy? Am I being influenced by the letters I have had from grain dealers, from warehousemen, from the operators of elevators? Am I more interested in helping them?

I think all of us realize that we have written into this bill an adequate vehicle to reduce these supplies and every time we reduce the supplies, we reduce the burden on the taxpayer. I know we will never come up with a farm program which is going to be universally acceptable, acceptable to all people.

We have in the farm economy one of the most difficult problems. There is the fact that there is so great a differential in the cost of production. That applies to all commodities. We talk about what is a fair price for corn. The Secretary says, "We are proposing to support corn at $1.20 a bushel." We are giving him the authority to sell corn out of these supplies, if he finds it to be in the best interests of the program, at $1 a bushel. I have in mind farmers in my area and in the corn section of this country who could put hundreds of thousands of acres into corn and the producers would be happy to receive $1 a bushel for it. But unfortunately all producers cannot produce corn for $1 a bushel. So we have to arrive at some fair average figure, and that is what it is.

Today I want to remind you of the very difficult task you will have in trying to write this bill on the floor. Your committee went into this very thoroughly. I think all of us could have offered some amendments that would have been acceptable or that we might like to see in this bill, but in the best interests of not only the farmer but the whole Nation and the taxpayer we brought out this bill.

This bill, which was agreed upon unanimously in the subcommittee, with one abstention, and by a vote of 25 to 8 in the full committee, represents the best sound thinking in bringing to you a program that will work, which will give adequate support to the producer, and which will discourage a person who might want to get out and expand his acreage. At the same time this vehicle we have given to the Secretary in section 3 does two things: It discourages extensive overproduction and at the same time gives a protection to the consumer.

Someone said a minute ago that the dollar a bushel for corn was not enough. May I remind you that if we take off all agricultural controls and if we do away with all support programs, you are going to see corn selling for a whole lot less than a dollar a bushel. It sold last year for less than a dollar a bushel when there were not sufficient facilities to store the grain or the moisture content was such that it was not suitable for storage. So this section 3 does two things. It is a fair proposal.

In closing, may I call upon those who may not be familiar with all of the provisions of this bill to try to have confidence in a committee that heard all of the testimony, and has brought to you a bill that is fair. If you will go along, I think that during this year we can show some improvement. If we do not show some improvement, we are not obligated to go on any further. It can be changed. If this program works as well as some of us think, it might well be continued, but it will be up before you to act on again. I hope you will support the committee.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER].

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, just for the record I happen to be one of the eight.

I recognize that we do have an emergency, that agriculture has been in an emergency ever since 1931. Every time we bring a bill to the floor of this House and pass it we get agriculture in a little bigger emergency than it was before. Yet year after year we come before this House and ask the House of Representatives to back the best judgment of the Committee on Agriculture in solving an emergency. Yet we find at the very time we bring this bill here that it is only for 1 year. If it is going to solve an emergency it ought to be good from now on. But I do not believe it is going to solve an emergency.

I believe this bill before us today has as little to recommend it to any segment of this House of Representatives as any bill we have ever brought before you. In the first place, it permits the Secretary to set the support price of corn anywhere from 65 percent to as high as the sky. We have never done that on any other basic commodity. Regardless of what kind of juggling of figures is presented here, it is going to cost the taxpayers more money than the present program is costing. We will not raise the farmer's income to any great extent. He will have more administrative headaches, he will have more problems, he will be back to acreage allotments, which he got out from under the present program when 71 percent of the farmers voted to get out from under acreage allotments. It will completely put the grain trade out of business, and just keep in mind that the grain trade is not just a bunch of millionaires out in Kansas City or Chicago: the grain trade is every cooperative elevator in the entire country that deals in feed grains. These are owned by the farmers themselves. Now our distinguished chairman said we have lost $1,455 million on this program; that we now have $4,500 million invested in feed grains, and that we are facing a horrible emergency. We have lost an enormous amount of money. We have an enormous surplus, and that the way we are going to cure it is to raise the price of corn from $1.05 to $1.20. If you had a warehouse full of merchandise that you had spent too much money on and that you could not sell and that you could not give away, then I know the average businessman would not say the way to cure that situation is just to raise the price on more merchandise to put in the same warehouse where he has the present merchandise stored.

Our distinguished chairman yesterday attempted to make this a strictly political issue. He says this is the Democratic platform, and he appealed to one of his colleagues over here to vote for this bill on the ground that it would be carrying out the Democratic platform. I do not know just exactly what the Democratic platform contained concerning this, but I might say for you folks over here who have party loyalty, and I know all of you do and you should have, you are not going to be doing your party a great favor, in my opinion, in voting for this bill. In the first place, you are going to make practically all the corn farmers mad because you are going to force the Secretary of Agriculture within the next few weeks to go out and determine the number of acres planted on every feed grain farm in America in 1959 and 1960.

In addition to that, you are going to force him to determine exactly how many bushels were raised on those acres planted in 1959 and 1960. If he makes a mistake and finds that too many bushels were planted, he is going to be hurting the taxpayers. If he makes the mistake and does not give the farmer credit for enough bushels, he is taking money away from the farmers.

Section 3 has been kicked around here a great deal. Section 3 is about the most impossible provision in this whole bill, and for this reason. This is the situation in which we find ourselves. If section 3 is taken out, there is not a single consumer or anyone representing a consumer area on this side or on the other side either, or any of you representing any of the deficit areas who is going to dare to vote for this bill without penalizing practically every constituent that you have. By the very same token, if you do leave section 3 in, then you are going to hurt every single corn farmer in the country and everybody in the feed grain area. If you take it out, you ruin this side and if you leave it in, you ruin the other side. I do not know what you are going to do with section 3.

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

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. The farmers in my district generally produce livestock, dairy and poultry products. Would you elaborate on your statement as to how they will be affected by this bill?

Mr. BELCHER. I just got through saying that every farmer who lives in a feed deficit area has to buy feed for their poultry and for their dairy or for any other purpose, and undoubtedly would have to spend more for it unless section 3 stays in the bill. So at any rate you are going to be caught.

Now just one comment on the new Secretary of Agriculture. I know it is an impossible job to be Secretary of Agriculture. But I never in all the 8 years that our party had a Secretary of Agriculture ever voted to put him in the hole that you fellows are going to put this Secretary in when you force him to go out and determine all these acreages and all of these average bushels of production because you are going to put him in the deepest hole possible. You gentlemen had a tremendous lot of fun for 8 years running against Secretary Benson, but I just want to tell you something, that if you put Orville Freeman in a few more holes just like you are putting him in a hole with this bill, it will be nothing compared to the fun that we are going to have running against your Secretary of Agriculture.

So, from a political standpoint, before you vote to make all of the grain dealers mad, the consumers mad, and all of your taxpayers mad, and all of the people who have to buy feed, just stop and consider the situation.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

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

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, who has done so much for the American farmers and is at the present time on the important Committee on Appropriations dealing with agricultural matters.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

I just wanted to point this out, that the statement made about section 3, I think, up to this point has not made it clear that all section 3 does is to prevent the nonconforming farmer, the man who refuses to help bring things into line, from receiving any benefit of the passage of this law. That is all it does. It allows the Secretary to say "I will sell this corn at the price you get," and that is all it means. If we do not do it, if those who help carry the load get to $1.20, and this fellow who refuses to do anything would probably get $1.15 in benefit, and he should not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to thank the gentleman for his excellent statement.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to thank the members of the committee who are not from farm areas for the interest they have expressed in the farmer, and for their sincere desire to be of help, if they possibly can, and at the same time be fair to their constituents.

I want to plead for your continued sympathy and understanding, because you see that as far as the farm belt is concerned we are greatly divided.

There are 35 members of our committee. As I recall, there are about 6 minority reports, but keep in mind that those minority reports suggest opposition by only 11 members of the 35 men and women on the committee. One or two of our colleagues have dissented twice and have given a couple of dissenting opinions, which of course is their privilege. But now to those who represent consuming areas may I point out some information that has not been placed in the RECORD. I think it would be helpful to the cause of American agriculture, and for a better understanding of the people of America concerning American agriculture, if you would permit me to give you a few facts.

Agriculture is today the Nation's biggest industry. It employs 7.4 million workers, or more workers than are employed in the steel industry, the automobile industry or transportation and public utilities combined.

Investment in agriculture exceeds $203 billion. Each year the farmers of America spend $25 billion to $26 billion a year for goods and services to produce crops and livestock, and another $15 billion a year for the same things that their friends in the cities buy, food, clothing, drugs, furniture, appliances, and other products and services.

Each year the farmers' purchases include $2½ to $3 billion worth of new farm tractors and other motor vehicles and machinery and equipment; $3.5 billion for fuel, lubricants, and maintenance of machinery and motor vehicles. The farmers use more petroleum than any other industry. The farmers spend $1½ billion a year for fertilizer and lime. They use 320 million pounds of rubber, about 9 percent of the total used in the United States, and they use 24 billion kilowatts of electricity, or 5 percent of the Nation's total.

Here is another figure: 10 million people have jobs, storing, transporting, processing, and merchandising agricultural products. Six million people have jobs providing the supplies the farmers use.

American agriculture is today, of course, an efficient, progressive industry. The American farmer as a taxpayer in 1959 paid farm real estate taxes totaling $2.1 billion; income taxes totaling $1¼ billion were paid by the farm population.

Net taxes paid by farmers on motor fuels were $372 million.

Motor vehicle license fees and taxes paid by farmers were $172 million.

The American farmer, of course, is doing his part to help us win the cold war by his efficiency and abundant production of food and fiber. That is his record.

Farming is shelter. It takes one acre of healthy forest 20 years to grow the lumber for a five-room frame house.

Farmers and other small woodland owners control 54 percent of the Nation's commercial forests. Three out of four forest owners are farmers.

About 400 pounds of paper per person is consumed each year. This requires the net annual wood growth from about three-quarters of an acre of commercial forests. A large New York paper uses the equivalent of the net annual growth from 6,000 acres of commercial forest land for its Sunday issue, and the net annual growth from 500,000 acres every year.

Mr. Chairman, this is the problem that the farmer faces: What does he receive? I have often said that if the farmer could get his just share of the consumer's dollar and let everybody else have his just share, the farmer's problems would be solved. But the farmer does not get his fair share. For each dollar spent for food the farmer gets not 50 cents but just 38 cents. He gets 2.4 cents for the corn in a 26-cent box of corn flakes.

He gets 62 cents for each $1 spent for Choice grade beef, and 11 cents for the oranges in a 26-cent can of frozen orange juice concentrate.

He gets 2.3 cents for the wheat in a 20-cent loaf of white bread, and about 11 cents from a 25-cent quart of milk. He gets about 29 cents for the cotton in a man's $4 business shirt, and about 25 cents stumpage for each $1 worth of pine lumber produced from his woods.

Then I would like to give this final statistic in this connection: 20 percent of our disposable income went for food in 1959. If we had bought in 1959 the same kinds and quantities of food we ate in the period 1935 through 1939 we would have spent only 15 percent of our 1959 income. So the price of food to the consumer, I sincerely believe, shows a very favorable situation, and today we ask our friends representing the consuming areas to support us in the solution of the farm problems because I believe consumers—all of America—have a stake in a healthy agricultural economy.

But here is where the rub comes: What is the best solution to our problem? Good men have disagreed. I felt that after having worked for days with our committee on this bill that the better angels had played on the chords of our natures so that we had almost 100 percent unanimity on the basic features of this measure. Then I do not know whether baser angels came into the picture, but something happened and we found ourselves I am sure due to no wrong motive, but due to honest differences of opinion—we found ourselves in disagreement.

May I repeat what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] so ably said: We are in a deplorable situation insofar as feed grains are concerned. The taxpayers—and farmers are taxpayers—have a right now to begin to ask us for a concrete suggestion, and this bill is designed to help meet that problem; it is designed to help the farmer; it is designed to help the consumer. This bill is supposed to take out of possible production hundreds of millions of bushels of grain that we do not need and save $500 million. Perhaps it would not do that, but I think it will. I think the bill should be given a chance.

Let us look at some of the objections that are made to the bill. It has been pointed out that we do not have time for administrative procedures. I am proud to say our Secretary of Agriculture has already been making certain investigations and reports so that he can calculate the average yield on feed grain production for 1959 and 1960. In every newspaper of every county in my district of Florida already information has been given to the farmers so that they will be on the alert to help prepare the reports we are going to have to have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, time is of the essence. We do not have any time left to delay the starting of a plan which we hope will do something about this tremendous grain problem, $4 billion worth of it in CCC stocks. I want to be fair to the farmers of America, I want to be fair to all of America to the best of my ability. I am proud of the fact I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture and that I have this particular responsibility of trying to give information about this bill.

Someone has expressed concern about the increased cost for feed grains in deficit areas. One of the most outstanding members of our committee, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE] a great friend of the farmer and a great personal friend of mine, pointed out yesterday he feared about the increased cost of feed grain in deficit areas. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] who is another powerful champion of the farmer, is worried about this bill because he is afraid it gives the Secretary of Agriculture the right to make the price of grain so low it will be unfair to

the corn farmers. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] is worried because we give the Secretary of Agriculture the right to set feed grain prices at any level above 65 percent of parity. Remember our friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN], is worried because he thinks the language is such it will depress the price of corn to his farmer, while the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE] fears it will increase the price of corn. These are all honorable gentlemen, and they are learned gentlemen. They are concerned with these problems as all of us were.

Now I think we have equated these views in a manner fair to all. I think we came up with the very essence of statesmanship. We could not satisfy everybody. We could not completely satisfy the man who sells the grain, or some of our people who naturally want to make all they can off the farms. We could not go all the way with any of them, but we have come to that point of honorable compromise which is the very essence of good legislation.

Coming back to section 3, let me read you the very language in the bill:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to sell any corn or grain sorghums during the marketing year for the 1961 crop of such grains at any price not less than 17 per centum below the 1961 support price for such grains.

If you cut that section out you cut out the heart of the bill.

This reminds me of a story down in my section of the country. We were going catfishing in the Suwannee River where we have the most succulent and wonderful catfish in the world. When you catch a catfish sometimes he jumps around and gets out of your hands. We had a helper to clean the fish. One day he was trying to get hold of a squirming catfish. The catfish would not stay still so he could clean the fish. He said to the catfish: "Keep quiet. I'm not going to hurt you. All I am going to do is cut your insides out."

If you take section 3 out of the bill you cut the insides out of it, you will not have the protection that we think we ought to have for those who comply and those who make certain sacrifices. It will not produce a decrease in the production of grain.

In conclusion, let me say that we have tried to put controls in this bill. We tried to say to our farmers, "We think if you get a good price support we ought to have the courage to say to you: 'You ought to have production controls' so that the taxpayers, so that all segments of America may be treated fairly."

We have only two alternatives.

We can keep the present program, spending $500 million a year more than the cost of the proposed program, or we can try this new program, which we think deserves a chance, for 1 year. Two billion, seven hundred million bushels of needless feed grains are stored up in our bins today, and I plead with you to vote for this bill and give it a chance to see if it cannot correct some of our problems.

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

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will be glad to yield to my very dear friend from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I do not have the privilege of serving on the committee, and I did not have a chance to hear all the discussion yesterday. We had an appropriation bill on the floor, as you know. Now, I have high respect for the judgment and the ability of the gentleman, and that is the reason I ask this question. In the course of his remarks—and I know this bill is designed to help the corn farmers and grain farmers—the gentleman said it would be beneficial to the consumers. I wish he would, for my benefit and the benefit of those of us who may not know how it will benefit the consumers, tell how this bill will benefit the consumers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will certainly try to. But, before I make this explanation, let me tell this story about the man who had two wives. One wife was named Millie. She died. He married another beautiful girl named Tillie. She died. Then the gentleman died. And, in his will he had said, "Bury me between Millie and Tillie but lean me toward Tillie." All I will say to the gentleman is this, the bill leans toward the farmer. Let us be frank about that. My friends from the large city areas want me to tell the truth, and I am telling it. This will help the farmer, and I know you do not want me to apologize for him. Let me say this, I believe it will cost you less than the program we have today, and if it saves you nothing else except the storage costs, I think the saving will be tremendous. I want to say to my dear friend from North Carolina—and I thank him for his interest in the matter—that we who are in favor of this bill believe that in storage costs alone it will save the consumer, who pays the taxes of course, many millions of dollars. We are talking about tax relief now, in this instance.

Mr. JONAS. My farmers produce poultry, livestock, and dairy products. How will this bill help them?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, we just heard our friend from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] say he is afraid the price of corn with section 3 is going to be so low that it will be detrimental to his area.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Maybe I can answer the question.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Thank you, sir.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. If this bill passes with section 3 in it, it will force my corn farmers to sell corn at $1 a bushel for the next 5 years due to the surplus of corn in the hands of Commodity Credit Corporation, and therefore it will force my farmers to go into the poultry business because of the fact that they are not getting more than $1 for corn. It will force my farmers also to go into the hog business. We can produce and do produce hogs, poultry, and livestock in great numbers in Minnesota, and we will have to step up that production if you persist in giving the Secretary of Agriculture the power to bring the level of our corn down to $1 a bushel. That is my reason, Mr. MATTHEWS. I do want to compliment you for bringing out the agricultural economy picture, as you did today.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to thank my distinguished friend.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, when this bill left the Committee on Agriculture I voted for it. But as I did, I announced to my colleagues that I intended to do everything I could to strike section 3, and for a number of reasons. But before getting into that I would like to go over the first two sections of the bill and the program involved in order to give you my views on it.

We worked out a compromise—granted. To start with, the price support level shall be set by the Secretary at not less than 65 percent of parity. There is no limit on the top. I do not think we have to worry that the Secretary will set the price supports at 100 percent of parity or 200 percent. I think he will do it somewhere within reason.

There is also a section that a person must idle 20 percent of his acres in order to be eligible for price supports and be allowed to idle 20 percent more if he so desires. I would have liked to see the additional permissive diversion set at 30 percent in order to get more land out of production this year. But the Committee on Agriculture did not see fit to go along with that so I accept the compromise.

There is one provision which we changed, which is important and which I think all Members should bear in mind. As the bill came from the Secretary of Agriculture, in his report to us, and as the gentleman from Texas introduced it in the Committee on Agriculture, it provided that all the grains paid to the farmer by way of payment in kind could be merchandised by the Secretary of Agriculture through the Commodity Credit Corporation at the market price. We refused to go along with that proposal. This would have enabled the Secretary of Agriculture to manipulate the market. We changed it so that the payment in kind would be paid through a negotiable certificate so that the farmer would merchandise his own grain.

On reading the report on the feed grains bill I find at the bottom of page 5—and I want to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] a question about it:

> The committee suggests that it might be possible for the CCC to act as the agent of farmers who wish to sell their certificates, rather than withdrawing the grain themselves.

You will recall Mr. POAGE, that we intended that the farmer should merchandise his own certificate. We absolutely refused to go along with allowing the CCC to merchandise the grain for him. I should like the gentleman to state to the Committee his understanding of what we intended by the bill, as it now comes to us in regard to the negotiable certificates used for payment in kind.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's recollection is substantially correct. The subcommittee did feel that we did not want to authorize the CCC to be the redemption agent itself; in other words to pay out the money on the certificate. As I recall it,

the sentiment in the committee was that we wanted the CCC to assist the farmer to get his certificate redeemed by somebody who wanted to redeem it. We did suggest that the Department could very well take a man's certificate; that is, the Department was in a position to put it in the hands of somebody who would buy it, more readily than would be the individual farmer. We suggested that possibly the Department could do that, and pass the proceeds on to the farmer but not that the Department itself make the redemption with Government funds.

Mr. QUIE. It is true, then, that the CCC would not purchase the certificate from the farmer, nor would they actually be selling the grains in the market.

Mr. POAGE. That is correct.

Mr. QUIE. They would bring the buyer and the seller together, acting as the agent.

Let us get on to the more controversial section of the bill. It has been suggested by many speakers prior to myself—in fact, the speaker who just preceded me, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS], that if you took section 3 out of the bill, you would completely ruin the purposes of the legislation.

Let me explain what would happen under this proposed legislation. We have two incentives in the first two sections of the bill. No. 1: Unless a person complies with a 20-percent reduction on his grain and sorghum acres, he could not receive the support level, which we expect will be $1.20. That is an incentive.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the provision of the bill which says that eligibility for price support will be contingent on whether a person complies or not is important to the cash grain farmer. In corn production about 70 percent, it was testified in our committee, is fed back to livestock on the farm itself. So the other 30 percent would be interested in receiving a guaranteed price support. For that incentive they must comply with the program in order to receive that price support of $1.20. The other 70 percent of the corn would go back into the livestock on the farm where it was raised. For these farmers it is no incentive to receive the price-support level. They would never take a loan on it, because they use that corn to feed to their livestock. The cost of that grain is the cost of production. But we have another incentive in the bill to bring these people into the program, and that is the rental payment, which we have limited to 50 percent in cash and 60 percent in kind. I wish we had not limited it to that amount, but, as I said, this was a compromise, and that was the incentive to livestock farmers who produce their own feed.

What incentive is there in section 3? If section 3 stays in the bill, it allows the Secretary of Agriculture to sell for less than the support level, as low as $1 for corn. This means that when the farmer who has received payment in kind tries to merchandise it he will not receive $1.20 for that percentage of his normal production, he will get somewhat less than a dollar for his corn. This would greatly reduce the value of payment in kind as an incentive to divert acres.

If section 3 stays in the bill, you drive down the income of every complying farmer, as well as the income of every noncomplying farmer, so you are going directly in the opposite direction from where you want to go, that is, if we intend to retain our original objective of increasing farm income. This bill is for the purpose of increasing farm income. There are only two ways that can be obtained. One is from the consumer, the other from the taxpayers. Nobody should try to fool you into thinking it comes from any other place. We want to increase the farmer's income because he is at the low end of the economic totem pole now and needs this kind of help. I do not want section 3 to drive his income down.

Second, this would increase the cost to the Government, not decrease it. We have all heard from our taxpaying constituents that they do not want us to spend so much. Here we have a section that would actually increase the cost of government.

The reason I say this is that the farmer who feeds his grain on the farm and has complied with the program would find that during the marketing year, October 1, 1961, to October 1, 1962, that if he puts his grain under loan he can get $1.20 and he can go out on the market and buy it for $1 or less. That is what he would likely do. Right now none of this grain which is fed on the farm is going into Government hands. It has not been going onto the market at all like cash grains. But if section 3 stays in he will sell his grain to the Government for $1.20 and buy it back for a dollar or less to feed livestock. So 70 percent compliance under this program as Secretary Freeman indicates will mean 3 billion bushels of compliance corn, and that means a $600 million additional cost added onto the estimated cost of this program.

Another reason why I think section 3 is wrong is that the incentive, as I pointed out before, would be decreased to these farmers who feed their grain back on the farm and take part in this rental payment. They will not know what price their payment in kind will command during the marketing year which begins 5 months after planting. When the Secretary announces he will sell on the market under section 3 the bottom will drop right out. Experience has shown this time and again.

Also, this would give the Secretary of Agriculture a power that could ruin our competitive marketing system if he used it. This is the most dangerous aspect of the whole bill. This is why the grain trade have come in and stated why they oppose the bill.

The National Grain Trade Council expressed its concern over section 3 when it said on March 3, 1961:

We believe that if section 3 of H.R. 4510 is enacted—

1. The Commodity Credit Corporation during the marketing years for the 1961 crops of corn and grain sorghums can arbitrarily establish the market price for these grains and other feed grains.

2. To grant this authority to the Commodity Credit Corporation will create great uncertainty as to feed grain prices since the supply-demand factors of the market will in no sense determine the price of these feed grains—these prices will be determined by the arbitrary decisions of the Commodity Credit Corporation as to when to sell, where to sell, and at what price to sell.

3. Cattlemen, dairymen, and poultrymen, in the absence of an ability to know at least roughly in advance what the cost of feed grains is to be, will be unable to plan in any way for future production of meat, milk, eggs, and poultry. The market for these consumer items will be disrupted to the detriment of consumers, both pricewise and supplywise.

4. Processors and merchandisers of feed grains, particularly corn, will not attempt to accumulate inventories in anticipation of future needs because of the concern they will share with cattlemen, dairymen, and poultrymen, over the possible arbitrary sale of Government stocks of feed grains.

5. Uncertainty as to the Government's sale policies, if any, on feed grains—where they will be sold, when they will be sold and at what price they will be sold—will, in preventing an accumulation of inventories of feed grains, irreparably damage future and cash trades in feed grains, thus leading to a breakdown in the highly efficient economic low-cost competitive grain marketing system.

6. Congress for some years has been committed to foreign market development programs for all grains. According to news reports, the administration will recommend further expansion of market development programs for all grains. If section 3 of H.R. 4510 is enacted, foreign buyers may not make forward purchases and U.S. export firms may not make forward sales of feed grains.

This will impair the effectiveness of present or future market development programs. This will greatly curtail the operation of the P-I-K export programs for feed grains under which for the past several years U.S. exporters have made forward sales of up to 6 months with foreign buyers making forward purchases for a similar period and under which exports of U.S. feed grains have been increased all to the benefit of the Government, feed grain producers and other U.S. taxpayers.

7. A serious curtailment of the P-I-K program will remove the world demand for feed grains from the U.S. marketplaces, will depress U.S. market prices, and will force larger quantities of feed grains into Commodity Credit Corporation's inventories, all to the expense of feed grain producers and other U.S. taxpayers.

On March 1 the GTA Daily Radio Roundup said:

There also is some genuine concern on the part of farm grain co-ops as to what this new legislation will mean to farmer-owned storage and the storing and marketing of grain. And—it would be well for the Department of Agriculture to clarify itself on some of these points, as it no doubt will be doing.

On March 3, 1961, the National Association of Grain & Feed Dealers wrote to each Member of the House as follows:

The Grain & Feed Dealers National Association has no established policy as to levels of crop price supports or acreage retirement. Historically, it has been our policy to leave to the administration and farm organizations recommendations to the Congress on price-support policy.

This national association does have policy regarding legislation that will destroy the competitive grain-marketing system. Therefore, we are opposed to section 3 of H.R.

4510 as reported out of the House Committee on Agriculture as follows:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to sell any corn or grain sorghums during the marketing year for the 1961 crop of such grains at any price not less than 17 percent below the 1961 support price for such grains."

We are opposed to section 3 because of the following reasons:

1. If enacted, CCC during the 1961 crop marketing year of corn and grain sorghums could set market prices at any level down to approximately $1 per bushel for corn. (Under present statute, CCC is prohibited from making domestic sales of grain less than 105 percent of the support price plus reasonable carrying charges.)

2. The impiled threat of sales of feed grain would have disruptive effects upon grain markets. It would be impossible to feed manufacturers, grain processors, and other grain merchandisers to carry inventories because large feed grain sales set by a giant Government agency could depress any market price and would discourage forward buying.

3. The CCC could largely replace the present competitive market system.

4. Grain consumers and merchandisers would have to assume greater risks because the legislation would destroy the opportunity to hedge, i.e., free grain markets could not continue to function.

5. It would result in the Commodity Credit Corporation becoming the chief handler of the corn and grain sorghum production in 1961.

This national association is opposed to giving the authority to any Secretary of Agriculture to depress grain market prices, and to destroy the competitive grain marketing system.

I have been told that back in 1937 or 1938 this request was made by Jesse Jones, head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. At that time the Commodity Credit Corporation was under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. When he asked for this authority to sell our surplus stock at the market to reduce the amount of it we found that Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace refused to go along. The endeavor on the part of the cooperative grain elevators to prevent that action enabled them to organize what is now known as the National Association of Grain Cooperatives. If it was dangerous at that time, it is certainly dangerous now.

If we allowed the Secretary of Agriculture to do that with corn, we might also ask the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization to do this with our strategic stockpile. When they said they were going to sell coconut oil, the price dropped through the floor. If they said tomorrow they were going to sell lead and zinc at the market price, the price of those commodities would drop through the floor. You are asking to give the Secretary of Agriculture the same authority as this on our grain. I do not want the Government to do that to my farmers and I hope you do not want to do it to your farmers.

Also, under this section 3 the Government is the principal buyer and seller of all our grain. Right now we have a competitive market which handles about 30 percent, raised by cash-grain farmers.

But this would put the Commodity Credit Corporation into the business of buying and selling most of our corn and/or grain sorghums. Also, this would put a ceiling rather than a floor on the income of farmers for the price they receive. You know what the price support program is supposed to do. It is supposed to put a floor under the farmers' prices so that they will not go below that point, and the Commodity Credit Corporation is supposed to handle its stocks so that they will stay up about at the support level. Here you allow the Government to knock the prices down below the support level. Let us look and see what the other commodities have and see what a dangerous precedent that is. At the present time under the law, and if you strike section 3, section 407 will apply: No commodity can be sold for less than 5 percent above the support level plus a reasonable carrying charge. This gives an opportunity for the competitive market to operate. I think that 5 percent above is too small a margin. I think it should be greater than that. Do you know what the cotton people did after their A and B program was terminated? They saw how drastic it was to allow cotton to be sold below the support level. At the beginning of this next market year for cotton the Government shall not sell below 15 percent above the support level plus reasonable carrying charges. This is the direction we ought to go to give some help to the farmers, the producers of these commodities. Yet, this section of the bill proposes to go in exactly the opposite direction. I think it completely unwarranted. We should never allow anyone to have that kind of authority over our market system. I think if we want to increase the farmers' income, we must strike section 3. If we want the first two sections of the bill or the program itself to really work, to really take land out of production and reduce the amount of overproduction and surpluses, then we must strike section 3. If we want to have this bill as an incentive and make it work, section 3 must be stricken.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I just have two questions which I would like to ask the gentleman. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] has had a lifetime of experience in farming, as I have had, and I believe he is practical and his feet are on the ground. Now in relation to this authority supposedly to be given to the Secretary of Agriculture—is there any doubt in your mind but what with the $1.02 cash corn, for example, and held there by action of the Secretary under this law by allowing grain to trickle in, as it undoubtedly would, is there any doubt in your mind but that that would also set the price level on barley, oats, and all feed grains in proportion?

Mr. QUIE. I am certain it would because their market price is related to the price of corn, as it always has been.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Absolutely, and it is based on the cash price of corn and not the price support level of corn.

As the gentleman has rightly said, section 3 destroys for all practical purposes any good that comes to agriculture from this bill in my area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I am in support of the bill which we are presently considering, but with a number of reservations. As a short-range measure and as a step in the right direction, I believe the bill deserves our support. But as we consider it, we should, I believe, recognize the bill for what it is, namely, a stopgap measure designed to give us time to make a beginning on a long-range program to increase farm income and reduce taxpayer expense.

The overall principles of the bill are good, and could well, in modified form, serve as a basis for the long-range approach that is needed in the near future. They provide incentive to the farmer to participate, incentive in the form of increased price supports in return for a reduction in production and in the form of payments for the retired acres, both in cash and in kind. These principles are identical to those embodied in proposals which I have made during this and each of the past 2 years. By providing this incentive, the bill makes it at least somewhat attractive for the farmer to participate in a program designed to reduce the surpluses, through reduced production and payments-in-kind, and, therefore, to reduce the taxpayer costs involved in buying and storing these surpluses.

I say somewhat attractive because, in my opinion, the bill does not offer opportunity for a substantial enough increase in farm income. When we consider the drastic manner in which net farm income has been decreasing, while the remainder of our economy has been flourishing as never before, 74 percent of parity on sharply reduced acreage looks severely inadequate. But it is a start.

Another principle of the bill which deserves commendation is the fact that it is, at least on the surface, voluntary. A farmer may participate or not, as he desires, and this is certainly as it should be. Our long-range program should also be based on a freedom of participation.

But whether the bill we are considering today will actually be voluntary in practice is questionable, and here I would raise an objection to a part of the proposal. Section 3, which provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell surplus corn and grain sorghums at prices down to 17 percent below the support price, could well force all farmers to participate in the program, whether they actually desired to do so or not. The threat of such supplies being placed on the market at such low prices might provide a risk only the foolhardy would take.

Section 3 provides the Commodity Credit Corporation with tremendous potential authority. It makes it the sole

source of the farmer's achieving even a support price, and makes it potentially possible for CCC to determine the market price. Also, by virtue of these items, it has the potential of making the program more costly, in that CCC would be handling an increased volume of grain.

Another objection which must be raised to the bill is the fact that it does not deal with the problem of imports. During the past 12 years, American farmers have not raised as much barley, oats, and rye as we have used domestically and for export purposes. Yet, surpluses of these crops have grown, due to the entirely disproportionate amounts of oats, barley, and rye which we have allowed to enter this country. We have, in effect, been importing surpluses.

There is a question in my mind as to the wisdom of raising price supports on oats, barley, and rye without doing something about these imports. There is no doubt that prices for these crops are far lower than they should be, and should be allowed to rise. But increased prices could well attract increased imports, with the end result that prices could be driven even lower. This is a serious omission of the bill.

Despite these shortcomings, I believe the bill should be approved, in that it provides a badly needed opportunity for better grain prices and a beginning on the task of reducing grain surpluses. It should then be our purpose to make a beginning on the long-range farm program so badly needed—a program which should deal with the entire national agricultural unit and provide a climate for increased farm income and reduced taxpayer costs.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains of the Agriculture Committee I spent a number of days in study of this emergency plan to deal with the feed grain problem, as presented to us by the new Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman. After the subcommittee and the committee as a whole had made a number of changes and amendments to the original bill as introduced, I joined the majority of the members of the Committee on Agriculture in their vote to bring this legislation to the House as a whole for its consideration.

I would like to say for the record at this point that when the report came out from the committee on this bill my name was not on any of the minority reports, and I would like to make it clear that this was an oversight.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. I want to confirm what the gentlewoman has said, in relation to minority views. Due to press of time the minority report had to be filed by midnight of a certain day. Due to some misunderstanding the gentlewoman was not contacted in time for her to express her minority views. I understand that if she had had an opportunity she would have signed the minority views, as expressed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mrs. MAY. I would like to say that I joined to help bring this bill to the floor for consideration, but for reasons well explained by previous speakers, if section 3 remains in this bill my cooperation with the administration of the New Frontier will end at that point.

If this body, in its wisdom—and I assure it will be wisdom—votes to delete section 3 from the bill, then I will give serious consideration to voting in favor of it on final passage. We have a serious and an emergency situation in the present accumulation and buildup of huge stocks of feed grains. A situation that affects every section of our country economically, and the very future of agriculture itself. Though the situation has been with us for many years, constantly worsening, Congress has failed to act affirmatively on it—has remained on dead center—while citizens everywhere plead for action. Some time ago I pledged the people of my area that I would work for and support any plan that seemed to have possible merit to help the situation in any way, regardless of political considerations or pressure from special interest groups. Secretary Freeman, in testimony before our committee has stated that he believes this program will save the taxpayers in the neighborhood of half a billion dollars, and will reduce the buildup of surpluses and at the same time protect the income of the participating farmer and assure the consumer fair and stable prices for food products. Frankly, the more I study this bill, the more doubts I have about this program accomplishing such worthy objectives. But I cannot oppose for opposition's sake at least a 1-year trial run on a plan that the newly installed officials of the Department of Agriculture have asked for on the basis that it will accomplish the ends we all seek. We have witnessed in previous years the tragic situation whereby heads of departments charged with the responsibility of expediting programs to help certain sections of our Nation were constantly being impeded and held back in implementation of these programs by action or lack of action on the part of Congress, sometimes for purely partisan reasons. We have seen this happen from creation of judgeships to farm policies. I do not ever want a purely political obstructionist vote on my record. But I wish also to make it very clear that if this legislation gets my affirmative vote it is because it has been presented to us by this administration as a short-range, emergency measure that will be in effect for only 1 year. I have never deviated from my position that our long-range objective for American agriculture should be more freedom from Government control rather than steps that take us closer to a maximum of Government control. Unfortunately, today, for those of us who adhere to this principle we have such a tragic situation of built-up surpluses casting a shadow over our hopes for restoration of a free market, that interim emergency steps must be taken before we can even begin to give practical consideration to how best to return to the wonderful days when supply and demand were in some reasonable balance.

But on this point of the bill before being enacted as a temporary measure, let us be sure that it is just that. Those Members who represent areas that are feed deficit areas—where much livestock and poultry production exists, where dairying is a major industry—take warning. Under questioning, in the committee, Secretary Freeman testified that this program will not change beef and pork prices, and might even halt the decline of poultry and egg prices. On a 1-year basis the effect of this program might not have serious effects in these fields. But we must always remember that feed grains are of major importance in the production of meat and milk. Adequate supplies at stable prices must always be available if we are to protect not only the feeders, but the consuming public. On a short term basis, we can only hope our fears of this bill are groundless. But I hope if this body takes affirmative action on this legislation they embark on this course determined to have the political courage and the intelligence to end this program at the end of the first year of its operation. Now this can only be done if we pass a sound, long-range program taking into consideration both the wheat and feed grains in their relation to one another in the whole picture of the farm economy and surplus situation which is causing its economic headaches of today. Much like a tax titled "temporary"—legislation called emergency—has a strange way of staying in existence, long after the emergency has passed.

If this program is extended beyond its now admitted deadline, my great apprehension is that it cannot help but seriously hurt the livestock and dairy industry, and through them the consuming public, through a scarcity situation.

I earnestly request that this administration in attempting to solve one problem, please make sure that the solution itself does not became a long-term problem, compounding the troubles of today's American farmers for endless tomorrows.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, after an unavoidable absence it is a great pleasure to return to the well of this House; also it is a great pleasure to serve on the Committee on Agriculture. Let me say at this point that the members of the Committee on Agriculture are almost without exception dedicated people. They would have to be, because it is a very grueling committee upon which to serve and one that is subject to a great deal of problems and difficulties. I am likewise of opinion that in our very sincere effort to try to solve the various farm problems as they come along, many times we have the unfortunate effect instead of enlightening, of further confusing the rest of the membership of the House; in fact, one of my very good friends asked me today when he learned

I was going to take the floor on this bill, whether I was going to further compound the confusion.

One of the things, in my opinion, that has created a great deal of lack of understanding has been the fact that the feed grain problem is associated with livestock. There are many facets to the problem. I know in my State there is a considerable segment of the farmers who grow grain for cash purposes. This area takes in parts of Illinois, Iowa, and Ohio. A different view is held in most cases by the grain and the livestock farmers. In that area corn is grown to feed the livestock and then goes to market in the form of livestock. Historically we have produced most of our own livestock, but I would say to the gentleman from North Carolina, to illustrate how complicated this problem can become, that back in my own county during this past year more than a thousand head of feeder calves were imported from his State to be fed for market on our supply of feed grains.

Historically, many of these feeding cattle have come from the West and we have the opinion of the range cattle producers who really believe, and I think sincerely believe, that cheap grain will make for high-priced feeder cattle for his benefit. All of these conflicting opinions have left many of you confused.

Mr. Chairman, there are some fundamental facts I can leave with you. The great bulk of the income of agriculture comes from feed grain, and the livestock that are the resultant product. I do not go in for statistics very much, but let me say that better than 60 percent or thereabouts, at times as much as two-thirds of all the farm income, is from livestock and livestock products, which makes the market for feed grain.

This is another corollary that is not understood, even by grain producers themselves. The long-range price of livestock and livestock products is determined by the price of feed grain. So I would say to those who figure there is some kind of a quick profit to be made from depressed grain prices, you had better have a second look. We need for a prosperous agriculture a fair price for feed grains, and we need an adequate supply for the cattle and livestock producer in general.

I am going to offer an amendment later, and I do so with some reluctance because my whole instinct in working for the benefit of agriculture has always been to work for things rather than against things. When we finally presented this bill to the full committee I became alarmed because I heard many disquieting reports that this story of the Secretary fixing the price at $1.20 was a sort of a blind to get the bill through, and that he had other ideas when he finally got it past the Congress. I am not inclined to doubt his word, but I do know beyond any question of doubt that there are going to be forces at work in attempting to drive the price of corn and the associated feed grains higher than they should be and higher than they are if we implement this bill without any ceiling on the price of these products. So my amendment will say that the Secretary may fix a price at between 65 and 75 percent of parity. This will provide the present base price that we have already discussed. It will put a ceiling of approximately $1.23 on the price of corn, which gives the Secretary the range that he said he thought he ought to have, and would like to have. I cannot impress too much on you the importance of this amendment because I say it is just as bad to get grain prices too high as it is to get them too cheap.

There has been a lot of talk going on in the House about the great emergency that we have. We do have somewhat of an emergency, but I would like to say that we do not have a year-and-a-half or 2-year supply of feed grain in storage in extra supply. The storage investment looks like it is pretty big in terms of dollars, but do you realize we have in reserve only a little over 6 months' feed supply for the country to take care of the great demand that is put upon us. Bear in mind, we have historically carried in reserve about a 4 months' supply which is regarded as a safe margin to do business on. So we must not get our perspective out of proportion as we look at this problem.

We do have a problem, yes. We should face up to it, yes. But, it is not so dangerous, nor is it so emergent in nature that we need to rush in and do a lot of foolish things and finally find ourselves in a worse position than when we started. Certainly, I think all Members of the House would want to feel, in passing on this legislation, that we were doing something of a constructive nature, even if it is only a short-term bill.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA].

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset of my remarks that I will have nothing to say about the 15-acre wheat allotment.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important bill and I see on the floor scarcely more than those who belong to the various committees on agriculture and the subcommittees on appropriations, and therefore I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. I think these people should be over here listening to further arguments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fourteen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks I would like to commend our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] for the expeditious manner in which he has brought this bill to the floor today. I also wish to commend our ranking member, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] for his participation in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, at this late hour, I do not believe many Members are still undecided on the bill presently before us.

Let me say at the outset, that on yesterday when our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] mentioned that this bill was recommended out of our subcommittee with only one abstention and that was by a Member from Illinois, he was in error. That abstention happened to be by the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I thought I had corrected that in the RECORD. It was a mistake. I thought I had corrected it. Maybe I did not. If I did not, I am very sorry.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman. I wanted to make that clear, because the gentleman from North Carolina and I are in full agreement on the point that he mentioned yesterday, which I will point out later in my remarks.

At the time the new Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, was before our committee, I mentioned to him that the bill that he presented to the Congress with his recommendation, which has since been stricken out, contained three principles that I thought should be in any farm bill. First of all, it was at least called voluntary, even though it has been adequately pointed out that this is a voluntary-compulsory measure. Second, it dealt with land retirement. And, I am for that. And, thirdly, it dealt with payment-in-kind.

I am one who believes that the end does not always justify the means. It seems to me that as this bill progressed in our subcommittee and through our committee, certain legislative barnacles, as I wish to call them, became attached to the bill and I think it is time for this fact to be pointed out here today.

First of all, I would like to direct your attention to the title of this bill. It deals with feed grains. It says, "A bill to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961." If you will look at the bill on page 4, lines 17 and 18, you will see that we added another farm commodity in committee—and this was not in the bill that was presented by the Secretary of Agriculture—soybeans; and in line 18 the words "or oilseed crops." Perhaps this is the reason points of order on this bill were waived. We cannot raise a point of order at this time, but I want to point out to you what this little amendment does.

Beginning on line 15, page 4, it states:

> The Secretary shall require as a condition of eligibility for price support on the 1961 crop of corn, grain sorghums, soybeans, and any other feed grain or oilseed crops which he may designate that the producer shall participate in the special agricultural conservation program for 1961 for corn and grain sorghums.

Let me tell you what this is. This is cross-compliance, if you please. There are certain gentlemen in this House who have been after this corn-soybean cross-compliance feature in the law for a good many years and they have not been able to secure it, and now they are attempting to accomplish it in this bill, a feed-grain bill. We are going to say to our farmers in the State of Ohio who have

been raising both corn and soybeans, that before you can secure price support for your soybeans you must participate in this program for corn. What an advantage this is to those areas that grow only corn. Take out the corn-soybean cross-compliance provision in this bill and I predict you will lose a lot of votes from the corn States of the West. This is a vote-catching gimmick and I object to it in principle and I object to the attempt to bury it in this bill dealing only with feed grains.

Let us take the figure of $1.20 which has been talked about for the support price of corn. What does this actually mean to the farmer? Is it $1.20? No; it is really $1.09. I took the time yesterday to call the Deputy Director, Grain Division of the Commodity Stabilization Service, Mr. George Hanson, to find out; and let me give you a hypothetical case.

A farmer out in your State on October 1 delivers his corn to the grain elevator, and puts it on loan under this program until July 31. Does he get $1.20? No, he does not. They immediately deduct a prepayment for storage at 11 cents per bushel. So he actually gets $1.09. The only way he is going to get $1.20 is to store the grain on the farm or he redeems it and sells it on the open market at $1.20. So we are not talking about $1.20, we are talking about $1.09, and let us not fool anybody about that.

I also took the time to look up the market quotations back in Bowling Green, Ohio, on this date. I have the price of corn from three different elevators. At one they were paying $1.18, if you please, on the open market. At another one, for some unknown reason, they were only paying $1.07, and at another one they were only paying $1.07.

This is only 2 cents below what the farmer would actually be getting if this bill became law after he was required to put at least 20 percent of his acreage into the land retirement section of this bill in return for only a 50-percent payment in cash for his retired acreage based on his average production in 1959 and 1960.

Now I come to the point in this bill on which the chairman and I agree. That is on page 4, beginning in line 9 and ending on line 14, the bushelage control feature of the bill. I have said many times, I am unalterably opposed to bushelage controls for agriculture. The farmers in Ohio are unalterably opposed to bushelage controls. In adopting bushelage control, we are saying to American agriculture, "You have progressed just far enough. Do not progress any further, Mr. Farmer, because you are not going to get price support on any additional bushelage you might produce." Do you want to say this to American agriculture? I think not. Let us continue to have progress in agriculture, not retrogression.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill as presented to us by the House Committee on Agriculture. In its present form we might well ask the question "What does this bill do to the farmer, rather than for the farmer."

The whole question of feed grains and what should be done about them cannot and should not be considered without taking into account our wheat surplus which is in the greatest supply of all commodities with approximately 2½ years' supply on hand.

I was sorry indeed that on yesterday the administration farm bill proposal was not sent up here as originally planned. Had it been this legislation could have been considered in whole and as to what to do with wheat. Undoubtedly, the message which did not come, dealt with wheat and if I were to hazard a guess whenever it is sent to us for consideration it will include a proposal for a two- or three-price system for wheat. Then might I ask you, what will the effect of such a proposal have on what it is proposed we do here today and what will its effect be on the future of corn?

This bill suggests that if enacted it will save at least a half a billion dollars through a reduction in storage costs. What I would like to ask is how can you bring about such a reduction in costs when at the same time, through implementing this program, the Government must pay for idle acres and in substantial amount if there is, as has been suggested, as many as 75 percent of the farmers coooperating in the program?

Likewise, if section 3 remains in the bill, and the Secretary of Agriculture is permitted to sell commodities presently in storage at 17 percent below the suggested support price, who pays the loss except Uncle Sam? In other words, I am not at all convinced that this proposal can effectuate any savings at all.

It is stated this is an emergency 1-year bill. Naturally the question that then follows is: What next when the Committee on Agriculture considers permanent legislation? Will the pattern of this bill be followed, and will we be moving directly into the mold of rigid, strict, and absolute controls over agriculture? I cannot, nor do I, believe this is what our farmers want. I think the records of the past clearly indicate that they desire to move toward more freedom and less controls in agriculture.

This bill surely needs amending, and we should attempt to do just that. Many amendments will be offered. I shall offer one which will change the language in the bill which reads: "Average yield per acre for the farm for 1959–60" to "Normal yield for any farm in the case of corn or grain sorghum during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the year in which the normal yield is determined."

This bill would reinstate the discredited acreage allotment concept for corn and grain sorghums. In the Agricultural Act of 1958, Congress provided corn farmers an opportunity to vote for or against corn acreage allotments. Corn producers threw out by a vote of 254,262 to 102,907 in a 1958 referendum, acreage allotments for corn. Thus, by a vote of more than 2 to 1, corn farmers in 1958 rejected corn allotments and high price supports, and voted for the elimination of corn allotments with a lower level of price supports.

Corn allotments are not practical. They have never worked, and have not resulted in the whole history of farm programs, in the curtailed production of corn. Congress, by its own action in 1954, eliminated the marketing quota provision attached to corn allotments, with the full realization that it would be impossible to enforce. A high percentage of corn is fed on farms, and to police an acreage allotment and marketing quotas program for corn would be literally impossible.

For the Congress now to reinstate these discredited allotments on any basis is unthinkable. If, however, we are foolish enough to reinstate them over the protest of farmers, certainly in all fairness we should use at least a 5-year history from 1955–60 rather than a 2-year history. Many farmers stepped up their acreage the last 2 years, while other farmers continued a good farm rotation. It is extremely unfair to those farmers that followed a good rotation practice to use the 1959–60 years as a base in setting corn allotments. By such action, we would be giving a bonus to those who have caused the problem, and penalizing severely those that have not caused the corn surplus problem.

Therefore, in fairness to all corn farmers, I would like to submit an amendment to this feed grain bill which would make it mandatory on the Secretary of Agriculture to use a 5-year history rather than a 2-year history. I want it understood that I am against corn allotments because farmers voted them out, but if the House is now going to vote them back in, certainly it should be done on a fair and equitable basis.

This farm question is a complicated problem. As we have learned over the years, there is no easy answer to it and hasty action on our part at this time might prove to be more detrimental than helpful to our farmer.

So that you might know or catch a glimpse of what may be ahead in the future, I would like to read a short excerpt which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Monday, March 6, under the heading: "Farm Philosophy." Listen as I read:

> Though the objectives of Mr. Freeman's plans are readily discernible, just how far he will dare go remains uncertain. Some of the ideas being tossed at him almost defy comprehension in their complexity, yet they come from reputable sources. Grapple, if you will, with Mr. Cochrane's proposal to control the production of feed grains—corn, oats, barley, rye, and grain sorghums.
>
> Feed grains pose a special difficulty because many farmers feed most of these grains to their own livestock and sell the balance. The problem is how to measure what is fed to animals. Mr. Cochrane suggests that feed grain nutritional values be converted into something called "total digestible nutrients," or TDN's. The Government, with advice from interested groups, would calculate (1) what level of prices would be fair for a given year for all livestock; (2) how many animals of various kinds would have to be marketed to achieve these prices; (3) how many TDN's it would take to produce that many animals; (4) allot TDN's to feed grain producers according to production history of their farms.

A conversion factor for each would convert the TDN allotment to bushels. That is, a bushel of corn would be worth so many TDN's, oats would be worth about half as many, and so on. A farmer then would be allowed to grow whatever feed grains he pleases as long as the total does not exceed his TDN allotment.

RURAL ARITHMETIC

When planting time comes, the farmer converts his TDN's to bushels of grain; the bushels are then converted into acres on the basis of average yields in the area. Finally, the farmer sows. When crops begin showing above the ground, an Agriculture Department agent computes the acreage planted to each grain to one-hundredth of an acre. If the farmer has done his arithmetic correctly, he may do whatever he wishes with the feed grain he harvests—feed it or sell it. If the farmer exceeds his acreage, he must agree to destroy the overage or pay a stiff penalty.

At the end of the marketing year, Government economists would review the nationwide results. If too many animals were marketed, the national TDN allotment would be reduced. In theory, this would make feed scarce causing a price rise that would prompt a cutback in livestock production. If too few animals were marketed, more TDN's would be decreed.

Again, I ask that this House either carefully amend this bill or defeat it. This I feel we must do if we truly intend to be of help to the farmer now and in the future. Let me repeat, in its present form I certainly oppose passage of this legislation as presented to us by the committee.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman when he suggests the 5-year period instead of 2 years. I pointed out it would be very difficult for the Secretary of Agriculture to obtain accurate information. But, would the gentleman be agreeable to an amendment which would at the proper place provide "and to give due consideration to tillable acreage, crop rotation practices, and type of soil and topography"? The gentleman yesterday pointed out how important it was to take into consideration crop rotation practices. I understand in some States and, perhaps, in the gentleman's own State, the records are more complete and more accurate than they are in other States, and this would give the Secretary of Agriculture the right to take into consideration the very things that the gentleman appears to be interested in. We will offer this amendment, or someone will offer it, and I hope it will be acceptable to the gentleman on this point even though there might be other objectionable features in the bill.

Mr. ARENDS. I am pleased to know that the gentleman is looking in the right direction, and I appreciate his comments this time. I shall, however, offer my amendment in the hope it will be favorably considered by the House.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I have taken these 2 minutes, first, to ask a question and, then, to make a very brief statement. The question is directed to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. Is this program designed to raise or to lower the cash market price of feed grains such as corn?

Mr. COOLEY. It will increase the loan price to the cooperator, but it would leave the market prices available to noncooperators substantially about where they are.

Mr. KYL. The purpose is to leave the price where it is?

Mr. COOLEY. That is for the noncooperator, but for the cooperator, the price would go from $1.06 to $1.20.

Mr. KYL. I am asking about the market price and not about the selling price or the loan price.

Mr. COOLEY. No one has any way of knowing exactly what the market prices will be because that would depend on the supply of corn and other feed grains moving in the markets. The bill would prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from selling good corn at less than $1 a bushel.

Mr. KYL. But is the purpose of the bill to raise or lower the cash market price on corn?

Mr. COOLEY. The purpose of the bill is to bring about a reduction in the production of corn and feed grain, and to bring about a decrease in the amount now in storage. The bill we are talking about is something that will do those two things.

Mr. KYL. As the thing is designed, it seeks to promote compliance by placing penalties on those who do not comply. That, as the gentleman says, prevents the farmer from receiving any benefit if he does not comply. But the man who complies with the program takes payment in kind and finds himself penalized.

Mr. COOLEY. He would not be penalized if he takes payment in kind.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman for his answer but it does not enlighten me.

For the past 8 years I have been hearing from members of the opposition party the continued statement that if we would get rid of the Secretary of Agriculture our farm problem would be solved.

During the recent campaign we heard presentation of glamorous programs guaranteed to solve the farm problems.

After election the President appointed task forces, so called, to present solutions.

In spite of all—we are now presented a temporary emergency crash program for 1 year. The proponents say in effect: This is the best we can do in a hurry. We will start immediately to work on a long-range program.

All of which proves that (at least so far as agriculture is concerned) the new frontier bunkhouse is still full of "bunk."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, it shall be my purpose to seek, if possible, to shed some light on what is not right with the proposed legislation to deal with a farm problem that is very grave today and may become a crisis before long.

It must be noted and admitted that the total farm problem is a complex and difficult one; one that demands thorough and complete study by experienced and competent farmers, by able and interested agricultural leaders, and by knowledgeable students and experienced researchers. It seems to me, it is abundantly evident that the situation calls for new plans and ideas that involve serious and thorough research to determine to what point in our storage program we actually have a surplus, and to what point the so-called surplus should be allowed to affect the free market of feed and grains. Results of this kind of a program of study and research which is very much needed will take many months. A task force, no matter how much talent, experience and understanding of the problem it has within its membership and even if it were completely immobilized from political pressures, could not possibly come up with adequate answers in a matter of weeks or even several months. Therefore it must be concluded that this bill is the result of very inadequate study.

So I would like to suggest that the great Committee on Agriculture consider now setting up a qualified, completely bipartisan, task force with authority to study and investigate all the problems in all the areas that affect agriculture in every part of the United States, and report back to Congress at some future date with some studies and information that could result in some adequate and fair legislation on the more complex problems.

This should not mean, however, that we should not try to do something now that would be good for agriculture and good for the country. There are many people, especially in the organized farm groups, who have been thinking about this, studying this problem and who have ideas about some plans that would be good for America and could have a salutary effect on the difficult surplus problem.

A suggestion that these farm leaders have brought forward for our consideration is called a Crop Adjustment Act or a conservation reserve program. I like this approach because it is not only good for farmers but it is good for all Americans.

When we aid and abet programs that feature conserving the water, soil, and replaceable natural resources, we are participating in a program that is good for all of America.

An adequate conservation program that features saving and building soil is a program that will benefit every living person within America and will strengthen the whole of our economy and provide assurance for adequate food supply for those who come after us.

Mr. Chairman, during and after the election, in visiting with the farmers from the First District of Iowa which I have the honor to represent, I found complete support by all farm leaders for this program.

Representatives of the National Farmers Organization, the newest of the several farm organizations in my District, indicated to me that they were in complete support of the philosophy suggested in a bill that I have since introduced, H.R. 2736.

The Farmers Union members in my district, with whom I have visited, see much merit in this approach as does one of the older farm organizations—the Grange.

The Farm Bureau from my district expressed complete confidence in this approach. Every national affairs committee from every Farm Bureau in every county in my district has indicated enthusiastic support of this approach.

The bill I introduced on January 16, 1961, H.R. 2736, provides legislation to expand the conservation reserve program under the soil bank to 80 million acres. This feature would seek to amend the Soil Bank Act and the Agricultural Act of 1956 in order to make necessary adjustments in the Nation's agricultural economy and I believe would tend to bring supply more nearly in line with demand.

The bill would provide a $10,000 annual payment limitation to any one producer in any State.

The 10 amendments included in my bill are, as follows:

First. Extend the period during which the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into conservation reserve contracts through 1969;

Second. Change the authorized period of contracts for the establishment of tree cover from 15 to 20 years;

Third. Provide for a limit of 80 million acres under the conservation reserve program in lieu of the monetary limit as now provided in the Soil Bank Act;

Fourth. Make land owned by the State and Federal Governments ineligible to be placed in the conservative reserve program.

Fifth. Provide for a $10,000 annual payment limitation to any producer within any State;

Sixth. Authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make annual payments in cash or by the issuance of certificates redeemable in wheat or feed grains;

Seventh. Require the Secretary of Agriculture to formulate and announce the conservation reserve program not later than March 1 of the year preceding the first year of the contract period;

Eighth. Require producers who enter into conservation reserve contracts to agree to carry out farming operations on the entire farm in accordance with good farming practices;

Ninth. Provide for a 100-percent civil penalty instead of 50-percent as now provided in the Soil Bank Act; and

Tenth. Provide that for a period of 5 years after such lands are first devoted to agricultural production, newly irrigated or drained lands within any Federal irrigation or drainage project or lands reclaimed by flood-control projects shall be ineligible for certain crop loans, soil bank payments, price support benefits, and other farm payments.

After more thought and after further counsel with agriculture leaders in the Government, on the committees and with the leaders of farm organizations in Washington, I have introduced another bill, or a refined version of my original bill. This bill was introduced February 13, 1961. It is H.R. 4267.

This bill differs from the original bill in that it authorized taking out of production up to 100 million acres of agricultural land.

This bill provides, also, a plan to fit the farm output to market needs and at the same time liquidate the apparent accumulated Government stock in surplus, by providing a payment-in-kind feature.

After counsel and advice with the leaders, I have preferred to call this the Cropland Adjustment Act of 1961 but I want to emphasize that this plan also is a conservation plan. In this area, it would be just as effective and probably more effective than the original bill I introduced on this subject.

As I see it, Mr. Speaker, this plan, if enacted into law, would be a major step toward better farm prices and an increase in per family farm income as well as a means of reducing the tax cost of the farm program.

My bill calls for the Secretary of Agriculture to make an annual determination of the overall acreage adjustment of feed grains, wheat, soybeans, and flax necessary to bring the total estimated annual production plus the anticipated disappearance. The Secretary shall also establish annually the percentage of cropland which must be placed under contract to qualify for price support of these commodities. This is the payment-in-kind feature.

To be eligible for price supports on wheat, feed grains, soybeans, and flax, producers must participate in the cropland adjustment program. Cropland already in a retirement program shall be counted in determining compliance with this requirement. Producers of other commodities may also participate. Any cropland retired under the program in excess of the minimum requirement for price supports must be placed under contract for at least 3 years.

Other features of this bill, H.R. 4267, include:

First. Cropland adjustment payments shall be made at a level which will encourage voluntary participation to attain the desired result;

Second. Annual payments may be made in cash or in kind. Emphasis would be placed on payment in kind with care to minimize disturbance of the market price structure of grain;

Third. Cropland retired under the program must be in addition to land normally left idle or fallowed;

Fourth. Acreage retired under the program may not be harvested or grazed;

Fifth. A maximum limit shall be placed on the percentage of cropland acreage that may be retired in any county after allowing for minimum acreage required for price support. Acreage retired under previous programs shall not prevent participation in the annual adjustment program; and

Sixth. Wheat acreage allotments shall be terminated;

Seventh. The price support level on corn shall be left unchanged and related to the average price received by farmers during the immediately preceding 3 years with a floor of 65 percent of parity, the same as the Agricultural Act of 1958. The support levels for other food grains and wheat shall be comparable to the level for corn with adjustments for the difference in weight, nutritive value, buyer preference, and supply-demand conditions. The support price for wheat of the 1962 crop shall not be less than 120 percent of the support price for corn of the 1962 crop;

Eighth. Adequate measures shall be taken to protect farmers from the competition of Commodity Credit sales from accumulated stocks.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out that we have been in session now a long time. The record shows that the Agriculture Committee met first to organize on February 20. Since that time, the committee has had 24 formal hearings, with only 9 hearings on H.R. 4510—the bill before us.

Mr. Chairman, it is hard for me to understand why, when all the farm organizations in America are in complete support of the philosophy embodied in a conservation reserve or cropland adjustment program act, the great Agriculture Committee of the House has not even had 1 day of hearing on this proposition. This is all the more amazing when one thinks about other endorsements—political endorsements that have been made on this proposition.

There is a document, bearing the date of July 12, 1960, called "The Rights of Man." It is the Democrat platform adopted in Los Angeles. Nowhere do I find any opposition reflected in this pamphlet to what I have proposed in both H.R. 2736 and H.R. 4267, for American agriculture. Further the record also shows that many of the important leaders of the Democratic political party indicated sympathetic interest in this approach to the problem during the campaign last fall.

At another meeting soon after the above-mentioned document was offered, another great, and I think the greatest, political organization in America met in Chicago and there the representatives of the people wrestled mightily with the great problems that confront us on many fronts. The Republican resolution committee, after thorough and complete study of the problem and proposed answers, endorsed the idea of "Conservation Reserve Program" and/or "A Cropland Adjustment Act."

But, this great legislative body, elected to represent the people and to reflect their interest and their ideals and ideas has not even seen fit to give consideration to some of the proposals that I think of great merit and can, in the long run, do more for the farmers of America and at the same time be in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, there is a demand everywhere in the agricultural

communities for a conservation reserve program. It is something we need whether we pass this legislation before us or not.

Since so much has already been stated on the bill before us, and since it is quite apparent to me that this is stopgap legislation, that it is politically inspired, that it was authored apparently in haste and with the endorsement of a task force that could not possibly understand all of the complex problems, it might be advisable to defeat this legislation or send this bill back to the committee and ask the committee forthwith to come to grips with the real problems in a more realistic and a more adequate way.

Certainly, section 3 of this bill ought to be defeated and it ought to be noted that authorities in the field of agriculture, who understand this problem better than we do and who have more reason to be interested in this than we do, apparently are unanimous in their opinion that this legislation holds very few, if any, answers to the complex and difficult problems that have presented themselves in this age of change through improved techniques and greater knowledge and ability to produce from the American soil by progressive, forward-looking, and ingenious farmers in a great free land.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I should like to place in the RECORD a portion of a letter I received from a representative of one of the great farm organizations in my State. He writes:

Between February 27 and March 3, the Iowa Farm Bureau held nine district meetings to discuss national policy on farm problems. These meetings were attended by more than 800 farmers and farm wives—people who actually live on Iowa farms. At all of these meetings considerable discussion was held on the various farm programs. The proposed emergency feed grain program was discussed in detail. At first many people felt it had some merit, but after the discussion in every instance people did not seem to think it was an answer to our farm problem. Farmers are concerned that no provision is made for wheat in the bill. Livestock farmers certainly do not see any merit in the bill. There was general feeling that a permanent conservation and land retirement program was needed immediately. Temporary programs such as the proposed feed grain proposal might further complicate the situation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 24 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, we have had a rather broad discussion of the pending bill. Perhaps we ought to go back and review just what we were trying to do.

I think it has been outlined several times, probably correctly, by other speakers, but shall I say that our audience changes from time to time, and some of those who were here yesterday are not here today, and vice versa.

I think we must bear in mind in the first place that the U.S. Government now has an investment of over $4 billion in feed grains. Most of this is corn, with a very substantial amount in grain sorghum. The storage costs several hundred million dollars per year and interest at only 3 percent is another hundred million dollars. There is no marketplace for this grain. The grain is not needed. It benefits no one except the storage people and the warehousemen. We are presently paying nearly a half billion dollars a year for this storage of unneeded feed grain. The existence of this stockpile depresses the value of every bushel of grain in the United States.

The administration wants to stop this senseless buildup, and so do I and so do most of the farmers and so do most of our taxpayers. I believe that if we can reduce the rate at which grain moves into storage and ultimately reverse the flow so that more comes out than goes in, we can ultimately save billions of dollars to the taxpayers.

We believe that such a policy would result in better income for the grain farmers and in the long run for the general situation of the livestock people.

How does this bill attempt to bring about this change? Basically, it proposes to use the surplus we now have to pay for reduced production, to make reduced production desirable.

In spite of all that has been said, this is not a crop control bill.

It does not require anybody to reduce the production of anything. I want you to bear this in mind and place it against the statements to the contrary which have been so recklessly made. I repeat, this bill does not require anybody to reduce his production of anything if he is satisfied to take the market price.

Mr. MASON. If.

Mr. POAGE. Yes; if he is satisfied to take the market price. If he wants to be entirely free, if he honestly beileves—and I know there are some who honestly do believe—that the U.S. Government should not do anything for agriculture; if he is honest about that and wants the Government to leave him alone both in his production and in his marketing, the Government is willing to do it. The Government is willing to say to him that he can plant every acre of his land in feed grains and he can get just what he can on the market, and no more; we are not going to help him get anything more. I think that is probably a very fair proposition.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. When I have finished my statement I will yield.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I wish to clear up that particular point just a little.

Mr. POAGE. I will yield to the gentleman when I have completed my statement. I do not want to be discourteous, to my good friend from Minnesota, but I know if I once start yielding the chances are I will not be able to complete the statement. So I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman when I have completed my discussion.

But if the farmer wants support at the hands of his Government we say that if he is willing to make some concessions, if he is willing to help work down this great stock of feed grains by reducing his planting by at least 20 percent we will give him some assistance which we think will be very helpful. We will guarantee him a much better price for his grain than he is getting right now, and we will assure him a return from his land which we think will be much greater than he can get if he plants it to feed grains as a noncooperator. We will give him 50 or 60 percent of what he would normally expect to grow on this land without the expense of making a crop, if he will but conserve that land. So we think we are offering some substantial inducements in this program. These inducements will undoubtedly be adequate to encourage most growers to participate.

Yet we realize that when we establish a support price for cooperators there is an opportunity for noncooperators to sell their product in the market just below the support price, no matter where the support price is. If you offer a support price but put no restrictions on one group of producers that group with no restrictions and no responsibilities will sell in the market just below the support price. We say we will fix a support price of $1.20 for corn and other feed grains in proportion. The noncooperators would come in and offer his grain at the equivalent of $1.18. So it is obvious that the program cannot work unless we make this practice of overplanting unprofitable. Since the noncooperator will have done nothing in the world to bring about the higher price we anticipate, it seems clear that we owe him no assistance in giving him any higher price.

The bill proposes to discourage these noncooperators, discourage this destructive practice of overplanting by authorizing the Secretary to sell surplus stocks at market price, but not lower than $1, which is the present average price, whenever the Secretary finds it is advisable. Thus the noncooperator will not be disturbed so long as the price of grain stays where it is, but should the program cause the price to advance, we authorize the Secretary to hold the market about where it is right now until all cooperators' grain has been sold, and thus save a tremendous loss to the taxpayers which the Government would otherwise sustain on grain on which it has a loan.

Not only would this action on the part of the Secretary save the taxpayers money, but it would encourage cooperation. Surely, if we are to have a program at all it must encourage enough participation to get real reduction in production, or it will be far worse than useless. That is all there is to this much-criticized section 3.

I know that many people have wired and written and called about this section. Many of them have communicated with me. I have had to ask each one of them, "What would you put in this bill in place of this section to secure a good degree of cooperation?" That question has been asked on this floor, and nobody has answered it here, and none of my correspondents has answered it. I have had some say, "Surely there must be some other way of handling this," but nobody has suggested what that other way of handling this is. There is not anyone who has answered that question. Until somebody gives you an answer to that

question I do not believe you are justified in assuming that there is any way of getting the needed compliance without section 3.

I have observed that a great many people have given a lot of lipservice to this bill. They say "I want to help the farmer." They then go on and in effect although not in direct words say: "This bill will help the farmer, and I want to be counted as a friend of the farmer, but I want to put a time bomb in the bill which will completely destroy its effectiveness; something that will take out the heart of the bill and all of the enforcement of the bill. I want to fix it so that the man who does not comply will be really the one who will make money out of the bill." That is the man who stores the grain.

Now, I have some extremely good friends in the storage business. Every one of you have. All of those fellows have made enough money from storing U.S. Government grain that they can afford to call or wire you, but very few of my farmers can afford $1.40 to send a telegram. However, many of these storage people can afford the $5.40 to talk to you on the telephone. There are about $60 million involved in additional storage in this bill which we will save if we can keep this section in here. Of course, if you can fix it so everybody will grow as much grain as they have grown in the past, there would be more grain stored. You will not cut down the amount of the cost of this unnecessary storage.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, who have you been hearing from about this bill? Who has been talking to you? Who has been making suggestions about section 3?

Someone asked, Why would this not work without section 3? Let me take an illustration of a farm I know so well consisting of 540 acres in west Texas, in the grain area, the feed-grain area. It has about 50 acres of feed-grain history. In other years they have had 300 or 400 acres in grain but not for the past 2 years. That farmer can only get paid for 20 acres if he goes into the program. He can only get $1.20 on his normal production on about 30 acres.

That is not much of an inducement for a 500-acre farmer to go into the program.

But if he stays out, without section 3, he can plant, and he would plant, every acre except his cotton allotment, which is 150 acres, leaving him about 400 acres that he would plant in grain sorghums. That 400 acres will offset what a dozen farmers around him will contribute in the way of reduction by reducing their acreage. Under this bill the man who complies is not required to take out more than 20 percent of his grain acres. He cannot take out more than 40 percent, therefore he cannot make a great dent in the surplus. But the man who does not comply, in order to make money must become a big producer. The man who does not comply is going to put practically every acre into feed grain because that is the way he makes his profit.

He goes into feed grains in a big way and his increased plantings destroy what a great many compliers have done. He is able to produce a substantial volume of feed grain and bring it onto the market where he offers it just under the support price. If the support price is $1.20, he offers it for $1.18. As long as there is need for feed grain he is going to sell it and not comply.

Of course, it is true, as has been said, that every bushel of compliance grain is going into the Government loan just so long as there is noncompliance grain on the market. Now, if you want to save the Government from acquiring a vast stock of grain under loan, the thing you must do is to see that there is not a great deal of noncompliance grain coming onto the market, because if there is anything like enough noncompliance grain coming in to satisfy the needs of the market, there never will be any of that compliance grain moving out of Government hands. It will stay there and make good business for some storage man for a good many years to come. It will likely have eaten up more in storage than the grain is worth when it is sold. That is the way this thing works.

Now, those of you who want to pass a bill for the benefit of the farmer should bear in mind that it cannot benefit the farmer unless you get a substantial reduction in production. Everybody says that we have got too much surplus grain on hand. Oh, even those organizations which oppose doing anything, even those groups who do not want anything except lower and lower support prices and more and more production, say we should not have so much in storage. You know that. There is not a man or woman on this floor who does not feel that we should cut down this storage. Well, you have a chance to cut it down. You have had chances before to cut it down. You voted them down. Oh, yes, you voted previous reduction programs down. You have a chance this afternoon to cut production. The question now is, Are you going to vote to cut production or are you going to vote to simply store more grain for some people who have already done right well at the hands of our Government? I do not think we owe anyone an obligation to continue to produce grain, just to enable someone to store more grain.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. I understand the gentleman does not feel that without section 3 the bill will be of any great value; that they might even produce more corn than we are already producing.

Mr. POAGE. I have great fear in that respect. I certainly fear that if you take section 3 out of this bill, you will have certainly taken the most effective tool the Secretary has with which to make a success of this program. Are you willing to tie the hands of your Secretary? We are not asking that you do something revolutionary for the Secretary. As has been suggested here, sure, we are asking that you let the Secretary sell corn at the market price, even though that market price stays at $1. It is $1 now. We are not talking about driving anything down. The market price is $1. The Department of Agriculture figures for the 15th day of February, just 3 weeks ago, showed the average price in the United States to be $1. Now we say to you, "The noncompliers are not going to do anything to help raise this price, so we will keep this price where it is now," and if a farmer thinks that he can make a profit by noncompliance, we say to the noncomplier, "You will be getting just as much as you are getting today. We are not driving your price down, but we are not going to let you share in the increase which those compliers are going to bring about." Is that not fair? Is there anything unfair about this?

Let me call your attention to this further thing. They say, "Oh, the Secretary ought not to have the right to depress the market." Let me call your attention to this fact, that right today the Secretary can sell grain in the market at $1.12 a bushel. We are only asking that he be allowed to sell it for 12 cents a bushel less than the present figure at which he can sell it. Now, is there any difference in principle in letting the Secretary sell grain at $1 and the principle of letting the Secretary sell it at $1.12 a bushel?

I ask you about the principle, my friends, those who are so disturbed about the principle. There is a 12-cent difference, but there is no difference in principle.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ULLMAN. The gentleman is making an excellent statement, and I could not agree with him more. I think it is most essential for the farmers of America that we pass this bill. I would like some indication from my friend, however, on one point, and that is what protection do those farmers have who have placed their feed-grain acreage under the soil-conservation program during the past years and whose contract has now expired?

Mr. POAGE. They have the protection of the Soil Bank Act, which provided that if they placed allotted acres into the soil bank their allotments will be preserved and that the history of their production would be preserved.

Mr. ULLMAN. They will not be penalized, then, for having their acreage in reserve?

Mr. POAGE. As I see it, they cannot be penalized, because the Soil Bank Act gave them the protection of the history that they had at the time they placed it in there.

Mr. ULLMAN. So their 1959 to 1960 production will be considered as if they had that soil bank acreage included in feed grains at the time?

Mr. POAGE. That is right; if it was put in as feed-grain acres.

Mr. ULLMAN. I thank the gentleman and commend him again for an excellent presentation.

Mr. POAGE. I want to bring out one more point. It has been suggested that this bill might work a hardship upon the livestock industry and upon consuming areas, and there has been particular reference made to the chicken industry. I want to call your attention to certain

facts. I think I have the figures here, but do not have the time to hunt up all the details.

In 1956 corn was supported at $1.58 a bushel. That is almost 50 percent more than the $1.06 price at which it is supported now. At that time I sold calves for 35 cents a pound, and I will do well to sell those same calves for 25 cents this spring. My constituents sold broiler chickens for 17 and 18 cents at that time, and they will do well to get 12 or 13 cents right now. And yet I say to my friends from the big cities the cost of the grocery basket was about 18 percent less at that time than it is today. You know how the cost of living has gone on up, up, up as the price of corn has gone down, down, down. Do not tell me in the face of these indisputable facts that raising the support price on corn means a loss either to the chicken people, the livestock people, or the consumer. History shows a different set of facts.

I call your attention to the fact that unless you leave section 3 in this bill, these chicken people are probably going to be put in a squeeze. If you leave section 3 in this bill, they will see that for the immediate future they will probably be able to continue to buy a substantial amount of feed grains at a rather low price, with a certainty that the price will be higher this fall.

There is no factor known to economics which will so strengthen the market for chickens or for livestock as a feed grain situation like that. The greatest strengthening factor you can find for any animal product is a relatively stable feed grain price at the present with the prospect of an increased price down the line in the future.

If you want to be of help to the chicken people, to the poultry people, to the dairy people, to the livestock people, you must vote for this bill and for section 3. If you want to give to the American consuming public the same opportunity that we had when our wives were able to pay the grocery bill for some 15 or 20 percent less than we are having to spend today, then recreate the conditions that existed at that desirable time.

I do not have to tell you what my conclusions are. I am merely telling you what the facts of history are. You can argue against conclusions but you cannot disprove the facts of history.

I submit that this bill offers an opportunity to do something now for farmers without any compulsion, without any degree of Government interference with their business, with the opportunity for every man to remain an absolutely free agent, if he wants to, but with the opportunity to cooperate with his Government to his own financial advantage, if he wants to.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-four Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names.

[Roll No. 11]

Ashley	Davis, Tenn.	Kluczynski
Ashmore	Dawson	Machrowicz
Bailey	Diggs	Miller, N.Y.
Bennett, Mich.	Dooley	Rabaut
Blitch	Evins	Reece
Bonner	Fallon	Scherer
Buckley	Frelinghuysen	Springer
Cahill	Hoffman, Mich.	Steed
Casey	Jensen	Tollefson
Celler	Kilburn	Wright

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. IKARD of Texas, 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. 4510, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 400 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) The level of price support for the 1961 crop of corn shall be established by the Secretary at such level not less than 65 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary may determine. Price support for corn and grain sorghums shall be made available on not to exceed the normal production of each eligible farm as determined by multiplying the harvested acreage of corn and grain sorghums on the farm by the average yield per acre for 1959 and 1960.

"(2) The Secretary shall require as a condition of eligibility for price support on the 1961 crop of corn, grain sorghums, soybeans, and any other feed grain or oilseed crops which he may designate that the producer shall participate in the special agricultural conservation program for 1961 for corn and grain sorghums to the extent prescribed by the Secretary."

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARVEY of Indiana: On page 4, line 8, after the words "65 per centum", insert the words "nor more than 75 per centum."

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the nature of this amendment was explained a short time ago when I had time during general debate.

The Secretary said when he appeared before our committee that he would like authority to fix the price of corn at $1.20 a bushel. Historically the House has never resorted, except as I understand in the case of dairy products, to the policy of fixing price in terms of dollars and cents, but has always adhered to a policy of fixing it in terms of a percentage of parity. In this instance we did fix a floor of 65 percent which is the present level of price support for corn. My amendment would provide a ceiling of $1.23 a bushel or 75 percent of parity for corn which gives the Secretary the range that he deems desirable within which to fix the price of corn.

I think it is very important that we do this as a matter of policy in the House in considering this particular piece of legislation. I should appreciate it very much if I may have your support in making this very important decision.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was considered by our committee and rejected. The fact and the truth is that the Secretary of Agriculture first proposed to fix the price of corn, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] has said, at $1.20. I did not like the idea of fixing price supports at a dollar-and-cents level and so we changed the bill in the committee to provide that he would fix it at a percentage of parity which would turn out to be $1.20 per bushel. The $1.20 figure is 74 percent of parity. We have the commitment and the statement before our committee by the Secretary of Agriculture that this is the figure he will use.

I have some faith in the gentleman who is now the chief agricultural officer of our country. He has made a commitment. Why should we now adopt an amendment which would provide that he may not go beyond 75 percent of parity when he says he is not going beyond 74 percent of parity?

I object to this amendment for many reasons; first, because I am basically a high support advocate. I have never advocated high supports or any supports on the unlimited production of any agricultural commodity. I do not believe it is sound. I do not believe that this Congress should approve price supports on unlimited production of any commodity, I do not care where it is grown or what the commodity is.

Also I am objecting to it because cotton is grown in my area and the Secretary recently just fixed the price support on cotton at about 82 percent of parity. Why should we freeze the price of corn at 75 percent of parity and put cotton at 82 percent of parity? Sugar beets, sugarcane away above 75 percent of parity; wool far above 75 percent of parity; tobacco above 75 percent. And yet you pick out a very important crop—corn. Why would you want to freeze corn at 75 percent of parity and then have to go back home, as our friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. BELCHER says, and sit down on the wagon tongue and explain to the corn grower why you froze him at 75 percent of parity and let cotton go to 82 percent and sugar beets and wool and other commodities go away on up, some of them even far above 90 percent?

This bill embraces an emergency program we are proposing, and it cannot be compared to any other program that any of you from the city districts have heretofore voted on. This is something entirely new.

I do not approve of many of the features of this bill, but I am trying to look at it realistically. We have a problem of great magnitude. The Government has more than $4 billion invested in

feed grains. What are we going to do about it; nothing? This is the only possible thing we can do. We do not have time for a referendum, we cannot have a control program. We must adopt a program such as we have proposed—we are told that the program now in effect, if we do nothing, will cost in this year of our Lord 1961 $1.5 billion—to change this trend, to minimize this cost, to avoid these gigantic losses. You have just as much responsibility as I have.

Why should you go back home and say, "I voted against this program which the Secretary of Agriculture said he honestly believed would save the taxpayers of America half a billion dollars." Maybe it will not. Of course, it all depends on the volume of participation.

I could justify a vote against the bill if I lost sight of the overall problem that is involved. I do not like this business of bushels and bales and parity, just like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA]. I agree with him 100 percent. But I am not going to vote against this bill just because of that. There are other things in here that I can object to, but I am appealing to you not to vote against the bill because some grain dealers or mill operators are fearful of what might happen.

I know that the Secretary could lower the price to perhaps a dollar a bushel. Maybe he will. We are trying to reconcile our views and compose our differences, and we are now trying to draft an amendment which perhaps will improve the present bill and make it more acceptable to you. But I appeal to you at least to try to find a way to vote for the bill and turn it over to the Secretary and see what he can do with this voluntary program. Why should you vote against a bill that is purely voluntary, to reduce production and reduce the supply?

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I sincerely hope we are both trying to go in the same direction. The gentleman raised the point that we can perhaps bring about a saving of half a billion dollars in the operation of this bill. I do not question the gentleman's belief, but I do not see how it can possibly happen under the provisions of the bill, for the very simple reason that with the 20-percent provision someone is going to have to pay for these idle acres.

Also, if the Secretary of Agriculture is permitted to sell the commodities in storage at 17 percent below the support price of $1.20 and then they are in there at a higher price than that, who pays? Uncle Sam pays. So I cannot see how the saving can be effectuated.

Mr. COOLEY. That is just the point. I have no reason to believe that the Secretary of Agriculture would use fully the power contained in section 3. I am frank to say that the effect of this amendment is to make noncompliance less attractive. Of course, under some circumstances, he might lower the price to $1, but certainly he would do it in an orderly fashion and not with the idea of destroying or breaking the market.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the argument of the gentleman from North Carolina in opposition to the Harvey amendment, I simply want to say, that if the Secretary of Agriculture means what he said on many, many occasions covering his intention to fix the price support on corn at $1.20 per bushel, I cannot see any harm in spelling it out in the legislation so that there will be no misunderstanding and no misapprehension on the part of anyone, as to what the Secretary intends to do. The Secretary of Agriculture has positively said that he would fix the price support on corn at $1.20 per bushel. That statement was made by him in the transmittal letter sent to the Speaker of the House and to the Vice President of the United States, urging feed grain legislation. His intention was again set forth in the Secretary's prepared statement before the Committee on Agriculture in which he specifically said that the price support on corn would be $1.20 per bushel; later, at a press conference held last week when the question was asked of the Secretary as to the price support on corn, he specifically said again that it was his intention to fix the price of corn at $1.20 per bushel.

Now what is wrong in adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana? It fixes the support level at from 65 to 75 percent of parity. This in reality is $1.20 or approximately 74 percent of parity. In fact, the Harvey amendment provides for an additional point over and above the 74 percent of parity figure. Personally I have no fear about the Secretary of Agriculture not keeping his word, but the fact is that the present wording of the section dealing with price support on corn leaves the sky as the limit. This leaves it open for pressure groups and others to prevail upon the Secretary of Agriculture to raise price support to any figure he desires over and above 65 percent of parity. This could go to 110 percent of parity and even beyond. I do not think this will be done by the present Secretary but there is nothing to prevent another secretary tomorrow to do something else. Such uncertainty should not be permitted.

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

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

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the Committee is not in order; the gentleman from Iowa, the ranking Republican member of the committee, is making a very important statement, and I think he is entitled to be heard.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Would the gentleman from Iowa agree with me that this in essence is simply not a matter of questioning the Secretary's word, but it is a matter of protecting him insofar as the views of the Congress are concerned on this issue.

Mr. HOEVEN. I agree with the gentleman. His amendment is a protective measure to protect the Secretary of Agriculture, and I think he would welcome it. I think this legislative body should protect him when he says that he wants a price support of $1.20 per bushel on corn.

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

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I just want to remind the gentleman of the fact that the bill that the Secretary sent up here had these words in it, "the level of price support for the 1961 crop of corn shall be $1.20 per bushel." I think the gentleman objected, as I did, to that language and we put in the language which we now have before us. Further, I want to point out to the gentleman what the final report of the committee says. We are making legislative history at this moment.

The Secretary indicated in his memorandum to the President and in his testimony before the committee that at the level of conservation payments recommended in his memorandum, which has been reduced by the committee, it was his intention to set the support price of $1.20 per bushel. There cannot be any misunderstanding about it. Why can we not have confidence in the gentleman who has just now taken office? This is the gentleman's first promise to this Congress, that he would fix it at $1.20 a bushel, or 74 percent of parity.

Mr. HOEVEN. I would advise the gentleman that on yesterday I gave the committee history of this particular amendment. The first figure presented to the committee in the bill sent up by the Secretary was $1.20 a bushel without relation to the parity formula.

Mr. COOLEY. Right.

Mr. HOEVEN. I objected to pegging the price as did the gentleman from North Carolina. Subsequently we considered fixing a support price from 65 to 90 percent of parity. That again was objected to because there was apprehension on the part of some members of the committee that the figure 90 might have some magnetic significance so as to weaken the bill. So we came up with the compromise provision now in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. HOEVEN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HOEVEN. I simply want to say that the Secretary, without equivocation, on many occasions said that he was going to fix the support price at $1.20 a bushel. What harm, therefore, can there be in writing the Harvey amendment into law so there will be no misapprehension and no question about the Secretary's intentions? I am not questioning the honesty or integrity of the Secretary for one moment and am sure he would favor the amendment as a protective measure to himself.

This amendment, in fact, tests the honesty and sincerity of those who want to support their own Secretary of Agriculture in his announced intention of supporting corn at $1.20 a bushel, which is 74 percent of parity. I do not question the motives of anyone, and do not charge anyone with ulterior motives, but

I cannot understand why anyone should object to writing into law the very thing the Secretary said he wants, in this regard.

The Harvey amendment should be adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be partisan. I must, however, view with some suspicion the effort on the part of my Republican friends to assist the new Secretary of Agriculture as they say they wish to do. After listening to their almost 2 days of speeches in opposition to this bill I am somewhat suspicious of this amendment being designed to assist him as they say it is.

They say they simply want to write into law and help him do that which he wants to do. Up until 20 minutes ago every speech, without a single exception, coming from my friend from Iowa and his side of the aisle, has been against this bill which Secretary Freeman brought to the Hill.

If the gentlemen will assure the House that they will vote for and help us pass this bill on the adoption of the pending amendment, then we will support the amendment.

Will the gentlemen do that?

Mr. HOEVEN. I think this amendment should stand on its own feet.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think it should too, but I do not think it has very good feet on which to stand.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman from Iowa, as the gentleman from Mississippi well knows, was one of those who voted to report out this bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is right.

Mr. HOEVEN. With the specific intention of getting this bill before the House.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well I do not know about that. I voted to report it out with the hope that it or something quite similar would pass.

Mr. HOEVEN. But I made reservations as to this particular feature of this bill; and I most emphatically am opposed to section 3 of this bill. I do not intend to vote for any bill which contains section 3.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You know I am very fond of my friend from Iowa as well as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY], who is also my friend. You gentlemen say you are offering and supporting the amendment in an effort to assist the Secretary of Agriculture. After listening to your speeches in opposition to the bill I am inclined to warn the Members on my side of the aisle to beware of Greeks bearing gifts.

With all deference, I have some doubt that this effort is designed to assist the Secretary. I am afraid it is intended to embarrass him.

This bill is the first request that has been made by the new Secretary of Agriculture on agricultural legislation.

Mr. Freeman came to the hill and told the committee what he wanted. As a part of that he told the committee he would support corn at a particular figure. I see no point in nailing down every commitment he made by legislative act. Certainly we have confidence in the Secretary to do what he says he will do. He has given no indication that he will renege on any commitment or promise.

They say they do not distrust the Secretary. They say they are confident he is going to do what he says he said he would. If they mean what they say, and I am sure they do, then I just cannot understand the logic in offering the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the pending amendment will be voted down. With all deference to my friend who offered it and the gentleman from Iowa who spoke in support of it, both friends of mine, in my opinion the amendment is somewhat frivolous. It adds nothing to the objective of the legislation. It takes nothing from it. Let us not adopt an amendment to the very first piece of legislation sought by Secretary Freeman, which amendment on its face, whether so intended or not, indicates that we have some doubt of the Secretary doing that which he stated he would do, and more especially when he made the statement in a public hearing before the committee in the presence of numerous witnesses and the press.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, due to the courtesy of some of my friends I have had an opportunity to intersperse my remarks occasionally, but this is the first time I have managed to obtain the floor in my own right on this bill.

I want to refer to the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] who is a very fine friend of the farmer and always has been. But let me remind him of the fact that this bill affects only about 10 percent of his acreage whereas it affects practically 100 percent of the acreage in my district. That is the difference. We are doing something here that will affect the livelihood of the 41,000 farmers in the Seventh District of Minnesota. So I am getting up here and pleading with you not to do anything that is going to harm them. You have the right to think they need help, and they do, but when you come in here and put in section 3, Mr. Chairman, you destroy whatever good effects you have in the bill through the other provisions.

Why do I say that? Because section 3 gives to one man the right to say that from now on all of this 2 billion bushels of CCC corn, not to speak of the oats and barley, will start to trickle out of the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation and into the market just as soon as the market price reaches $1.02 or $1.03 at the terminal markets. By the way, cash corn in Chicago and Kansas City does set the value of cash barley and cash oats, and to a great extent cash rye. So for 5 years until this Commodity Credit Corporation stock of 2 billion bushels is consumed you are going to say to my farmers: "We must be content with $1-a-bushel corn." What are you saying to the chicken and poultry producers in the East, and to the livestock producers? You are saying "You might as well get accustomed to the idea you are going to have $10 hogs from now on, because the producer of corn is going to have $1-a-bushel corn." The poultry producers in the East will have to be satisfied with competing with literally thousands of poultry producers in the Seventh District of Minnesota alone, not to mention what is produced in the balance of the Midwest. Cheap corn means cheap livestock; cheap grain means cheap poultry. Yet you actually propose here to give to one man, regardless of how good he is, and I think Mr. Freeman is sincere, but I hesitate to vote to tempt him at any time to do the wrong thing. You are going to say to him that from now on for 5 years by the use of section 3 we are going to hold down the level of agriculture prices to the $1 corn level. It will mean that every corn farmer who complies with the program from now on, will turn his corn over to the Commodity Credit Corporation at the low price of $1.20 per bushel. He will turn over every bushel of corn that is produced, and then he will go out and buy for $1 on the free corn market, and perhaps oats and barley as well, and the Government, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, will be both the buyer and seller.

Why, my friends, just think it over. I sincerely say to you that you are destroying by section 3 any good that you are doing in the balance of the bill. As far as I am concerned, if section 3 stays in, I will be reluctant to vote for the bill.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Would not the gentleman actually, in fact, buy his own corn back at $1?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Certainly. That is what it amounts to, after a lot of expense heaped onto the Commodity Credit Corporation and the taxpayers. I will take my corn and deliver it to the CCC bin site in Tyler, Minn., and then I will buy it at another, or perhaps the same Commodity Credit Corporation outlet to do my feeding, and every corn farmer in America will do the same thing.

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

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield to my good friend.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is addressing himself to section 3, but is the gentleman in favor of the Harvey amendment which would fix 75 percent as a price ceiling on corn?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. If the Harvey amendment would also fix that as a minimum, I would go along with it.

Mr. COOLEY. He did not fix it as a minimum.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I know that, so I am opposed to the Harvey amendment. If we are going to have $1.20, let us have it as a minimum as well as a maximum.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Harvey amendment do now close.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Harvey amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ARENDS) there were—ayes 121, noes 121.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair votes aye.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JENNINGS and Mr. HOEVEN.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 149, noes 123.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that the Secretary of Agriculture is an outstanding man and that his word is good. However, when he says that high support prices mean that the cost of living will come down, I disagree with him. At the same time I disagree with the pending amendment offered by my friend from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY]. I think this amendment will raise the cost of living. In the areas that I represent in the northeastern section of this country it is going to mean higher prices for our farmers who produce milk and poultry and eggs.

Another thing that surprises me is that my good friend from North Carolina, the very able and genial chairman of this committee and a friend of mine for a long time, on the floor explaining the bill said it would not be very hard to find a good reason to vote against the bill. Then following the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], my good friend from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] took the floor and said he has many doubts and reservations about the bill as it is constituted now. Here we have the chairman and the ranking member of the committee saying they could vote against the bill or they have doubts and reservations about it.

I do not know where this leaves those of us who do not come from these heavy farming areas, because I have been led to believe that high support prices are the cause of an increase in the cost of living, as it has been in my area of the country.

I listened to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] a short time ago. He made a very good speech, but I did not agree with his conclusion when he said that when corn was $1.56 the cost of living was lower than when corn was $1. If he could guarantee this House that if we raise the support prices of all these things he wants to have raised the cost of living will come down and down and down, then I would vote with him and vote for this bill, but I do not think he can give this kind of guarantee.

I have had a long history of opposing any proposals that would lift the level of Government price supports for agricultural commodities. I have stood here before to voice my sentiments in terms which can be easily understood.

I am against higher price supports for two basic reasons: First, the idea that Government can cut production by offering farmers a higher and higher price incentive is to me a false one; and second, I see no logic at all in being part of an effort which can have only one effect—raise food prices for consumers; the same consumers, incidentally, whose tax money would be used to raise their own food prices.

I am opposed to this bill now before us, just as I have been opposed to similar measures in the past.

Let us look at this bill from the viewpoint of a Congressman in a deficit feed area—and all of the Northeast is a deficit feed area. Our farmers must buy most of their grain to produce milk and eggs and poultry.

Raise the price of corn—from $1.06 to $1.20, as this bill proposes—and you raise the price to all of the dairy farmers in the Northeast. None of us here is so foolish as to believe that northeastern dairy farmers can, or will, absorb that increased cost themselves. Instead, they will seek—and get—higher prices for milk—and higher prices for milk involves all of my constituents.

Now, some proponents of this bill have argued—and will continue to do so, I am sure—that this bill would save the taxpayers' money by compelling farmers to take land out of production. This is only a theory—and not a very good one. All of us know that the record of corn producers is rather consistent—they have consistently refused to comply with Government programs. Their refusal has been stated both in practice and in votes. In 1958 in the last referendum on a question of acreage allotments, about 73 percent of those voting elected to discontinue the allotments, which the bill now before us would reinstate.

What makes the sponsors of this feed grain bill think the corn producers suddenly will conform to controls? It will take more than a few face changes at the Department of Agriculture to work that miracle.

I am not concerned here with the politics of this bill as such—that is politics with a capital "P." I am concerned at the direction this bill would presume to take us—deeper and deeper into Government controls, higher and higher subsidies, greater and greater tax costs—and for what? I say for a bigger mess than we have now—and that is big enough.

The taxpayers of my district—and I wager the taxpayers of most of the urban districts of this Nation—are realizing more and more that they are beating themselves over the head with their tax dollars. How long must this continue?

Some of my colleagues will tell me that urban districts like mine receive much business and income from farm districts. With this I agree. I greatly admire the tremendous technological advances made by all of the farmers of this country—those in my areas as well as those in the grain-growing States, or in the tobacco areas, or in the cotton areas—all farmers.

But, I refuse to believe that these farmers who have been so intelligent as to make the greatest food and fiber production gains ever known in the history of the world are naive enough to believe that economic success lies in bleeding the other American taxpayers. I was brought up on a farm. I know something of farm thinking. As I look around in my district, the most prosperous farmers are the ones who concern themselves little or not at all with Government controls.

If I may, I have a word of warning for those who would use more and more Government control and money for farm programs.

The day soon may come that my constituents—and hundreds of thousands of others like them—will say one of two things—either cut this all out or else guarantee me, too, that I will succeed in my little corner grocery store, my bar, my shoe shop, my laundry, my cleaning establishment, my garage, my filling station—and I could go on for 5 minutes enumerating occupational and small business groups that might want a piece of the pie.

I repeat—look out.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to include the following news item from the Wall Street Journal of March 6, 1961:

FARM PHILOSOPHY—ADMINISTRATION IDEA IS HOOKED TO AMBITIOUS CONTROLS

(By Joe Western)

WASHINGTON.—Orville Lothrop Freeman has a problem. He's firmly convinced that only strong controls by the Federal Government can save farming from its recurrent economic trouble. Yet, he knows from experience that the farmer is a most difficult fellow to control.

As Agriculture Secretary, he's about to try to engineer what promises to be the most ambitious program of controlled farming ever attempted by the Federal Government—President Kennedy's "managed abundance" farm philosophy.

Mr. Freeman will undertake this monumental task with the knowledge that the farmer he's seeking to help, though perhaps outwardly pleased with the jingle of extra coins in his jeans and gladdened by the departure of Mr. Freeman's predecessor, Ezra Taft Benson, nevertheless inwardly harbors an abiding sympathy with the free farming concept that Mr. Benson so tenaciously espoused. For, Mr. Freeman spent 6 years as Governor of farm State Minnesota, and he's keenly aware of the farmer's near-religious reverence of the soil's productive capacity and his resentment at being told what to grow and—more to the point—what not to grow.

To call the new scheme ambitious and far ranging is perhaps an understatement. Under the new Democratic farm philosophy Uncle Sam will attempt to determine as closely as possible the actual human nutritional needs—not only domestic but global

as well—and gear production directly to them.

Perhaps the best summary of this theory comes from the man who masterminded it, Willard W. Cochrane, former professor of agricultural economics at the University of Minnesota and now special economics adviser to Mr. Freeman. Says Mr. Cochrane: "By supply control I mean the conscious adjustment of supply to demand commodity by commodity, year after year, to yield prices in the market that have already been determined fair by some responsible agency."

The evil that the Cochrane-Freeman approach seeks to correct is demonstrated by the fact that by next July 1 Government-owned surpluses could mount to as high as 1.5 billion bushels of wheat. (Much of it piled up as a result of previous efforts to control farming.) That's enough wheat to satisfy domestic consumption needs for 2½ years, and the surplus of corn and other commodities equals about a half-year's production. Yet, Mr. Freeman points out, at the same time, the Government has no surpluses of such protein foods as meats, oils, and fats; thus the Kennedy administration, its storage bins bare, must buy these products in the open market for distribution to needy families, school lunch programs, and for other welfare projects.

THE GLOBAL SITUATION

According to the 43-year-old Agriculture Secretary, a similar situation exists in world markets. Sure, the United States has mountains of wheat to dispose of abroad, but so do Canada, Australia, and Argentina. Consequently, this country's wheat-disposal program can have a disrupting impact on world markets. On the other hand, some items that are needed abroad, such as dry milk solids, are considered noncompetitive and would be ideal for oversea disposal. The problem, says Mr. Freeman, is that these products are not in surplus here.

In short, then, the Kennedy "managed abundance" farm philosophy seeks to cut surpluses that are not needed and create surpluses that will be considered desirable by the planners. Mr. Freeman has taken a few preliminary steps in this direction. He's asked the State Department, the International Cooperation Administration, and his own Agriculture Department for a country-by-country breakdown of foreign people's food and fiber needs. He's also talking with heads of nonprofit foreign relief agencies about just what good has been accomplished with U.S. food distributed all over the world, who's benefited, and how to do the job better.

But when the preliminaries are over, the big programs will come. The first outlines probably will appear in President Kennedy's farm message to Congress this week. And before he's through, Mr. Freeman can be expected to produce a host of new schemes to jerk farm production up or down at the pull of Federal puppet strings—for, by his own admission, the Minnesotan is open to any and all ideas.

Nevertheless, Mr. Freeman demands that Federal controls be effective in what they set out to do. Take acreage allotments, for example. The Agriculture boss recognizes that this familiar system of production control has its limitations. For one thing, farmers may thwart Federal goals simply by pushing up yields on their limited acreage. To tighten the Government's grasp, therefore, Mr. Freeman believes commodities should also be controlled in the marketplace. At his confirmation hearing, he told Senators that eventually Government planning will have to include pounds and bushels marketing controls in combination with acreage controls.

Those who talk to Mr. Freeman about the soil bank—Mr. Benson's innovation, unsuccessfully designed to cut production—get another clue to his thinking. Democratic farm policy probably will include some form of soil bank to pay farmers for taking land out of production because most major farm groups favor the scheme. But the Agriculture Secretary has a new twist. As leisure time increases Americans need more parks and recreational areas, he argues. Doesn't it make sense to convert some of the soil bank land into public use? It could always be turned back to crops and pastures in an emergency.

Though the objectives of Mr. Freeman's plans are readily discernible, just how far he will dare go remains uncertain. Some of the ideas being tossed at him almost defy comprehension in their complexity, yet they come from reputable sources. Grapple, if you will, with Mr. Cochrane's proposal to control the production of feed grains—corn, oats, barley, rye, and grain sorghums.

Feed grains pose a special difficulty because many farmers feed most of these grains to their own livestock and sell the balance. The problem is how to measure what is fed to animals. Mr. Cochrane suggests that feed grain nutritional values be converted into something called total digestible nutrients or TDN's. The Government, with advice from interested groups, would calculate (1) what level of prices would be fair for a given year for all livestock; (2) how many animals of various kinds would have to be marketed to achieve these prices; (3) how many TDN's it would take to produce that many animals; (4) allot TDN's to feed grain producers according to production history of their farms.

A conversion factor for each would convert the TDN allotment to bushels. That is, a bushel of corn would be worth so many TDN's, oats would be worth about half as many, and so on. A farmer then would be allowed to grow whatever feed grains he pleases as long as the total does not exceed his TDN allotment.

RURAL ARITHMETIC

When planting time comes, the farmer converts his TDN's to bushels of grain; the bushels are then converted into acres on the basis of average yields in the area. Finally, the farmer sows. When crops begin showing above the ground, an Agriculture Department agent computes the acreage planted to each grain to one-hundredth of an acre. If the farmer has done his arithmetic correctly, he may do whatever he wishes with the feed grain he harvests—feed it or sell it. If the farmer exceeds his acreage, he must agree to destroy the overage or pay a stiff penalty.

At the end of the marketing year, Government economists would review the nationwide results. If too many animals were marketed, the national TDN allotment would be reduced. In theory, this would make feed scarce causing a price rise that would prompt a cutback in livestock production. If too few animals were marketed, more TDN's would be decreed.

To be sure, there's no suggestion that Mr. Freeman has any intention of quickly adopting the Cochrane feed grain scheme; the temporary 1961 Democratic feed grain program recently sent to Congress proposes a comparatively simple formula: raising price supports for farmers who cut back acreage. But as the Government becomes more deeply involved in farming, there's no telling what new ideas may be tried. The point is, the administration is willing to try almost anything that may work.

How much will the greater Federal involvement cost the taxpayer? Mr. Freeman insists that tighter Government control of farming does not necessarily mean that Agriculture Department spending must rise enormously, whatever has been the result of past control efforts. Though Mr. Freeman probably wouldn't admit as much, the solution this seems to suggest is that through higher farm prices the consumer may become the prime candidate to bear the added cost of boosting farm income.

And, from the farmer's point of view, there's an argument of sorts that shoppers should pay more for food and fiber. It goes something like this: Americans pay far more for processing and marketing services than for the original cost of food; the wheat in a 1-pound loaf of bread costs roughly 3 cents, while bread sells for 20 cents or more. Yet, while farmers continue in a chronically depressed state, Americans in 1960 paid only an average of about 23 percent of their disposable income for food—compared to about 45 percent in Italy, 36 percent in Austria, and even more in other countries. Whatever the validity of such reasoning, it nonetheless is being offered by some close to the new farm planning.

MODERATE PRICE RISES

Mr. Freeman, himself, will argue that moderately higher consumer prices, with the Government keeping supply and demand in balance, are preferable to what he considers the alternatives: A continuation of farm poverty, or a soaring retail price level that would result if, in his view, the Government steps out of farming and allows a tight combine of corporate farmers to assume control. But some critics are already suggesting such price rises under the new Government plan would not be so moderate either.

So, this will be the philosophy Orville Lothrop Freeman will be trying to sell—to Congress, the consumer, and the farmer. In the end, the farmer may prove to be the toughest customer. If the Government does not engineer production, the Agriculture Secretary is convinced the result will be a population of poor and angry farmers. Yet, he knows that as the Government tightens its control, the farmer, though perhaps more prosperous, will resist the yoke.

Perhaps because he realizes the inevitable consequences of this dilemma, Mr. Freeman already has reached one decision: He does not want to become the whipping boy for the plan. Whatever new programs are produced will be carefully attributed to the Kennedy administration; there will be no Freeman plan.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I must say the gentleman from Rhode Island just does not understand the program now before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HARVEY of Indiana and Mr. JENNINGS.

The Committee divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 103, noes 165.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to believe that this House could be so confused. Apparently, our dear beloved colleague from Rhode Island has neither read the bill nor heard the debate, and I say that in all kindness. Actually, he indicated he is opposed to the bill for exactly the

opposite reasons that some of you gentlemen on the left have indicated as the basis for your opposition. On the left, you say this means cheaper beef and poultry and dairy products, cheaper food for the city consumer.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And cheaper grain.

Mr. COOLEY. And cheaper grain. I notice the gentleman here on my left made a very forceful argument to that effect. Then the gentleman from Rhode Island comes along and says "Oh, no; it means higher food prices, higher dairy products, higher poultry prices, higher price supports."

He argued another thing, that if we reduce the grain acreage, the farmers will use fertilizer, they will do subsoiling and other things to produce larger crops. We took care of that in our committee, although I did not approve of it, and I do not now approve of it. But I am going to vote for the bill. The committee placed language in the bill that says price supports will be based on not to exceed the normal per acre yield of each eligible farm. That is normal production. So we took away the incentive to use fertilizer in an effort to increase production, because regardless of production the price support is fixed on the normal output.

I cannot agree with all these arguments. I do not think some of these things we have been talking about are of such great importance, but I do believe it is important for this Congress to do something about the overall problems that are involved here.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I appreciate the last statement the gentleman made. I too believe it is very important that we carefully consider this measure. I was a little disappointed, however, a moment ago, in the action of the House in restricting debate on what I think is going to be one of the most fundamental issues to come before the Congress, and that is the matter of agriculture, regardless of politics or anything else. I hope the gentleman will no longer be a party to shutting off debate or anything else on a problem that is as much misunderstood as was evidenced by the colloquy between the two gentlemen a while ago. Let us proceed in orderly fashion, and let us not push people around here by limiting debate.

Mr. COOLEY. May I say to the gentleman frankly that if I had followed my own inclination I would not have offered the motion. I had no desire to cut off debate. I thought that discussion was over on the Harvey amendment. I thought we would hear from the gentleman from Rhode Island and then take a vote. I certainly was not trying to close debate. I knew when I made the motion we would lose more time by making the motion than I would have by saying, "What time will you agree on?" I think we should have closed debate in 10 or 15 minutes. But I assure the gentleman it will not be my purpose to close debate. I am going to move that the Committee rise in a minute.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. IKARD of Texas, 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. 4510) to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961, had come to no resolution thereon.

SOME FIGURES IN CONNECTION WITH THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. BECKWORTH. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter I wrote Senator Kennedy last fall and a copy of a letter I wrote Vice President Nixon last fall in connection with agricultural problems. Also I include the answers I received from Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon.

I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which was written to me by a prominent wheat producer, Mr. Tom Campbell, and also some comments by Mr. Marvin McLain of the U.S. Department of Agriculture as of September 2, 1960.

I feel neither platform was specific in connection with plans to find solutions to the farm program.

I desire to include in the RECORD certain data in connection with the feed grains program which were sent to me March 3, 1961, by Mr. Scoville of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The matter follows:

OCTOBER 11, 1960.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I live in an area of Texas where we formerly had many small farmers. They used to be small cotton farmers and also grew some peanuts. When the programs of acreage restriction came into being, these farmers were diversifying already. They then suffered cotton acreage reductions to the point that many of them had to quit farming; they moved to town. Cotton and peanut acreage reduction has resulted in a diminished opportunity to farm in our area and has helped in my opinion to contribute appreciably to the loss of population in our counties. Some seven of the nine counties of the Third Congressional District lost population in the 1960 census, I'm informed.

I would like to know what plans you and your agricultural advisers have, if any, that would give people who wish to grow cotton and peanuts in this area an opportunity to do so. It is my opinion no farm program should knock out free enterprise in agriculture for the man who truly wants to farm as a vocation and as a way of life. I believe in free enterprise in business and also in agriculture.

There is a "1958 Crop Cotton Price-Support Loans of $50,000 or More by Producer" report which shows that one producer received $1,442,595. The value per cotton allotment in some cotton counties is less than $500 per allotment. Do you think with reference to a governmental supported and control program this spread is too great?

I would appreciate your comments.

Kind regards,

LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

OCTOBER 7, 1960.

DEAR VICE PRESIDENT NIXON: I live in an area of Texas where we formerly had many small farmers. They used to be small cotton farmers and also grew some peanuts. When the programs of acreage restriction came into being, these farmers were diversifying already. They then suffered cotton acreage reductions to the point that many of them had to quit farming; they moved to town. Cotton and peanut acreage reduction has resulted in a diminished opportunity to farm in our area and has helped in my opinion to contribute appreciably to the loss of population in our counties. Some seven of the nine counties of the Third Congressional District lost population in the 1960 census, I'm informed.

I would like to know what plans you and your agricultural advisers have, if any, that would give people who wish to grow cotton and peanuts in this area an opportunity to do so. It is my opinion no farm program should knock out free enterprise in agriculture for the man who truly wants to farm as a vocation and as a way of life. I believe in free enterprise in business and also in agriculture.

There is a "1958 Crop Cotton Price-Support Loans of $50,000 or More by Producer" report which shows that one producer received $1,442,595. The value per cotton allotment in some cotton counties is less than $500 per allotment. Do you think with reference to a governmental supported and control program this spread is too great?

I would appreciate your comments.

Kind regards,

LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

FARMERS FOR KENNEDY-JOHNSON,
Washington, D.C., October 29, 1960.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Thank you for your recent letter regarding the farm situation and more specifically the cotton and peanut programs. I believe the enclosed release of my letter to the Farm Bureau presidents in Arkansas, Tennessee, and Mississippi will clarify my position with regard to the present and future cotton programs.

May I assure you that my farm program will not in any way "knock out free enterprise," but will instead, strengthen the bulwark of free enterprise in America—the family farm. It will enable a traditional type of farming enterprise to earn returns on their capital, their labor, and the managerial ability comparable to those received in other important industries.

I'm enclosing a copy of "Agricultural Policy for the New Frontier," which outlines the approach which I believe to be best for American agriculture.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., October 26, 1960.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In the Vice President's absence, his office has referred your letter concerning cotton acreage

to me for acknowledgment. As you know, cotton acreage for 1961 was recently increased by the Department of Agriculture. I believe you may find informative a recent statement by the Vice President on the cotton program.

Sincerely yours,

ROLLIS S. NELSON.

CAMPBELL FARMING CORP.,
Albuquerque, N. Mex., October 4, 1960.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR LINDLEY: My absence from Albuquerque has delayed my answer to your letter with copy of letter of September 2 from Marvin L. McLain, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and statement by Secretary Benson of February 18 enclosed.

I have read both with more than ordinary interest and cannot agree with Mr. McLain or any of the recommendations of the platform of either party. They are all too general, not specific enough and full of complications. The idea of reimbursing the farmer for more acreage put in the land bank with surplus wheat in lieu of cash is utter nonsense. This wheat has a freight charge against it of approximately 50 cents a bushel and storage charges from 1 to 5 years, which means there would be very little value in the wheat to the farmer even if he sold it at the loan value.

The Government pays an export support price to millers of 72 cents a bushel on wheat exported and wheat exported in the form of flour. This runs into many millions of dollars a year and is an absurd practice. The farmer is blamed for this expense along with other similar expenses.

It is difficult for me to understand how the Agriculture Department can be so incompetent. We have always taken our full wheat loan and with the exception of 2 years out of 29 have paid the loan in full, with interest, when due. During those years we sold our wheat from 12 cents to 70 cents over the loan value. We sold our 1959 crop for 12 cents over the loan value. If it were possible for us to be paid 10 cents a bushel instead of 72 cents for exporting wheat, we could do a very prosperous business.

The entire agriculture program is so inconsistent with good business and good judgment that it should be abandoned and an entirely new, drastic one established. I would like to discuss this more with you when I am in Washington later in the fall.

With a great deal of friendly esteem, I am

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. CAMPBELL.

SEPTEMBER 2, 1960.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This replies to your request of August 22 for comments on the proposed solution to the wheat problem which was submitted to you by Mr. Thomas D. Campbell, of Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Briefly, Mr. Campbell recommends as a solution, that we dispose of our present surplus by gifts to needy nations and that price support be limited to that quantity needed domestically. Support on such production would be at 100 percent of a new parity formula reflecting modern methods of production. Any production in excess of domestic requirements would be available for export at world prices.

We certainly agree with Mr. Campbell that steps must be taken to improve the wheat program. Our preferred approach is one which will provide greater freedom for individual producers to operate and one which will permit the establishment of a realistic price support level which would result in increased utilization and at the same time, would discourage uneconomic production. It is doubtful whether Mr. Campbell's proposal would accomplish these desirable objectives. While it would give farmers greater freedom to plant than the present program it would require strict regimentation of all marketings for domestic use. This would require the establishment of marketing quotas for each producer and policing marketings through the entire marketing channel. Unless this is done, it could result in production not eligible for price support flowing into domestic markets at prices below the support level. In this event, the quantity eligible for price support would be placed under price support and acquired by the Government.

It is difficult to determine the support level which would result under the proposed parity formula. It is our opinion that the same purpose is determining the level of support could be accomplished by relating the support level to a specific percentage of the average market price during previous years rather than by attempting to devise a new formula for determining parity.

With respect to donating our surpluses to foreign nations, we wish to make it perfectly clear that we are successfully distributing large quantities of surpluses to needy people throughout the world. Such outlets, however, are limited. We shall continue to use all available means, such as Public Law 480 programs, and food for peace programs to expand such markets which are in the best longtime interests of the United States.

We are enclosing a copy of a statement made before the House Committee on Agriculture on February 18 which discusses the Department's recommendations for improving the farm program. We believe the adoption of the approach recommended therein is preferable to the one recommended by Mr. Campbell.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN L. MCLAIN,
Assistant Secretary.

MARCH 1, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: As requested in your telegram of February 28 to Secretary Freeman, the attached tables give the names and addresses of the 10 feed grain producers receiving the largest CCC loans on feed grains in 1958 and 1959.

The amounts shown represent the loan of funds advanced. In some instances these were redeemed but in other cases the grain was taken over by the Government. Similar information is not available for earlier years. Several previous years are available for the basic commodities but these include only corn among the feed grains.

Sincerely yours,

ORLIN J. SCOVILLE.

10 largest price-support commodity loans, 1959 crop [1]

Producer	Crop		Total
	Barley	Grain sorghum	
Salyer Land Co., Corcoran, Calif.	$1,136,667		$1,136,667
Westlake Farms, Inc., Stratford, Calif.	1,017,500		1,017,500
Giffen, Inc., Huron, Calif.	923,991		923,991
Employees Enterprises, Inc., Huron, Calif.	435,046		435,046
Youngker Farms, Buckeye, Ariz.	270,836		270,836
Price Giffen Ranch, Firebaugh, Calif.	263,142		263,142
South Lake Farms, Corcoran, Calif.	164,817		164,817
Massey & Harper, Robstown, Tex.		$137,207	137,207
Five Points Ranch, Inc., Five Points, Calif.	107,569		107,569
Jack Harris, Inc., Five points, Calif.	97,732		97,732

[1] No oat or corn loans above $2,500.

10 largest price-support commodity loans, 1958 crop [1]

Producer	Crop		Total
	Barley	Oats	
Westlake Farms, Inc., Stratford, Calif.	$1,140,431.70		$1,140,431.70
Giffen, Inc., Huron, Calif.	1,115,860.72		1,115,860.72
Salyer Land Co., Corcoran, Calif.	951,076.70		951,076.70
South Lake Farms, Corcoran, Calif.	398,666.68		398,666.68
Tulana Farms, Worden, Oreg.	92,392.34	$247,954.56	340,346.90
Five Points Ranch, Inc., Five Points, Calif.	314,990.08		314,990.08
Calflax Co., Inc., Fresno, Calif.	313,681.20		313,681.20
Employee Enterprises, Inc., Huron, Calif.	267,085.35		267,085.35
Jack Harris, Inc., Five Points, Calif.	257,553.45		257,553.45
Buena Vista Associates, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.	193,280.21		193,280.21

[1] No grain sorghum or corn loans above $50,000.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, March 3, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: With reference to my letter of March 1, I have been advised that a few corn producers received large price support commodity loans in 1958 and 1959 and should have been included in the tabulation. Would you kindly substitute the enclosed tables for those sent you with my previous letter. Allow me to repeat that the amounts shown represent the total amount of funds loaned to these producers on the 1958 and 1959 crops.

Mr. Gordon Parke has related to me your question concerning the largest loan that could be expected to be made under the proposed 1961 emergency feed grain program. This question cannot be answered with certainty but I would expect the largest loan to be somewhat smaller than the largest loans of the past 2 years. A loan level of $1.20 would be only a little higher than the $1.12 level of 1959 but lower than the $1.36 support of 1958.

Eligibility for price support loans would be limited to those who reduced corn and sorghum acreages by 20 percent, therefore, the quantity placed under loan by any one producer should reflect this reduced acreage. We do not know that any of these growers put all of their feed grain crop under the loan but I see no reason for the proportion covered by loans to vary with the new program.

Sincerely yours,

ORLIN J. SCOVILLE.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

10 largest 1958-crop price-support commodity loans made on feed grains (corn, barley, grain sorghum, oats, and rye)

Producer	Crop				Total	Producer	Crop				Total
	Barley	Corn	Grain sorghum	Oats			Barley	Corn	Grain sorghum	Oats	
Westlake Farms, Inc., Stratford, Calif.	$1,140,432				$1,140,432	Calflax Co., Inc., Fresno, Calif.	$313,681				$313,681
Giffen, Inc., Huron, Calif.	1,115,861				1,115,861	Employee Enterprises, Inc., Huron, Calif.	267,085				267,085
Salyer Land Co., Corcoran, Calif.	951,077				951,077	Jack Harris, Inc., Five Points, Calif.	257,553				257,553
South Lake Farms, Corcoran, Calif.	398,667				398,667	Harrison & Quirk, Hastings, Nebr.		$136,940	$71,778		208,718
Tulama Farms, Worden, Oreg.	92,392			$247,955	340,347						
Five Points Ranch, Inc., Five Points, Calif.	314,990				314,990						

10 largest 1959-crop price-support commodity loans made on feed grains (corn, barley, grain sorghum, oats, and rye)

Producer	Crop			Total	Producer	Crop			Total
	Barley	Corn	Grain sorghum			Barley	Corn	Grain sorghum	
Salyer Land Co., Corcoran, Calif.	$1,136,667			$1,136,667	Price Giffen Ranch, Firebaugh, Calif.	$263,142			$263,142
Westlake Farms, Inc., Stratford, Calif.	1,017,500			1,017,500	Cote Farms, Inc., St. Anne, Ill.		$182,988		182,988
Giffen, Inc., Huron, Calif.	923,991			923,991	South Lake Farms, Corcoran, Calif.	164,817			164,817
Employees Enterprises, Inc., Huron, Calif.	435,046			435,046	Morrison & Quirk, Hastings, Nebr.		88,000	63,938	151,938
Youngkerf Farms, Buckeye, Ariz.	270,836			270,836	Massey & Harper, Robstown, Tex.			137,207	137,207

Mr. BECKWORTH. Under our present farm program in our area of Texas, many farmers, yes, veterans, who wish to farm have been compelled to leave the farm.

I include some letters about a case on which I recently have been working:

GRAND SALINE, TEX.,
November 12, 1961.

Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEAR SIR: On September 23, 1960, I made application for a loan from the Farm and Home Administration, Canton, Tex. My credit reference and character reference checked out good. I was turned down on this farm I was going to buy, because they considered a 97½-acre farm is too small to make a living on.

I have been a farmer all my life. That is the only occupation I have. I do truck farming and some cattle raising; I am also a veteran of World War II.

I am unable to rent farming land in this county because of the soil bank. I am in need of a place to live.

Mr. George Yates, manager at the FHA office told me he went and looked at the place and it is worth $10,000 but he wanted me to raise $2,000 to get the appraiser to go look at the place.

Mr. BECKWORTH, I would appreciate anything you can do for me on this deal.

Yours truly,

H. W. CAMPBELL.

GRAND SALINE, TEX.,
November 29, 1961.

Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEAR SIR: The size of the farm I am trying to buy through the Farm and Home Administration is 97½ acres. The size of my working force is my wife, 10-year-old son and myself. I hire very little labor and this 97½ acres is all the land I can possibly work. This is a very suitable farm for the type of farming I do.

There is enough pasture on the farm to take care of about 15 head of mother cows.

I had a 90-day option on the farm and this time will be up December 23, 1960.

Mr. BECKWORTH, I don't feel like I have been treated fair at the FHA office and I certainly appreciate you looking into this and see what is wrong.

Yours truly,

HIRAM W. CAMPBELL.

GRAND SALINE, TEX.,
January 9, 1961.

Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEAR SIR: On the farm I am purchasing through the Farm and Home Administration here in Van Zandt County, when I first made application for this farm, Mr. George Yates, office manager at this office told me if the appraiser appraised the place anywhere near $10,000 they would carry the full amount; but now they want me to raise $2,000 to pay on the place and, I have tried at several different places to borrow the money; and the ones I have tried to borrow from tell me that the Farm and Home Administration is supposed to carry the full amount, and it seems like that is the only way I can buy this farm and Mr. Yates told me $8,000 was all they would carry and they will not lend me any more. Mr. BECKWORTH if there is any way to get them to lend me the $10,000 to buy the farm with then I could go ahead and start my operations on this farm and pay the money back, if you can't get them to do this there isn't any way I can borrow the $2,000 and pay for the place.

The Farm and Home Administration office has never recognized me as a GI. Would it be possible to get a loan through the GI bill or maybe a second loan of $2,000 if the FHA will carry the $8,000.

I appreciate all the help you have given me on this.

Thank you very much.

HIRAM CAMPBELL.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., January 24, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This is with further reference to your letters to the Office of the Secretary, the State Office, and this office in behalf of Mr. Hiram W. Campbell, route 2, Grand Saline, Tex.

Mr. Campbell applied to this agency for a loan to purchase a 97½-acre farm. The cost of acquiring the farm and making essential improvements exceeded the amount this agency could advance on the property. He therefore, would have needed to invest $2,000 in the transaction. Mr. Campbell was not in a position to do this and, under the planned operation of the farm, income would not have been available to repay the loan had it been possible for Mr. Campbell to borrow the money to make this cash contribution. An additional $1,000 also would have been needed for fertilizer in order to obtain maximum production from the truck crops.

Mr. Campbell recently lost the farm he has been renting and is urgently in need of a place to continue his farming operations and provide for his family. Our field staff, at the county, area, and State levels, has explored several possibilities of helping Mr. Campbell purchase the farm he selected and develop it into an adequate family-type farm. These efforts have not been successful. This agency is without legal authority to approve a loan to purchase a farm unless it will produce sufficient income to pay living and operating expenses, meet debt obligations, and have a reasonable reserve for emergencies.

We regret that we are unable to give you a more favorable report, but assure you that this agency will endeavor to meet Mr. Campbell's credit needs if he is successful in locating a suitable farm that can be acquired and developed within our authorities and available funds.

As you requested, we are returning your file on Mr. Campbell.

Sincerely yours,

H. C. SMITH,
Administrator.

I submit for the RECORD the pertinent part of a letter written to me January 13, 1961, by Mr. J. M. Gloer, of the Atlantic Cotton Association, and also a letter written to me January 27, 1961, by Mr. J. M. Gloer:

ATLANTIC COTTON ASSOCIATION,
Atlanta, Ga., January 13, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Thank you very much for your letter of January 10, 1961, enclosing copy of bill introduced by you in the Congress—H.R. 624—January 3, 1961.

Your bill protects the small or family-size farmer who has been sadly neglected in the more recent past. I enclose herewith copy of letter written Congressman COLMER, of Mississippi, from which you will note you and I are thinking in the same direction,

i.e., protection of the family-size farm. It had been my thought the purpose of price-support programs were to guarantee the farmer an income comparable to other lines of endeavor: to give the farms (dirt farmer working his own farm) the same protection as given to labor under the wage and hour law; and industry by tariff. Unfortunately, it has not worked that way as evidenced by your enclosure (which I return herewith in accordance with your request).

Supplemental or compensatory payments to the farmer, with reasonable limitation of payments, is the answer to cotton's problem.

Thanking you, and with best regards, I remain,

Very truly yours,

J. M. GLOER,
Executive Vice President and Secretary.

ATLANTIC COTTON ASSOCIATION,
Atlanta, Ga., January 27, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Thanks for sending me recap by CCC of 1958 crop cotton loans made to producers in the amount of $50,000 or more and showing the amount repaid by the producer, which I am returning herewith in accordance with your request. I would certainly like a copy, if you could obtain one from CCC.

The compilation you sent me "knocks into a cocked hat" the general assumption that only the small and family size farm benefits from price supports.

From the CCC compilation you sent me it seems that Arizona large farmers made loans from CCC of $22,035,000 and repaid $7,897,000; California cotton producers made loans of $40,141,000 and repaid $13,911,000. So to say the large farmer is not the greatest beneficiary of our Government's benevolence is absurd.

As I have written you, a compensatory payment program for cotton is the only program that will maintain the farm income and still make cotton competitive in the domestic market to manmade fibers and to foreign growths. I would imagine the large cotton producers would naturally be opposed to compensatory payments, for they have a gravy train under a loan program whether with limitation of payments or not. Even with limitation of payments, the large producer is in an excellent position in that he only has to sell his cotton slightly under the loan and make money. A loan is a protection of great importance to the large producer.

Best regards.

Very truly yours,

J. M. GLOER,
Executive Vice President and Secretary.

These tables may have been in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before. However, some of them are pertinent I feel in connection with this legislation. As I indicated in connection with a question I asked on the floor of the House Tuesday, I am interested in knowing the extent to which any of the loans might be reduced by the legislation under discussion and the extent to which money has been lost by the Government on any of these loans. Perhaps no money has been lost on any of these loans. The figures were brought to my office Wednesday afternoon. I regret I do not have the 1959 figures too.

1958 crop price-support commodity loans of $50,000 or more, by producer

BARLEY

[Bushels]

Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount	Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount
Arlington Cattle Co. et al	Arlington, Ariz	112,408	$112,408.00	Harnish Five Points, Inc	Five Points, Calif	77,388	$80,952.69
Westlake Farms, Inc	Stratford, Calif	1,086,125	1,140,431.70	W. H. Davenport, et al	Fresno, Calif	61,691	64,775.55
Giffen, Inc	Huron, Calif	1,063,720	1,115,860.72	Gilkey Farms, Inc	Corcoran, Calif	60,859	61,865.28
Salyer Land Co	Corcoran, Calif	936,541	951,076.70	John Kochergen, et al	Fresno, Calif	55,771	58,559.55
South Lake Farms	do	383,333	398,666.68	Newhall Land & Farming	Firebaugh, Calif	48,519	51,430.14
Five Points Ranch, Inc	Five Points, Calif	300,725	314,990.08	Anderson, Clayton & Co	Corcoran, Calif	47,844	50,235.72
Calflax Co., Inc	Fresno, Calif	298,744	313,681.20	Campbell Farming Corp	Hardin, Mont	73,867	53,184.24
Employee Enterprises, Inc	Huron, Calif	254,367	267,085.35	Stewart Bros	Shelby, Mont	69,466	52,099.50
Jack Harris, Inc	Five Points, Calif	245,289	257,553.45	Robert F. Reimers et al	Melville, N. Dak	59,119	54,389.48
Buena Vista Association, Inc	San Francisco, Calif	188,510	193,280.21	C. E. Dilse	Scranton, N. Dak	61,673	50,571.86
Vista del Llano Farms et al	Firebaugh, Calif	114,015	122,942.34	Tulana Farms	Worden, Oreg	97,957	92,392.34
J. G. Stoneland Co	Stratford, Calif	99,543	104,520.15				

BEANS, DRY EDIBLE

[Hundredweight]

Bean Growers	Sacramento, Calif	82,219	$567,944.35	Western Bean Growers	Denver, Colo	8,697	$50,919.89
California Lima Bean Growers Association.	Oxnard, Calif	57,096	520,039.80	Michigan Cooperative Bean Marketing Association.	Lansing, Mich	61,600	441,672.00
Harold T. Segerstrom et al	Santa Ana, Calif	11,200	106,960.00	Washington Cooperative Farmer Association.	Seattle, Wash	48,000	315,200.00
Walter Awe	Crows Landing, Calif	5,868	56,039.40				

FLAXSEED

[Bushels]

Moiola Bros	Brawley, Calif	23,235	$78,766.38				

OATS

[Bushels]

KV Ranch	Porthill, Idaho	112,102	$66,140.18	Tulana Farms	Worden, Oreg	356,367	$247,954.56

RICE

[Hundredweight]

Arkansas Rice Growers Cooperative Association.	Stuttgart, Ark	1,054,175	$5,369,078.30	Lawrence E. LeJeune et al	Elton, La	11,988	$59,288.63
				Percy Baronet et al	Shaw, Miss	17,327	83,345.95
Producers Rice Mill, Inc	do	253,179	1,331,723.65	James K. Greer et al	Hollandale, Miss	16,662	77,466.21
Craighead Rice Milling Co	Jonesboro, Ark	32,289	154,007.47	Allen Gray Estate	Benoit, Miss	13,777	66,006.80
W. B. Bynum Cooperative Co	Dermott, Ark	23,648	106,561.17	W. & W. Planting Co	Greenwood, Miss	14,434	60,181.03
Red Bud Farms, Inc	Wabash, Ark	14,537	76,210.51	J. C. O'Neal	Cleveland, Miss	10,201	52,095.96
W. F. Hurley	Diaz, Ark	14,204	75,325.23	Koop Bros	Edna, Tex	21,775	106,822.41
Dawson Farms, Inc	Louisville, Ky.[1]	13,466	71,020.63	E. J. Stoesser	Dayton, Tex	16,697	85,658.78
Moore Bros	Walnut Ridge, Ark	14,035	68,635.05	Schiurring Bros. et al	El Campo, Tex	15,660	74,147.26
R. C. Nicholson et al	Brinkley, Ark	12,214	66,950.90	J. W. Adams & Son et al	Angleton, Tex	15,323	71,777.02
Leon Rutledge et al	Newport, Ark	13,345	61,848.95	Emil Townsend et al	El Campo, Tex	14,989	69,270.96
Arkansas State Penitentiary	Grady, Ark	12,308	60,283.83	P. J. Smidt	do	13,783	66,509.46
Elmer Ferguson	De Witt, Ark	9,799	51,824.43	B. H. Willis	Beaumont, Tex	11,539	63,902.48
Farmers Rice Growers Cooperative.	West Sacramento, Calif	155,754	646,379.10	Texas Rice Land Co	do	10,452	57,988.65
				E. B. Anderson	East Bernard, Tex	11,051	56,491.90
Central Valley Rice Growers	Stockton, Calif	88,264	353,482.25	T. T. Duncan et al	El Campo, Tex	12,312	55,773.36
N. F. Davis	Firebaugh, Calif	19,879	83,888.96	Peltier Bros	Danbury, Tex	12,445	51,899.74
L. C. Ulrich	Woodland, Calif	13,105	53,599.45	O. L. Heckaman	Hamshire, Tex	9,804	50,694.89
Louisiana Rice Growers, Inc	Crowley, La	99,111	500,772.78	L Ranch Co. et al	Ganado, Tex	11,333	50,533.98
W. J. Gayle & Sons	Gueydan, La	18,104	88,866.52				

[1] Loan was made on rice grown in Arkansas.

1958 crop price-support commodity loans of $50,000 or more, by producer—Continued

GRAIN SORGHUM

[Hundredweight]

Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount	Producer	Address	Quantity pledged	Amount
Jack Robinson & Sons	Willcox, Ariz	40,724	$89,185.56	Massey & Harper	Robstown, Tex	56,754	$120,885.67
J. L. Kidd, Jr	do	31,658	69,647.16	Palo Alto Farms	Bishop, Tex	48,121	102,497.47
Farmers Investment Co	Tucson, Ariz	29,792	63,456.96	Taft McGee	Hereford, Tex	56,895	99,566.25
G & K Farms	Willcox, Ariz	26,727	58,800.22	Jack W. Miller	Dimmitt, Tex	45,408	79,463.86
Hooper & Rugg	Casa Grande, Ariz	24,295	53,206.02	Salt Creek Ranch	Refugio, Tex	36,143	74,815.70
Walter C. Owens	McNeal, Ariz	22,735	50,016.34	Howard Bros	Dimmitt, Tex	43,665	71,611.26
C. M. Wilmarth	Grimes, Calif	22,947	52,090.53	V. E. Nichols	Friona, Tex	32,240	52,550.55
Burkham & Glenn	Johnson, Kans	63,994	108,149.86	Rodney Smith	Hart, Tex	29,610	51,818.11
Carl N. Brollier	Moscow, Kans	42,061	71,503.70	H. H. Moore	East Bernard, Tex	24,639	50,509.13
Morrison & Quirk	Hastings, Nebr	39,223	71,778.24	J. K. Griffith	Morton, Tex	30,000	50,100.00
Williams & Sons	Clovis, N. Mex	35,501	62,127.03				

SOYBEANS

[Bushels]

Wesson Farm, Inc	Victoria, Ark	98,780	$203,486.80	James M. Thomas	Tuckerman, Ark	26,443	$55,530.30
Keiser Supply Co	Keiser, Ark	86,310	180,633.68	Leonard Sitzer	Weiner, Ark	25,854	54,293.73
Armorel Planting Co	Armorel, Ark	57,363	120,462.89	Middletown Mills, Robert Garrett.	Burlington, Iowa	24,114	50,398.26
R. A. Pickens & Son, Co	Pickens, Ark	50,727	106,526.76	E. B. Gee	Blytheville, Ark.[2]	145,906	307,322.61
Craighead Rice Milling Co	Jonesboro, Ark	50,153	105,320.46	Story Farms, Inc	Wolf, Mo	33,196	69,893.92
D. F. Portis	Lepanto, Ark	49,609	103,944.87	E. E. Jolly	Catron, Mo	33,295	68,920.65
Lee Wilson & Co	Wilson, Ark	45,403	95,346.34	Hunter Land, Inc	Bell City, Mo	27,984	57,926.84
Vance M. Thompson	McCrory, Ark	36,874	77,436.01	J. V. Conran et al	Conran, Mo	27,251	56,409.57
C. G. Morgan	Hughes, Ark	34,818	71,725.08	Ed Marshall & Son	Charleston, Mo	26,864	55,608.48
Carlson Bros	Marion, Ark	32,057	66,037.42				
Jack Hale	Armorel, Ark	27,113	55,717.21				

WHEAT

[Bushels]

John F. Nutt et al	Elroy, Ariz	74,221	$103,909.12	B. L. Davis Ranch, Inc	Adams, Oreg	38,472	$67,242.28
Vista del Llano Farms et al	Firebaugh, Calif	68,330	143,141.19	Coppinger & Son	Echo, Oreg	37,566	61,608.78
Raymond Castanchoa et al	McFarland, Calif	43,906	91,104.81	Key Bros	Milton Freewater, Oreg	35,158	61,420.91
Blas Gorrindo, Sr., et al	Lancaster, Calif	41,540	81,833.80	A. C. Lindsay	Lexington, Oreg	31,101	59,886.27
J. G. Boswell Co	Los Angeles, Calif	38,341	74,360.18	John Proudfoot and L. Gorger	Ione, Oreg	32,720	59,550.40
Redfern Ranches	Dos Palos, Calif	30,431	64,818.02	O. W. Cutsforth	Heppner, Oreg	32,112	58,560.30
Giffin, Inc. et al	Huron, Calif	32,542	63,131.48	Flassenroot & Gilbert	Pendleton, Ore	35,005	57,312.17
Frank Lamb et al	Meridan, Calif	27,466	58,462.44	G. S. Glen Thorne	do	34,254	56,176.86
Hammonds Ranch, Inc	Firebaugh, Calif	27,136	57,798.96	F. L. Watkins et al	Wasco, Ore	30,029	55,318.09
Employees Enterprise, Inc	Huron, Calif	31,201	56,500.18	Archie Harris	Touchet, Ore	29,884	52,595.84
J. R. Hammonds Estates et al	Firebaugh, Calif	25,610	54,548.03	Roy Howard & Sons	Milton Freewater, Ore	31,708	51,993.70
J. H. Monaghan	Derby, Colo	103,253	181,066.22	Cross Ranch	Pendleton, Ore	28,946	50,655.50
Sprague Bros	Holyoke, Colo	52,865	87,478.40	McCormmach Bros	do	30,628	50,229.25
Iron Mueller, Inc., of Colorado	Bird City, Kans.[3]	44,625	80,771.25	V. J. Asmussen	Agar, S. Dak	48,397	88,994.20
C. V. Cogburn	Walsh, Colo	42,853	76,506.70	Dennis L. Anderson	Onida, S. Dak	27,433	51,299.71
Ben Gay	Brush, Colo	33,649	60,231.71	J. T. Waggoner Trust Estate	Vernon, Tex	182,599	321,795.00
Rooney Farms	Garden City, Kans.[3]	27,388	59,458.05	Perrin, Perrin & Freeman	Hereford, Tex	95,909	165,593.82
Delford L. Bowman	Wray, Colo	31,157	55,147.89	J. W. Huff	Dumas, Tex	65,153	112,263.73
Tom Bradbury	Littleton, Colo	31,235	54,661.25	Ware Farms	Dimmitt, Tex	46,040	78,267.44
Bernard Neill et al	Springfield, Colo	31,047	54,642.72	Pan Tech Farms	Panhandle, Tex	40,991	77,062.76
Iler P. Anderson & Sons	Genoa, Colo	29,071	50,874.25	T. C. Harvey, Jr	Gruver, Tex	40,219	75,209.53
W. T. Wagner & Sons	Lewiston, Idaho	49,493	77,559.84	Thomas L. Moran	Dumas, Tex	41,567	70,192.58
Lenard Schritter	Aberdeen, Idaho	34,044	61,901.20	Price & Price	Stratford, Tex	37,321	62,698.73
Albert Frahm	Colby, Kans	54,068	97,322.40	H. H. Hogue	Dalhart, Tex	36,954	61,713.18
Ellsworth Sherman	Garden City, Kans	52,676	95,343.56	Delmar Durrett	Amarillo, Tex	32,158	58,609.82
Wycoff Bros	Russell Springs, Kans	41,358	74,857.98	W. T. Smoot	do	33,998	58,136.02
Theis Co	Dodge City, Kans	41,442	71,723.20	R. H. Holland	Perryton, Tex	31,379	53,657.53
Carl N. Brollier	Moscow, Kans	38,395	68,343.10	J. R. Stump	Waka, Tex	24,481	52,611.48
Jessie Johns, et al	Johnson, Kans	38,000	67,712.20	Conrad Williams	Goodland, Tex	27,125	51,840.45
Burkham & Glenn	do	35,238	62,723.64	Thomas L. Moran	Dumas, Tex	30,000	51,300.00
Wilber White	Goodland, Kans	31,360	56,243.74	Jap. Wilson & Sons	Claude, Tex	26,742	50,542.41
Harold W. Frasier	Sharon Springs, Kans	30,347	54,013.50	Horrigan Farms, et al	Prosser, Wash	92,249	161,894.49
Winter Bros	Dodge City, Kans	28,244	51,121.64	B. Everett Phillips	Lind, Wash	69,099	117,468.15
Campbell Farming Corp	Hardin, Mont	321,916	515,265.20	Virgil J. Feezell	Mabton, Wash	66,002	115,798.20
Sheffels Farms, Inc	Great Falls, Mont	64,784	104,063.02	Edgar W. Smith, et al	Lancaster, Wash	63,859	107,849.90
E. G. Onstad	Carter, Mont	55,928	89,720.21	Tompkins & Sons	Walla Walla, Wash	62,536	106,312.37
V. R. Cazier & Sons	Toston, Mont	55,622	86,875.99	E. C. Staley	Pullman, Wash	60,610	101,754.81
Warren Swenson	Cut Bank, Mont	51,551	82,481.60	Cecil R. Anderson	Walla Walla, Wash	53,425	87,175.57
Floyd Warren, Inc	Hardin, Mont	44,915	72,635.59	J. G. Peyton Trust, et al	Sprague, Wash	51,547	86,482.71
McNutt Bros	Eugene, Oreg.[4]	43,087	68,951.20	John R. Rea, et al	Touchet, Wash	47,277	82,734.75
LeRoy H. Anderson	Conrad, Mont	42,831	68,608.91	A. L. Ferrell, et al	Pomeroy, Wash	43,593	71,056.31
Walter Banka & Sons	do	38,380	61,490.16	Don Damon	Spokane, Wash	41,407	69,978.00
Hunsaker Bros	Toston, Mont	38,128	60,785.26	Adolph Timm, et al	Harrington, Wash	42,792	67,610.68
Milford Colony, Inc	Augusta, Mont	34,942	55,907.20	Redman Lasater	Prescott, Wash	40,418	66,690.41
Sylvia E. Gruel et al	Great Falls, Mont	32,554	52,086.40	Carl Boyd	Pullman, Wash	38,725	65,283.60
Math. Thieltges	Chester, Mont	32,292	51,732.03	Higginbotham Bros	Hartline, Wash	39,083	62,141.25
Morrison & Quirk	Harvard, Nebr	40,000	75,800.00	Dwayne Blankenship	Washtucna, Wash	36,489	61,724.63
H. B. Wellnitz	Rushville, Nebr	29,332	52,210.96	J. E. Hair	Walla Walla, Wash	34,005	59,508.75
John Garrett, Jr	Clovis, N. Mex	45,000	82,350.00	Guy Travis	Prosser, Wash	32,190	58,382.30
E. E. Dilse	Scranton, N. Dak	54,822	96,266.72	S.T.S. Farms	Walla Walla, Wash	35,527	58,096.37
L. E. Tibert, et al	Voss, N. Dak	33,646	63,254.48	Roger Moore	Connell, Wash	35,730	58,017.27
John D. Kirschmann	Lemmon, N. Dak	32,247	58,367.07	Owes & Belsby	Amber, Wash	33,622	56,148.74
Walter M. Anderson	Turpin, Okla	35,784	67,894.86	Horrigan Investment Co	Phoenix, Ariz.[5]	30,952	55,404.08
Kasmos & Georgearas	Helix, Oreg	93,430	153,169.41	Ralph A. Gering et al	Ritzville, Wash	35,000	55,159.08
Ralph Crum	Ione, Oreg	54,970	92,709.63	Merlin Phillips	Walla Walla, Wash	30,758	53,826.50
Bafus & Sons	Cecil, Oreg	42,914	83,253.47	Engdahl Ranches	Pendleton, Oreg.[5]	33,769	53,354.75
McCanse, Graham & Kaufman	North Powder, Oreg	47,365	73,962.53	T. & T. Ranch	Pomeroy, Wash	31,281	51,300.27
Chas. Carlson	Ione, Oreg	39,733	72,535.42	Philip Hoffman, et al	Eureka, Wash	30,819	50,235.33

[2] Loan was made on soybeansgrown in Missouri.
[3] Loan was made on wheat grown in Colorado.
[4] Loan was made on wheat grown in Montana.
[5] Loan was made on wheat grown in Washington.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 210) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI of Pennsylvania be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Ways and Means.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL LOTTERY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while some of the Members of this Congress as well as other Government officials express fear that a national lottery might raise economic, social and moral issues, the wheels of fortune still continue to spin in 24 States pumping out tremendous tax revenues from racetrack betting.

A report on horseracing in the United States for the year 1960, just released by the National Association of State Racing Commissioners, reveals some interesting and startling revenue figures. It shows that $3,358,264,483 was wagered in these 24 States where gambling on horseracing is legal and proper. It further reports that the revenue to these same States amounted to $258,039,365 with New York State taking in over $97 million in additional income. Also, in spite of our sanctimonious attitude about gambling, our Federal Treasury was the recipient of millions of dollars in taxes collected on admission charges for 46,879,043 persons who attended the races during 1960.

To those people who react with shocked surprise at the mere idea of legalizing a national lottery, I would like to point out that, according to this statistical report, the State of Florida allotted 9 additional racing days for scholarships and charities. This means that gambling funds will be used for the education of our young people and to help the needy.

This report makes one point crystal clear and that is, Mr. Speaker, that millions of American citizens throughout the United States enjoy the pleasures of gambling and that these 24 States, realizing that the urge to gamble is normal, have combined this universal human trait with their ever-growing need for more revenue.

Why, Mr. Speaker, all the resistance to a national lottery when every day millions of dollars are changing hands in every stock market, at every racetrack, at just about every sporting event that is staged? Are these transactions any different than buying a lottery ticket? Are these transactions any different than the lotteries conducted every month by thousands of civic clubs, churches, and welfare organizations where automobiles, television sets, and other prizes go out to lucky ticketholders?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, if we would stop and think of how much other legalized gambling we permit every day without giving it a second thought, the idea of a national lottery is not as immoral or wicked as it sounds.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time is come for this Congress to stop playing a double role on the subject of gambling. I think the time is come for this Government to wipe out hypocrisy and accept the indisputable fact that man is by his very nature a gambler and wants a chance to legally satisfy his gambling thirst.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, I think the time is come for this Congress to realize that a national lottery, which can easily pump into our Treasury $10 billion a year, would be the only means of substantially reducing the heavy tax burden carried by our wage earners. Let us wake up and become realistic and sensible on this issue.

RUSSIAN COLONIALISM AND THE NECESSITY OF A SPECIAL CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last August to deliver in this Chamber an address on "Freedom"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 13, pages 17674–17693. In it I emphasized the captive and colonial status of over 20 nations in Eastern Europe and Asia. I also stressed the enormous strategic importance of these Russian colonies to our own national security as well as to our interest in winning the cold war.

Furthermore, with considerable documentation my address pointed out that Khrushchev's major goal in this period is to secure the acquiescence and political indifference of the free world toward his captives. The evidence I furnished proved conclusively the fundamental point that when we manifest a concrete interest in the captive and colonial nations of Moscow's empire—as in the case of observing Captive Nations Week—Moscow becomes uneasy as its goal appears more remote.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK 1960

Many of us will recall the successful Captive Nations Week observed by millions of Americans last year. The data surrounding this first anniversary event reveal that Moscow and its puppets exceeded in vehemence and vituperation the reaction produced by Khrushchev the previous year when Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution. It appears that the Red totalitarians fear the possibility that this observance will become strongly traditional and that its effects will be felt in both our policy and actions.

This fear is well explained in an editorial which appeared in the summer issue of the authoritative journal on East European problems, the Ukrainian Quarterly. Titled "Captive Nations Week, July 17–23, 1960," the editorial points out the fact that our whole tradition since the American Revolution is at the foundation of this resolution and the observance of Captive Nations Week. In short, it demonstrates what President Kennedy had in mind when in his inaugural address he stated:

We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first revolution.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include this enlightening editorial here as part of my remarks:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 17–23, 1960

Americans throughout the United States observed Captive Nations Week during the week of July 17–23. It will be recalled that in July 1959, the Congress of the United States unanimously passed the Captive Nations Week resolution.[1] The act, now Public Law 86–90, authorized the President to issue a proclamation on the occasion, which he did. This authorization applies on an annual basis. The law also calls for "the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities." In response to this invitation by the Congress, a National Captive Nations Week Committee was established in Washington for this purpose. It has stimulated the formation of local Captive Nations Week committees in every major city of the country.

U.S. INDEPENDENCE AND THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

It was not without good intention that the week was set in the month of July. The fundamental issue of the captive nations and U.S. Independence Day are interwoven in substance and spirit. On July 4 Americans, throughout this land and also abroad, celebrate the independence of our Nation. To all patriotic citizens this sacred day symbolizes, under God, our national freedom, the untampered will of a sovereign people, our firm determination to meet any enemy who would attempt to destroy our hard-won independence. It symbolizes, too, the spiritual and moral power of our great tradition, the liberal institutions of this country, and the warm humanism of its laws.

There is no super- or ultra-patriotic note when it is emphasized that our spirit of independence is at once our past, our present, and our future. Different peoples throughout the world see the meaning and essence of this Nation more objectively and even more appreciatively than many of us do. The European writer, R. L. Bruckberger, in his remarkable book, "Image of America," rightly maintains that the religiously inspired perennial principles and tenets in our Declaration of Independence belong today not only to the American people but to all the peoples and nations of the world, particularly those in Moscow's farflung totalitarian empire. The philosopher Jacques Maritain, in his book, "Reflections on America," views the development of this Nation as a unique and unprecedented historical phenomenon and says, "All this talk about American materialism is no more than a curtain of silly gossip and slander" (p. 30).

As indicated in the first clause of the Captive Nations Week resolution, our Nation, built on the free and creative energies of people drawn from every quarter of the globe, is a unique historical experiment—indeed, the great experiment of mankind. Our Nation is a living revolution that moves

---

[1] For a complete documented account of this see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 1, pages 1032–1039.

the hearts and minds of freedom-aspiring peoples everywhere; again, particularly those in captive Eurasia. In the full perspective of the history of mankind, we, as a united, prosperous and peaceful people have with all humility every reason to be proud of our unique development and rich tradition. Our society, to be sure, is not perfect. But by all evidence it is unquestionably one that has given so much in so many ways to so many within a short span in the history of man. It is one which has made this Nation most powerful, exemplary and respected everywhere. Contrary to some false notions, we do possess an ideology which inspires our continued growth as a morally leading Nation and remarkably equips us to contend successfully with the present threat of imperialist Red totalitarianism.

This ideology is plainly and precisely spelled out in our Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. Normal American citizens know the principles of freedom enshrined in these historic documents and the purposes they necessarily imply for the continued growth and leadership of our Nation. A few in this country seem to think otherwise. It is a sad commentary on the faith that these few have in the strength and vision of the American people, no less in the political and moral foundations of our Nation, when they believe that by setting up a committee to define our national purposes, they could either improve upon or supplant the purposes and objectives of our Nation as provided by our own Declaration of Independence.

In these times, on each Independence Day it is vitally important for Americans to reflect upon the moral and political principles embodied in the Declaration. Nuclear weapons, missiles, luniks and the whole array of new technological innovations—which by nature are only instruments and means—cannot reshape or antiquate these natural norms of civilized human existence. But even more important at this time is the application of the perennial principles of national and individual independence to other nations and peoples. For not only is the living application of these principles crucial to the further growth and development of our Nation, but it is also indispensable to the existence and survival of the nontotalitarian free world. The Captive Nations Week resolution is such an application.

What a moving and powerful force our Declaration of Independence was on the various nations which were subjugated in the empires of the last century and a half. Nations in the Russian, Austro-Hungarian, and Ottoman empires soon rose at the beginning of this century to declare their independence with a will to pursue an independent national existence similar to ours. But, in significant part, this was short lived as the unchecked surge of Russian totalitarian imperialism since 1918 once again reduced the many non-Russian nations of Eastern Europe and Asia to servility. Today, we ourselves are seriously threatened by this barbaric peril. Worst of all, in our confusion, generated in great degree by the tremendous propaganda skill of the enemy, we aren't even aware of the enormous opportunities we have to defeat this menace in the cold war and thus stave off a hot global war.

RESOLUTION, A UNIVERSALIZED DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

The way to these opportunities was unmistakably demonstrated last year with the passage by Congress of the Captive Nations Week Resolution. When he was asked last year about the resolution and its effect on Nixon's visit to the Soviet Union, the President stated, "I said frequently that the United States would never believe and never accept the idea that a true peace had been established in the world until every single nation had the right to express its own views about its own destiny."[2] The resolution gives full expression to this idea. What the resolution, now Public Law 86-90, calls for is a universalized Declaration of Independence.

For the first time our Government recognized the fundamental fact that the Soviet Union itself is an empire, in which the majority of people constitute captive non-Russian nations. In addition to the three captive non-Russian Baltic nations, there are White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia, Idel-Ural and Turkestan—held captive and occupied by foreign Moscow. Following World War I, each of these—as did Poland, Finland, and others—broke away from Russian imperial rule, only to be reconquered one by one on the divide-and-conquer principle. Without these economically rich non-Russian colonies in the Soviet Union, Russia, with less than half of the population of the Soviet Union, would be only a second-rate power.

THE RESOLUTION AND MOSCOW'S REACTION

When Congress passed this resolution last July, it will be recalled that Khrushchev reacted violently and fearfully. He persistently sought to reassure Vice President Nixon that there were no captives in the U.S.S.R. Unfortunately, in our country the greater part of our press was puzzled and bewildered by this development; in fact, many for the first time learned that there are nations like Turkestan and Cossackia in the U.S.S.R.

Now, why did Khrushchev react with such verbal violence against this resolution? Our Government spoke often in the past about the few captive nations in central Europe—the so-called satellites—and yet no such reaction was produced. The answer lies in the fact that there is a serious colonial problem within the Soviet Union, which Moscow calls bourgeois nationalism; and if this is dragged out into the spotlight of world attention and opinion, the proper characterization of Russian Moscow as the last major and imperialist power in the world would be devastating to its propaganda and cold war efforts. Khrushchev well understood this and ranted against the resolution months after. We remained puzzled and bewildered, and muffed our opportunity.

THE RESOLUTION AND THE FUTURE

Our opportunity will come once we realize the following:

1. That the Soviet Union is an empire in itself, holding in bondage the majority of the captive nations in the Red totalitarian world.

2. That the issues of colonialism and imperialism within the Soviet Union are prime targets for our national concern.

3. That the chief type of warfare Moscow—and before it St. Petersburg—wages is propaganda warfare, one that we must equal and surpass.

4. That the cold war will be as permanent as the colonial imperium maintained by Moscow from the Danube to the Pacific.

5. That the universalization of our own Declaration of Independence is the appropriate and most formidable weapon in this type of war. Initiative, positive action, imaginative ideas can be ours with these new dimensions of thought.

The recent events in Paris, Japan, Cuba—indeed in our own San Francisco—are not shocking to those who understand Moscow's traditional techniques. It has built an unprecedented empire by them. These events should bring us back to the realities of the main struggle, for which unhappily, we are poorly prepared. Toward this end, citizens throughout the country have formed in Washington the National Captive Nations Week Committee. In accordance with Public Law 86-90, the committee is stimulating a nationwide observance of Captive Nations Week beginning July 17.

The independence we enjoy and celebrate every July 4th can only be preserved if we begin to translate it for all of the captive nations, both within and outside the Soviet Union.

We shouldn't be fooled by the slogan "Coexistence or Codestruction"; the real alternative is a policy of emancipation and independence, beating Moscow at its cold war propaganda game. This we can do with hitherto unused weapons of truth; and year by year we can truly find ourselves deserving to rejoice as a free nation in 1976, the 200th anniversary of our Declaration of Independence.

KHRUSHCHEV'S U.N. TACTIC

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is most important for us to observe, too, that the sensitive reactions of Moscow to the Captive Nations Week observance went far beyond the range of mere vitriolic opposition. Khrushchev and his minions carried their attack into the United Nations General Assembly and sought to pin the colonialist label on the United States. By their massive tactic in the U.N. last autumn they aimed not only to obtain the favor of certain Asiatic and African states, but also to shift the spotlight of colonial rule from their own empire. This spotlight was focused on Russia's unprecedented empire 2 months before during the Captive Nations Week observance.

We are all familiar with Khrushchev's tirades in the U.N., but are we equally cognizant of the tactics and speeches of some of his trained puppets? A Mr. Podgovny, for example, who ostensibly represents the Ukrainian S.S.R., centered some of his bombastic remarks on the Captive Nations Week and tried desperately to show that Ukraine is a sovereign and free state. For appearances sake, Khrushchev even permitted his puppet to deliver his address in the Ukrainian language, the first of its kind in the U.N.—United Nations General Assembly, 4 October, 1960, 11-20. The contents of this speech, as well as those of the address given by the Byelorussian delegate, Mr. Mazurov, are not to be taken seriously. What is to be taken seriously, however, is the Khrushchev masquerade of so-called representatives of sovereign and free states. His attempt to conceal the colonial and captive status of the many non-Russian nations within the U.S.S.R. must be exposed.

THE NEW FRONTIER OF UNDERSTANDING THE U.S.S.R.

A full-scale exposure of Moscow's extensive colonial rule is in the highest interest of securing peace with justice. Nothing can contribute more to a genuine and solid improvement of relations with the U.S.S.R. than an intelligent expression of our live awareness of Moscow's colonial and imperialist domination over nations both within and outside the Soviet Union. Any indication of an unawareness of this reality and of an inability to penetrate the blatant hypocrisy of Moscow on the colonialism issue would be inimical to such a desired improvement.

[2] President's News Conference, the New York Times, July 30, 1959, p. 12.

Mr. Speaker, this complete and systematic exposure of Russian colonialism truly opens up a new frontier—the new frontier of understanding the U.S.S.R. Defining the new frontier, the President recently stated that—

If freedom is to survive and prosper it will require the sacrifice, the effort, and the thoughtful attention of every citizen. It is this effort and concern which makes up the new frontier.

Needless to say, there is scarcely anything more essential to the preservation of our freedom than to explore and develop this new frontier of understanding the U.S.S.R., the prison house of captive nations, the primary sphere of Moscow's colonial rule.

SIGNIFICANT APPROACHES TO THE NEW FRONTIER

Mr. Speaker, since my address of last August in which I underlined the urgent necessity of establishing a Special House Captive Nations Committee, there has been an intense activity of thought given to the interwoven subjects of Moscow's colonialism, the captive nations, and this new frontier of understanding the U.S.S.R. Discussions, lectures, speeches, and writings on these subjects emerged in many different and diverse areas. It is not possible for me to record here all the examples that could be offered, but those that I do are sufficiently representative and more than justify the need for an operating Special Captive Nations Committee.

From the first two examples it is evident that there are far too many responsible people in this country who still fail to grasp the strategic meaning and significance of all the captive nations taken as an aggregate. Despite the fact that two Presidential proclamations on Captive Nations Week have summoned the American people to study this subject closely and intensively, many misconceptions, myths, and misunderstandings continue to circulate. This is well brought out in a reply prepared by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, to an editorial on Captive Nations Week which appeared in the October 21, 1960, issue of the Washington Star. The pertinent material which makes very interesting reading was published in this informative organ, the Ukrainian Bulletin of November 1–15, 1960, and I include it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin]

UCCA CHAIRMAN SCORES NEWSPAPER ON CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK STAND

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—That much educational work is yet to be done in apprising Americans of the great importance of the peoples enslaved by Soviet Russia is evidenced by an editorial which appeared in the Evening Star of Washington, D.C., on October 21, 1960. The Star said the Captive Nations Week resolution, which took cognizance of the plight of the enslaved nations and which was passed by the U.S. Congress last year, "was, indeed, ill timed and of doubtful value." The Star then proceeded to quote its own editorial of last year:

("The resolution requested Mr. Eisenhower to designate the third week in July as Captive Nations Week, and the President duly complied. It happens, however, that this was the week in which our exhibition in Moscow was to be opened, with Mr. Nixon on hand to do the good-will honors. If it is necessary or desirable to proclaim such things as Captive Nations Week, along with Apple Week, Sweetpotato Week, and Be Kind to Animals Week, why is it also necessary to choose the worst possible time. The chances are that no one in this country really thought about the coincidence of timing. But Mr. Khrushchev did think about it, and he has used it rather effectively—first, to put the chill on both Mr. Nixon's visit and our exhibition, and, second, to argue to his own countrymen that we are meddling in their affairs. This is always a potent propaganda appeal, and the probable result in this case will be to stifle rather than lift the hopes of peoples in the captive countries."

(Myopic to the point of blindness, this view of an influential publication is rebutted by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, UCCA chairman and National Captive Nations Committee chairman, who speaks not only for oppressed Ukraine but for all those nations denied their freedom behind the Iron Curtain. His reply which the Star did not see fit to run, is reproduced here.)

OCTOBER 22, 1960.

To the EDITOR OF THE EVENING STAR:

Your October 21 editorial on "Not a Valid Issue" contains so many of its own factual and analytic invalidities as concerns the Captive Nations Week resolution that it seems almost presumptuous to expect the informed reader to rely on your judgment in connection with Senator FULBRIGHT's injection of the Vice President's visit to Moscow into this campaign. On other grounds and for other reasons we can agree with your conclusion, but, in truth, that visit is a story in itself which should be told at an appropriate time. It reflects the limited knowledge and defective understanding of our opinion makers about the Soviet Union and, I regret to say, your editorial is an example of this general condition.

In the fervent hope that your convictions and attitude toward the resolution and its significance will be firm and well founded in the future, let me point out your inconsistency and factual deficiencies. First, if, as you say, the resolution is of "doubtful value," then it can be inferred that your very instructive and enthusiastic editorial this past July 17 on "Mr. K's Captives" is of doubtful conviction. Hailing Captive Nations Week and explaining its meaning—and thus value—this editorial is a far cry from the somewhat amateurish one written last year and unwittingly reproduced in the October 21 editorial. The July 17 editorial appears along with many others from all parts of the country in a preliminary documented study on this year's Captive Nations Week in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 13, pages 17675–17694. I leave it to the reader to judge whether the resolution is of positive value as seen by editors of the New York Times, the Chicago Tribune, and numerous others—and, on this occasion, as rightly seen by you.

Second, your cynical comparison of Captive Nations Week with Apple Week and the like scarcely requires comment. It speaks for itself and the level of your understanding of this as maintained a year ago. Incidentally, to disparage the resolution and its tremendous possibilities, Moscow and its colonial puppets have the same cynical approach these past 2 years.

Third, you contend that the resolution was ill timed and also that probably no one in this country really thought about the coincidence of timing. The first is a questionable judgment; the second is subject to factual investigation. With regard to the latter, it is evident that you didn't bother to investigate. The simple fact is that when in mide-June 1959, I approached Senators Douglas and Javits and Congressmen Bentley and Feighan to sponsor the resolution on a bipartisan basis, it was consciously timed between the foreign ministers meeting and the coming cultural exhibit in Moscow. After all, the resolution, which was formulated on a different time basis in 1958 and for certain reasons did not succeed in the House, could have been reintroduced in early 1959. Here, too, the documented story of the resolution appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 21, 1960, and the reader could judge the validity of our assertions for himself.

As to whether the resolution was ill timed or not, our position on this factually unfounded judgment should be obvious. It couldn't have been passed at a better time. To hold otherwise, as you do, indicates that some of us still fail to comprehend the crucial propaganda essence of the cold war, the thing that leads to basic questions of national prestige, the potency of ideas and command over the loyalties of human beings. It is strange, to say the least, that some of us have not yet profited from Moscow's successive demonstrations of the importance of timing. The passage of the resolution at the time of the Vice President's visit to Moscow afforded him an armament of rational arguments to contest successfully the anticipated offensive of Khrushchev. Nekulturny Nikita well understood this then, as he still does now; many of us, unfortunately, have yet to read the resolution with absorbing knowledgeability.

Fourth, your assertion that the resolution helped Khrushchev to argue to his own countrymen that we are meddling in their affairs substantiates my preceding sentence. Indeed, you contradict the contents of your own editorial of July 17. The predominant fact is that in political reality there are no internal affairs in the Soviet Union. Colonial captives in Georgia, Lithuania, Ukraine, Turkestan, and other countries in this prison house of nations do not take seriously the sovereignty and internal affairs argument that apparently you do. The argument is an old Russian device to preserve an empire and is actually employed in a manner that a bandit would try to preserve his stolen properties by telling the law to mind its own business and not meddle in his internal affairs.

Lastly, as to the additional values of the resolution, it is no exaggeration for me to state that a body of rational conceptions and directions, it stands to serve as the basis of a cold war effort that not only would decisively demolish the spurious Soviet image now being skillfully foisted upon many areas of the nontotalitarian free world but also would produce positive gains for the cause of freedom within the domain of the present Russian totalitarian empire—and this without precipitating any hot global war. As so often in the past, the power that could least afford such a war is colonial Russia. It is not possible to describe here the multifold ramifications of the resolution's implementation except to say that every effort is being made at this time to encourage our U.N. delegation in the debate on colonialism to speak out knowledgeably and intelligently about the colonial status of not only the few captive nations in central Europe but also—indeed, far more so—about the majority of them in Moscow's inner empire, the U.S.S.R. Such positive and truthful action is called for and certified by the resolution which your editorial of the 21st has regrettably and unfairly sought to depreciate.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is not without significant reason that in this context I make reference to the writings of this Georgetown educator and specialist on the Soviet Union. He and his supporters have long ago given their

answer to the question posed by the President in his inaugural address last month:

And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

For the past 2 years Dr. Dobriansky has been the object of bitter attack in Soviet publications. Evidently his ideas and activities are not palatable to Moscow and its puppets. A few months ago he wrote an article titled "Nine Lingering Myths on Russia" which points out the obstacles in our way to the new frontier of understanding the U.S.S.R. Appearing in a recent issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly, this article has produced a stir in many interested circles. I wish to introduce it at this point in the RECORD along with some apt observations made recently on the captive nations by Justice Michael A. Musmanno, of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

NINE LINGERING MYTHS ON RUSSIA

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Concepts are essentially the reflectors, the eyes, of our understanding. Blurred eyes, of course, symptomize certain underlying defects or deficiencies. No matter in what field of thought, the circulation of improper and ill-founded concepts reflects to a marked degree a defective understanding of the given subject. One may accumulate considerable bits of knowledge about a subject and yet fall short of a working understanding of it. The governing concepts in use will readily indicate this. Perhaps in no other field is this condition so glaringly evident than in that of so-called Russian area studies.

To be sure, much progress has been achieved over the past 10 years in our knowledge and understanding of the subject called Russia. Evolving and pressing circumstances have compelled us to respond with intellectual report. Nevertheless, despite this progress, we continue to suffer from a serious intellectual lag caused by nine lingering myths concerning Russia. A reading of the daily newspapers or some ostensibly expert work on the U.S.S.R. or a number of official statements on foreign policy will easily show the marks of these lingering myths. The gravity of this lag need scarcely be emphasized when we soberly recognize that as a Nation we are confronted by a challenge and threat which poses the utter destruction of our democratic institutions, indeed, of our existence as an independent national state. It follows, too, that to meet this mortal threat successfully, it is plainly incumbent upon us to possess the most accurate and comprehensive understanding of the enemy. Lacking in some respect in this, we cannot but be deficient in a considered appreciation of his points of strength and weakness, with incalculable detriment to ourselves. Therefore, so long as many of us, in high places as well as low, official as well as private, continue to perpetuate these mythical notions about Russia, we are really contributing in divers ways to a distorted conception of the enemy.

THE DEEP ROOTS OF CURRENT MYTHS

The myths which distort our image of Russia have deep roots. They can, in part, be sympathetically understood against a broad phasal background of U.S. relations with the Russian Empire. Prior to the Bolshevik revolution in 1917 and down to recent date, power relations between the United States and the Russian Empire, both czarist and Communist, were at best remote, with little cause for serious friction or major conflict and thus with minor stimulation of thought and concern about the nature and makeup of Russia. What serious interest developed between the two wars was mainly confined to so-called liberal intellectuals who viewed the Russian totalitarian enterprise chiefly as a novel socioeconomic experiment, about which much tinctured information was transmitted by those who hopelessly lost faith in our institutional norms of living. Later, the war alliance between the United States and the Soviet Union produced on both sides, but for different reasons, fanciful propaganda which only served to inflate to incredible proportions many of the prevailing myths about Russia.

Following the war, the political vacuums in both Europe and Asia, and also accelerated technologic progress brought the power relations between the United States and the Soviet Union into unusual direct line, precipitating with equal unusualness widespread interest and study relating to the Soviet Union. The supposed initiation of the cold war in this period also contributed heavily to this development, although in truth it merely represented an actualization of what was in steady growing potentiality since 1917. Underlying all of these phases, however, was the almost exclusive reliance by American scholars and students, trained in the Russian tongue, upon source material processed under the political censorship of either the former czarist government or the present Russian totalitarian regime. In the past decade, misnomered Russian institutes have cropped up at numerous American universities and, in so many unfortunate instances, have produced graduates who, whether consciously or not, transmit in their writings and activities the imprint of imperial Russian ideology.

This background goes a long way to explain why our understanding of what many loosely and carelessly call Russia has been deficient. In time, doubtlessly we shall overcome the deficiency, but the question is, "How much time do we have?" In too many places the myths still continue to circulate and to mislead. Some in perpetuating them are unaware of doing so. Others for plausible emotional reasons find it difficult to recondition their behavioral patterns of thought. And, as the evidence shows, a third category deliberately engages in it for political and even imagined financial objectives.

It is far from the writer's intention to become involved in the criticism of personalities as such. Where unavoidable mention is made of persons or groups in connection with any of the lingering myths, it is done in an objective vein and solely for purposes of concrete exemplification. A knowledge of the persistence of these myths on Russia should prove to be exceedingly valuable, if for no other reason than the real possibility that militarily we might have to fight Russia for our own survival.

THE RUSSIA/SOVIET UNION MYTH

Surely the most common myth arises from the interchangeable use of the terms "Russia" and "the Soviet Union," as though they were identical in reference to territory and peoples. In the light of accurate and uncensored history—which to the greatest degree was no more respected by the past autocratic czarist regime than it is by the present Russian Bolshevik one—it is even misleading to identify Russia with the past czarist Russian Empire, again in terms of ethnographic territory and peoples. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, conceived by the ever expedient Russian Bolsheviks after their military conquest of the independent non-Russian Republics of White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia, Turkestan and others, in the early period of 1918–22, is at least nominally more in conformity with the facts of distinctive nations, cultures, and religions that essentially characterize the present totalitarian Russian Empire than had been the previous czarist Russia Empire. If some would even take the trouble to glance at the Constitution of the U.S.S.R., they would find that what they call Russia is only one national, and at that federated, are in the U.S.S.R. known as the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic.

Now, what is the significance of this myth in its obstruction to a clear and just understanding of the Soviet Union and the many nations held captive within it? Is it, as some impulsively declare, a mere quibble on words, a play of semantics? First, definition and classification are indispensable to true scientific and philosophical knowledge. Where differentiation is objectively observed, be it with regard to matter, species, man, nations, or societies, concepts are found to coincide with such features of differentiation. When concepts arbitrarily confuse different objects, they lead to error which in turn exacts its price once projected into action. By language, history, culture, and religion, the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union are as different from the Russian, in some respects more so, as the French are from the German or Spanish, or the Chinese from the Japanese. Thus, from a scientific point of view alone, to subsume these non-Russian nations under the concept of Russia does violence to objective fact. It makes as much sense as identifying the British Isles with England.

Moreover, this misidentification weakens our evaluation of the supposedly internal problems of this empire and impedes a full appreciation of its major sources of weakness. The monistic and homogeneous concept of Russia does not easily permit an operational understanding of the existence of empire, colonialism, nationalism, patriotic underground activity and similar phenomena that glaringly characterize the Soviet Union. Instead, it breeds uniformed doubt and skepticism in the face of even overwhelming evidence. This was perhaps best illustrated by Western correspondents in the late forties who could not digest the existence of a Ukrainian insurgent army until it was necessary for its command to provide flesh-and-blood evidence on West German soil.

A third point of significance regarding this myth is not only the basis for misdirected psychological warfare that it erects, but also the adverse psychological reaction that it inevitably produces among the peoples in the various nations so misidentified. As individuals possess the instinct for proper and true identification, so do groups of people and nations. The reaction of a Ukrainian or Georgian being called a Russian is similar to that of an Irishman being misidentified as an Englishman. To refer to these non-Russian nationals as peoples of Russia, or to Ukraine as the Texas of Russia, or to Armenia as Russian Armenia is in the minds of these different peoples tantamount to a stamp of approval on the present Russian totalitarian empire which secures their bondage. In these trying times, marked by close competition for the minds of men everywhere, let us not forget that we, as rightly proud Americans, possess no monopoly on love of country, its rich heritage, its hopeful future.

Finally, this myth of Russia/Soviet Union is, as we shall see, a basic breeding ground for several other myths. It is a striking fact that adherence to this basic myth forms the preconceptual framework for the incurrence of other myths, distorting the picture of the U.S.S.R.'s economy, political environment, and history. This is most observable among American journalists who, by all evidence, are notorious in this misidentification. One prominent

writer for an internationally known newspaper argued the point that the term "Russia," no matter how inaccurate and misleading, was necessary to conserve line space. The simple answer to that, with benefit of further space conservation, is the convenient use of U.S.S.R. If one reads works on the subject, he will find that even State Department experts of the accepted stature of George F. Kennan perpetuate this myth.[1] Fortunately, the monumental hearings and reports on the Soviet Union by the Select House Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression have contributed in great measure to dispel this common myth.[2] Much more remains, however, to eliminate its lingering character.

MYTH OF U.S.S.R./U.S.A. PARALLELISM

Another outstanding myth in American circulation is the parallel myth which spreads the fiction that the Soviet Union is a federal union of states like the United States of America. This myth underlies the present usage of the term "the Soviets." It also leads to many practical errors. Actually, the parallelism is as spurious as those drawn between the constitutions of the two entities or the secession problems associated with the two. This superficial parallelism indicates a conspicuous lack of historical knowledge with regard to the forcible origin of the Soviet Union and its multinational composition, which in themselves are sufficient to destroy the parallelism. The Federal Union of the United States came into being and expanded through the free will of previously independent and autonomous States and territories; the Soviet Union originated and developed entirely on the basis of armed conquest and forced incorporation of the conquered countries. The United States represents the prime example of democratic and free federalization; the Soviet Union is the prime example of a totalitarian empire disguised as a federal union. The United States is a single, integrated and united nation; the Soviet Union, as the original Russian Bolshevik Empire, is a forcibly contrived structure holding in captivity many different nations, with different languages, customs, histories, and distinctive peoples.

These essential, general facts adequately explode the parallel myth, and yet one finds Mr. Kennan equating Ukraine to Pennsylvania, Senator Wiley paralleling it to Texas, Ambassador Lodge comparing Byelorussia with Massachusetts, and a score of newspaper editors committing the same mistake.[3] Is it little wonder that our people still cannot comprehend the tremendous fact that the Soviet Union, behind its nominal facade, is the greatest and worst empire in the pages of human history? From the viewpoint of the functional import of this myth, it should be obvious why we continue to fail in our psychological efforts and political warfare to the extent that millions in Asia and Africa are of the Moscow-inspired belief that the United States and its allies are the chief symbols of imperialism and colonialism. The prime representative of these historical evils, on the other hand, is thought to be a paradise of happy nations as well as of prosperous workers. Most ironical, isn't it? And yet a supreme irony capable of molding our own destruction.

In his remarkable address before the American Legion convention in Miami several years ago, Secretary of State Dulles pointed in the direction of demolishing the parallel myth when, on the matter of forging a vast domain, he stated, "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is itself a multinational state consisting of 16 so-called Republics, several of which were once independent nations."[4] The fact is that most of them were once independent, and when later the Secretary pointed out that, "the Soviet bloc represents an amalgamation of about 900 million people, normally constituting more than 20 distinct national groups," he necessarily implied Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Georgia, and the other non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. to arrive at this figure.

It appeared at the time that many competent observers were ready for a forthright, operational policy toward the Soviet Union as an empire within an empire. For example, a diplomatic correspondent for Newsweek, stressed that "serious American thought also must be given to the nationally conscious Soviet component such as the Ukraine and Byelorussia. The fact that these two nations have their own representatives in the U.N. has never been properly utilized by the United States. To encourage their independence and to strive for the decentralization of the Soviet Union into its separate though not necessarily unfriendly components is likely to become one of the chief U.S. objectives."[5] Of course, the sooner this objective is established, the sooner we shall begin to overshadow and dwarf Moscow's current propaganda on Western imperialism and colonialism.

THE POPULATIONAL MYTH

Despite Moscow's 1959–60 census disclosures, a third myth, closely associated with the first basic one, is the population myth. This subsidiary myth is usually reflected in such phrases and terms as "the national minorities of Russia," "the 177 nationalities in the U.S.S.R.," and "the nationality problem in the Soviet Union." It seeps into much economic and political literature on the Soviet Union and only serves to misguide the reader in his perspectival understanding of this area.[6] Those conditioned by this myth are obsessed with the baseless fear that should this empire colossus collapse, it would invite unmanageable chaos: others are led into the fiction that the situation in the Soviet Union is similar to the "minorities setup" in the United States. Another fiction related to this myth parallels the territorial expansion of the Russian Empire with that of the United States, with the gifts of civilization meted out by Moscow to the "Indians of Eastern Europe and Asia." In passing, it should be noted that many individuals in this country, nurturing a mystical pro-Russian bias for the eternity of holy mother Russia and its vast colonial domains, not inadverently but diliberately circulate this populational myth in order to discourage thinking and action directed at the freedom and independence of the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.

Again, stubborn facts explode this myth and each of its created fictions. Taking the Soviet Union as a whole, it is a reasonable estimate that about 54 percent of the population is non-Russian. More important than this is the overriding fact that 14 of the Soviet republics are populated in the greatest majority by their natives, and if one correctly combines the 5 central Asiatic republics into the Moslemic country of Turkestan, there are already 10 integrated, unified nations. With distinctive cultures and histories in this empire of many countries, these nations could scarcely be reduced to the level of national minorities, no more than the Polish people could in the event of Poland's incorporation into the Soviet Union. Furthermore, the "177 nationalities in the U.S.S.R." is clearly a statistical fraud since a multitude of small tribal units, misclassified as nationalities, are lumped with a dozen non-Russian nations that alone account for over 90 percent of the approximately 115 million non-Russian people in the U.S.S.R. Although a favorite phrase with Moscow and Stalin, there is really no nationality problem in the Soviet Union—the problem is one of colonial empire or free and independent nations. And lastly, since the dozen non-Russian nations possess such large populations and territories and since the continuous histories of some go as far back as 4,000 years, the fear of unmanageable chaos and the parallels with the minorities and territorial expansion of the United States are clearly imaginary.

THE IDEOLOGICAL MYTH OF SOVIET COMMUNISM

One of the most befogging myths which is sustained by a number of our governmental agencies is the ideological myth. It holds that the real enemy confronting the free world is Soviet communism or international communism. Those embracing this myth argue that we must not use the term "totalitarian Russian imperialism," because this would implicate the Russian people and thus a particular nation would seem to be responsible for the crimes of communism, or, simply, we should not appear to be anti-Russian. Others so inebriated by this myth go so far as to write about the Soviet man or the Soviet people.[7] This also is a favorite Moscow usage fashioned to conceal the real facts.[8] In the meantime, others dwell on the absurdity of a Soviet nation. It would seem from all this that the enemy is some enigmatic phenomenon dangling from the sky, without any roots in the soil, or bone and blood, of history.

The ideological myth is a most dangerous one because we are prone to lose sight of the real enemy and thus lose ourselves. History teaches that the real enemy is imperialist Russian totalitarianism. In the past, the empire building of imperialist Russian totalitarianism was pursued under the banners of the Third Rome and Pan-Slavism; today it is communism, and for the world. Briefly, the behavior of the Soviet Union does not bear the remotest relation to the fundamental doctrine of historical materialism in Marxist philosophy, not to mention other outmoded Marxian ideas.

Thus the use of the term "Soviet communism" or "international communism" is meaningless for our purposes, especially when thought of in terms of imperialist aggressions. We recall that a soviet by definition, is a representative workers' council. Are we, in response to Khrushchev, in effect telling the peoples of Asia and elsewhere that what they have to oppose are the economic forms of the Soviet Union or the imperialist aggressiveness of its workers? Semantically, these terms imply just this and, needless to say, we make little impression on them. The concrete threat of imperialist Russian totalitarianism, with its impeccability of the state, colonialism, ultimate Moscow control over foreign territories and empire absorption, not only conforms with indisputable facts but also possesses flesh and blood meaning in the stream of human events.

THE HISTORICAL MYTH OF "FIRST VICTIMS"

Objectively to identify the real enemy as such does not mean by any stretch of logic

[1] Burnham, James, "Containment or Liberation?" the John Day Co., New York, 1953, chs. 1–2.

[2] "Investigation of Communist Takeover and Occupation of the Non-Russian Nations of the U.S.S.R." Select Committee on Communist Aggression, House of Representatives, 1954.

[3] "Review of the United Nations Charter," Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 1955, p. 1832.

[4] The New York Times, Oct. 11, 1955.

[5] Edward Weintal, Newsweek, Aug. 29, 1955.

[6] E.g., "Tensions Within the Soviet Union," S. Doc. No. 41, 1951, p. 32.

[7] See Isaac Don Levine, Life magazine, Mar. 23, 1953.

[8] E.g., "Theses on the Tercentenary of the Reunion of the Ukraine With Russia," Tass, Jan. 13, 1954.

or imagination the indictment of the Russian people for the crimes of imperialist Russian totalitarianism; nor does it give the appearance of being anti-Russian. We had no qualms in characterizing German nazism and Italian fascism for what they were without imposing common guilt upon the underlying populace. The mass of the Russian people is in enslavement as any other within the expanded empire and, perhaps more than any other, stands in the greatest need of democratizing growth which it really has never experienced. The autocratic machinery has always prevailed in Russia and it is here that the source of responsibility rests.

Although one cannot but morally assume this just position, it surely does not follow that he must uncritically accept the circulated historical myth that the first victims of Bolshevik aggression were the Russian people. Scholars of the stature of Father Edmund Walsh, George Fedetov and many others are in complete agreement that without the broad support of the Russian people, induced by the Bolshevik platform of bread, peace, land, Lenin couldn't possibly have established his regime in 1917, regardless of the coup that took place. Here, again, history amply shows that the first true victims of totalitarian Russian aggression are non-Russian nations whose independent republics of Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Georgia and others were devastated by the Red Russian armies under Trotsky in the period of 1918–20. This set the intelligible pattern of aggression against the Baltic States and those of central Europe some 20 years later. In short, traditional Russian totalitarianism, for which the nonvested masses of the Russian nation are scarcely responsible, simply acquired in 1917 the messianic cloak of a new crusade to beguile the still unconquered peoples and nations of the free world.

THE SEMANTIC MYTH ON DISMEMBERMENT OF RUSSIA

There is also in circulation the semantic myth on the dismemberment of Russia which transports the foolish notion that the liberation and independence of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. means the division of the territory of the Russian nation. It is evident that this is an inferential argument of deception stemming from the first myth which finds currency in many popular writings. What is not honestly stated is the truth that such liberation and independence necessarily means the wholesome division and disintegration of an empire, which is something entirely different from the alleged division of the ethnographic territory and habitat of the Russian people.

In the empire framework of the U.S.S.R., Russia is itself a federated republic which, as far as the record shows, no one seeks to dismember, except perhaps the Siberyaks, or Russian separatists, in Soviet Asia, for whom the centralized control of Moscow has always been exasperating. In the earliest period of Russian bolshevism, the maritime provinces in the Far East succeeded in gaining their own political independence and, ever since, the real possibility of this division of Russia has existed. However, this is clearly distinguishable from the issue of dividing an empire, as constituted by the Soviet Union, through the natural forces of enlightened nationalism and national patriotism. These forces are operative in each of the non-Russian countries which have been forced into this uneasy federation.

THE BIG-BROTHER MYTH

Those who study both Russian totalitarian and even Russian emigree literature are also impressed by the big-brother myth. The myth maintains, among other things, that the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. do not desire their real independence and those who advocate it are separatists, extremists, and, as the Kremlin puts it, bourgeois nationalists. At first sight this myth should be recognized as an insult to the intelligence of any interested audience—peoples not wanting their independence. Yet, it is skillfully used to the extent of rewriting the early distinctive histories of Ukraine, White Ruthenia, and Muscovy (Russia) on the basis of a brotherhood of peoples notion, with the supposedly great Russians invariably the big brothers. It appears incessantly in Russian totalitarian propaganda as, for instance, in the Tass dissertation quoted above, we find, "With the great brotherly assistance of the Russian people, in all national republics a highly developed industry was built." [9] One of the major indictments against Beria was based on his attempt to undermine this big brotherly relationship.[10] The expensive fanfare of the Pereyaslav celebration in the entire year of 1954, was staged on this theme (the New York Times editorial, December 20, 1953, "Ukraine and Russia") and a dubious gift by Moscow of non-Russian Crimean territory to Ukraine was transacted as an overt token of this relationship (the New York Times, February 27, 1954, p. 1).

In actual fact, of course, there is no special brotherly relationship between the peoples of Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Georgia, and so forth, and Russia than what exists between these and peoples of other nations. It is plainly a propaganda theme with many deceptive ramifications. If one takes the utterances of Stalin and the several funeral orations at Stalin's bier, for example, the myth is magnified to racial proportions, with the great Russians as the chosen people of history. Behind the myth, however, the invincible struggle persists in order to arrive at sound neighborly relations by abolishing the colonial and imperialist yoke of Moscow from the non-Russian territories and countries of the U.S.S.R. Empire.

THE SATELLITE MYTH

Perhaps more widespread and damaging than several of the preceding myths is the satellite myth upon which, curiously enough, a number of official undertakings are based. According to this myth, the beginning of totalitarian Russian imperialist aggression is dated as of the 1940's with the destruction of the national independence of the Baltic States and those of central Europe. It spawns the specious argument that an enduring and just peace could be established with the removal of the Iron Curtain eastward to the prewar borders of the Soviet Union. Upon reflection, one should have no difficulty in perceiving the correlative significance of this myth with the other outstanding ones. In over 90 percent of political addresses and journalistic pieces on the subject, the satellite myth is invariably expressed against the background of the others. From an analytical viewpoint, this is of little wonder when the Soviet Union is viewed merely as Russia, a fictitious nation of over 200 million Russians, or an alleged federal union such as ours with foreign language minorities.

Adherence to this myth, as evidenced by such terms as "the satellite countries," "the satellites of the Soviet Union," or "the satellite people," produces a number of unfortunate and backfiring results that the adherents are usually unaware of. One, quite obviously, is the fact that it serves to conceal the greater part of the entire and full record of imperialistic Russian aggression since 1917. This scarcely helps our own propaganda cause. Second, the inexcusable lack of historical background upon which the myth thrives, objectively makes sham of our ceaseless professions on the indivisibility of freedom for all nations. The longer experiences under the yoke of Moscow of most of the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union are substantially repeated in the so-called satellite countries, pitted now in similar captivity. But when their peoples hear that we are interested only in liberating the satellite peoples, what could be their only reaction to our espousal of freedom everywhere? Are they the lost segment of humanity, despite a total population in excess of the satellites?

In addition, the satellite thesis detracts seriously, from our power of argument on the issues of colonialism and imperialism. The Russian totalitarian empire is far greater in geography than that represented just by the satellite areas. Its greatest base is the long and broad non-Russian territories of the Soviet Union itself, but the satellite usage only helps to hide this fact, with evident benefit to the enemy. Also, even if it were more than academic in character, the notion of prewar border withdrawal would not secure the type of peace we all seek, based on freedom with justice for all nations. Although it might bring desired freedom and independence to one part of the empire, it would still fall short of eliminating the powerful source of world tension and peril.

The one great lesson of the past 40 years that history teaches is that the surest guarantee of the independence of the Baltic States, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania is the sustained independence of Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Georgia, and other non-Russian nations now held captive in the Soviet Union. In the realm of historical reality, had this real possible course to what actually happened been realized, the former would not be in captivity today. Their state is one of mutual captivity. They all fall in the category of captive and occupied nations. And the Captive Nations Week resolution which Congress passed in 1959 stresses this important point.

THE MYTH OF PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

The final myth is that of peaceful coexistence. The term was originally used by Lenin before the conquest of the non-Russian nations. The term has been exploited in a variety of ways: as a propaganda prop to the shortsighted containment policy, as the hopeful theme to the misapplied doctrine of evolution, as the inspiration of the now lost spirit of Camp David, as the ticket for superficial trips to Moscow, and as part of the horrendous slogan "coexistence or codestruction." Further, we have been told that peaceful coexistence and preventive war are the only alternatives open to us in our policy toward the Soviet Union. Its slogan value can hardly be denied. The basis of such value is the natural yearning of all of us for peace and the avoidance of military conflict.

The ideal of peaceful coexistence among nations presupposes, by its very nature, a free cultural intercourse of peoples, a liberal exchange of ideas and information, a minimum of government restriction on the universally contributory activities of individuals. The political realities of the present don't even permit a faint approximation to this ideal, and events of the past few months furnish additional evidence of this. The blunt fact is that so long as the Iron Curtain exists, whether at its present location or at the prewar borders, these requisite conditions for peaceful coexistence cannot possibly be realized. A further blunt fact is that the Iron Curtain, as to some notable degree in the past, is an institutional necessity to the conserved power of imperialist Russian totalitarianism. To remove the Iron Curtain means to undermine the regime and its vast covert operations. But, needless to say, the totalitarian Russian regime is determined to remain in power indefinitely.

Logically, then, peaceful coexistence stands only as a myth, the retention of which can

[9] Ibid., p. 12.

[10] The New York Times, Dec. 17, 1953, p. 12.

be of practical benefit only to Moscow. With it, Moscow lulls the free world into a state of false security; behind the smokescreen, it feverishly pursues its planned work to subvert, divide, and eventually physically destroy the remaining free nations of the world. In short, containment, evolution, and peaceful coexistence constitute passive variants that afford Moscow the invaluable asset of time to achieve the goals of this sinister work. As spelled out rigorously in one of my previous writings, these episodes of passive and operationally deficient policy represent negative supports for the Communist calculus for world conquest (the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 28, 1955). There is grave long-run danger in this gamble for ourselves. Material power alone, for mass retaliation or otherwise, will not save us. A relentless spirit of revolution in our global struggle for independence is the basic requirement of the day. Unfolded by peaceful means, this necessary spirit can find compatible expression only in a strong policy of emancipation which is the third and soundest alternative open to us. The cold war never subsided with "the spirit of Camp David." Always the finest and most skillful instrumentalists, the imperialist rulers of Moscow exploited this spirit to the *n*th degree in pursuit of their own objectives. It was an integral part of the cold war as, indeed, everything is in the eyes of the Russian totalitarians.

These enumerated myths likewise are a part of the cold war. Their potency and breadth of circulation work to our weakness and, thus, to the relative advantage of the powerful enemy. They confuse, disinform, hinder, and impede, causing much needless waste in our endeavors to defeat the dedicated Russian totalitarian enemy. In this struggle for keeps, lest we delude ourselves, the only alternative to victory over imperialist Russian totalitarianism is disastrous defeat for ourselves. The historical dynamics of our times disallow any middle ground. It is thus necessary to dispel and destroy these myths that incubate the ingredients of defeat for our great Nation.

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY JUSTICE MICHAEL A. MUSMANNO, DECEMBER 4, 1960, PITTSBURGH, PA.

Khrushchev has uttered countless words, and his country has committed countless deeds, of unmitigated hypocrisy, but nothing can surpass the revolting two-facedness of Russia's resolution before the United Nations calling for the ending of colonialism. Russia holds in chains of slavery 22 separate nations, containing 114 million people, and yet it has the effrontery to speak of colonies flying the flags of other nations.

In the 22 nations held in a vise of iron by Russia, the people know nothing of free elections and individual political liberty. And yet, the Soviet Union representative at the United Nations had the supreme brazenry yesterday to attack the United States on her relationship with Puerto Rico where the people enjoy maximum freedom in choosing their own Governor and legislature and are otherwise unrestricted in the development of their own economic and political destiny.

I am happy that Pittsburgh is host to the Ukrainian Congress Committee which today celebrates the 20th anniversary of its formation. I am sure that Ukrainia, a beautiful land of 45 million people with a history, literature, and culture all its own, will yet fly its own flag, and we should encourage the Ukrainians in their legitimate, patriotic aspirations.

The so-called invincibility of the Soviet Union is a myth because no nation can be stronger, in the long run, than the will of its collective people. Since there are more non-Russians than Russians in the Soviet Union, the day is bound to come when these enslaved peoples will break their chains.

A spider is no stronger than the web over which it operates. As soon as its web is broken, the spider is cornered into helplessness. And so, if these captive nations would rebel, Russia would be as powerless as a spider with its legs cut off and no longer would it be able to terrorize, as it does now, almost one-third of the world's population.

The Congress of the United States has recognized the plight of Russia's captive nations and has offered them the moral support of our Nation. We are proud indeed to have as a guest in our city the man who drafted the captive nations resolution adopted by Congress in 1959, the distinguished Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor at Georgetown University.

I trust that the people of the United States will continue to offer prayers for the liberation of the 114 million people wearing the chains of Soviet imperialistic domination and that imperialistic colonialism in its true sense of oppression, and not as defined by Khrushchev, who seems to have a dictionary of his own, will end.

THE KENNEDY-NIXON ANSWERS ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the last presidential campaign, the subject of the captive nations was discussed in most quarters of the Nation. The record of this discussion would fill volumes. But there is one absorbing example of the thought given to this fundamental subject by the two presidential candidates. Their respective answers to questions presented to the National Captive Nations Committee indicate the tremendous importance they attach to the subject. Indeed, in his state of the Union address that is now under Moscow attack, President Kennedy demonstrated the consistency of his position when he declared:

We must never forget our hopes for the ultimate freedom and welfare of the Eastern European peoples.

Because I feel that every Member would profit from reading these answers, I include this copy of a release furnished by Mrs. Colby Bowden, secretary of the National Captive Nations Committee, at this point in the RECORD:

NATIONAL CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE, INC.,
Washington, D.C., November 4, 1960.

Question. As President, what implementing measures would you advance to extend and intensify the observance of Captive Nations Week in fulfillment of the will of Congress?

Mr. NIXON. As you know, in my telegram to your organization on the occasion of Captive Nations Week last July, I stated that I join the President in endorsing this significant observance and hope that the people throughout America and the world will be inspired by the purposes and activities of this week to rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom everywhere. I can assure you that the United States will continue to use every peaceable means to give them this opportunity (free determination of the form of their own government). Also, I want to repeat an earlier stated position: It is ironic in the extreme that the United States should ever be cast in the role of opposing legitimate nationalist movements. We should be the natural champion of legitimate nationalist movements.

These positions, coupled with the point I made in my acceptance speech (that the next President must develop a brandnew strategy which will win the battle for freedom for all men and win it without a war), furnish the obvious answer to your question without informing our adversary in advance of the specific steps we contemplate.

I witnessed face to face the powerful impact of the captive nations resolution when I visited Moscow. I know what this resolution and the week mean, but I wonder if my rival does in view of the fact that he never declared himself on this score.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Captive Nations Week resolution was passed by unanimous vote in the Senate last year. As a Member of that body I have continually spoken in behalf of the eventual freedom of the captive peoples. I'll state here, what I have been declaring throughout this campaign: We must never—at any summit, in any treaty declaration, in our words, or even in our minds—recognize Soviet domination of Eastern Europe. This is the theme of Captive Nations Week, and it must be furthered in future observances, indeed, throughout the period of every year until complete freedom is attained.

Both Senator FULBRIGHT and I have been trying to obtain the official transcript of Nixon's conversations with Khrushchev on the Captive Nations Week resolution. Until this is released we have every reason to believe that Nixon virtually apologized for the passage of the resolution last year. Certainly the newspaper texts show that Nixon made no effort to defend the resolution during his visit to Moscow and elsewhere.

Question. Since two Presidential proclamations on the week have stressed the urgency of popular study of the plight of all the captive nations, do you favor the establishment of a congressional Committee on the Captive Nations to meet this task?

Mr. NIXON. My answer to the first question indicates that I fully support the two Presidential proclamations and their emphasis on a determined study of the plight of all the captive nations. A continuous study of this subject is a necessity. However, quite properly, it would be for Congress to decide whether a Committee on the Captive Nations would be the best means of fulfilling this task.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am, of course, in agreement with the Presidential proclamations. The captive nations should be studied intensively. If a Joint Congressional Committee on the Captive Nations is the best way to insure such popular study, I would naturally not be opposed to it.

Question. To devise ways and means of placing Moscow on a perpetual defensive would you create an executive agency, perhaps known as the Commission on the Self-Determination of Captive Nations, with a depth of purpose similar to that shown in the fields of disarmament, atomic energy, and space?

Mr. NIXON. In my acceptance address I unequivocally declared that our Government activities must be reorganized to take the initiative from the Communists and to develop and carry out a worldwide strategy and offensive for peace and freedom. The idea of a Commission on the Self-Determination of Captive Nations has considerable merit and should be considered along with other ideas toward meeting these ends.

Mr. KENNEDY. I maintain that the next administration must devise a specific policy for Eastern Europe. Among other things, we must prove to the men in Moscow that colonialism is doomed everywhere in the world, including Eastern Europe; we must arm ourselves with more flexible economic tools; we must be willing to recognize growing divisions in the Communist camp and be willing to encourage those divisions. These and many other matters we must attend to, and certainly the idea of such a commission must be considered.

Question. Do you support the need of a Freedom Academy as proposed in Congress?

Mr. NIXON. The Freedom Academy idea also is a congressional consideration which would have to be decided upon by the Congress.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Freedom Academy proposal, which the Senate passed in the last session, will doubtless be considered by the next Congress. The decision on it will first have to be arrived at there.

Question. As the Chief Executive, would you take steps to formulate and execute a policy toward the freedom of the dozen captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.?

Mr. NIXON. Here, too, my answer to the first question suggests that such steps must be taken. I cannot reemphasize too strongly what I just recently declared: We can never accept the status quo of Soviet and Communist domination over the people of the captive nations. But we must do more. We must concert our economic and political policies and our diplomatic actions so that we may, ever more effectively, work to achieve our primary objective: to advance the aspirations of all peoples to be free.

Mr. KENNEDY. My many statements on the freedom of all peoples and nations should indicate that we cannot afford to overlook any. If you would consult the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as far back as 1953 (Aug. 4), you will find that I have supported ideas of freedom relating to Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Ukraine, Armenia, and other captive nations. Then, as now, I have been of the firm conviction that we must do everything possible to keep alive the spirit of independence and freedom of these nations.

Moreover, with regard to these non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., let me stress again, as I did in my letter to you of October 29 (in which I congratulated one of your organizations on its 20th anniversary), that I deplore the monolith term often used by the Republican administration in Washington, "Soviet nation," or "Soviet people." In essence, it is contrary to the Captive Nations Week resolution enacted last year.

Question. Are you satisfied with the operations of the USIA in relation to the captive nations, particularly those in the U.S.S.R.? If not, what changes will you propose?

Mr. NIXON. On the whole, I am satisfied with USIA's operations in relation to the captive nations. Persistent Russian jamming of our broadcasts indicates its effectiveness to a degree. But, as in other things, these operations must be improved and strengthened. USIA's requests for additional funds to achieve this have been denied by a Democratic-controlled Congress.

Mr. KENNEDY. I believe much more could be done to put our message across to all the captive nations. If I am elected, this problem will be carefully studied and the necessary changes will be effected.

Question. Are you for a firm policy and action now in regard to Cuba, designed to stave off the poisonous effects of the coming Khrushchev visit? What specifically do you propose?

Mr. NIXON. The answer to this question appears in my American Legion address and also in the transcript of the fourth joint television-radio broadcast. I repeat that our goal must be to quarantine the Castro regime in the Americas. I would pursue the line that we are presently pursuing. For us to do what Senator Kennedy has suggested (helping exiles to overthrow Castro) would bring results which I know he would not want and certainly which the American people would not want.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am for a firm policy in regard to Cuba, and my recent speeches disclose what we should do now: we can constantly express our friendship for the Cuban people and our determination that they will again be free; we must firmly resist further Communist encroachment in this hemisphere, working through a strengthened organization of the American States to encourage those liberty-loving Cubans who are leading the resistance to Castro; and we must make it clear to Mr. Castro once and for all that we will defend our naval base at Guantanamo under all circumstances.

THE NEW YORK TIMES SPEAKS OUT ON IMPERIALIST MOSCOW'S COLONIALISM

Mr. FLOOD. Turning now to the field of journalism, we find extensive editorials and columns written on the brute reality of imperialist Moscow's colonialism. While scholars elaborated on the subject in their journals and candidates discussed it from the rostrum, outstanding newspaper organs such as the New York Times published excellent editorials on this basic subject. As a matter of fact, the Times has for the past few years reflected advance thinking along these lines. The article, for example, on "Moscow's Huge Colonialist Hoax," written by C. L. Sulzberger in March 1958, is as applicable today as it was then. But last autumn three significant editorials were devoted to the subject, indicating the urgency and importance of the issue. For the RECORD I include the Sulzberger article and the three editorials, "Mr. Khrushchev's Big Lie," of September 24, 1960; "Who's the Colonialist Now?" of October 7; and "The Issue of Colonialism," of November 4:

MOSCOW'S HUGE COLONIALIST HOAX

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA, February 28.—One of the most important cold war propaganda centers is Tashkent, capital of the Soviet Republic of Uzbekistan and largest city in all central Asia. From that sprawling, jerry-built metropolis within sight of the great Tien Shan range of mountains that divides the U.S.S.R. from China, a powerful radio disseminates Communist propaganda in most of the languages of the Orient.

The main burden of this message is one of nationalism and hostility to the Western "colonialist" powers. Above all, Islamic peoples, especially the Arabs, are advised to heed Moscow, their benevolent, disinterested friend. And when Asian or Moslem dignitaries visit Russia they are invited to the Uzbek capital. It is displayed as a showpiece of non-European, Asian Soviet benignity.

The Kremlin is rarely inhibited by paradox. Therefore it sees nothing contradictory in exhorting underdeveloped peoples elsewhere to rise up against "colonialism" from Tashkent, administrative center of one of the largest existing colonial empires, that of Russia.

For, in fact, what is known as Soviet central Asia, embracing an area larger than Europe and inhabited by non-Slavic, Turkic and Iranian peoples, is held in thrall by Moscow's own imperialism. The old Mohammedan and Asian cities of Tashkent, Bukhara and Samarkand are governed by atheistic Europeans sent eastward to provincial tasks much as Christian British officials once went eastward to Hindu India.

The incongruity of this situation is splendid. Tashkent, which has its Russian quarter much as Delhi once had its English quarter, which has its garrison of European battalions and which is administered in all but name by non-Asians, challenges Asia and Africa to rise up and cast out remaining vestiges of foreign control. And what do we do to expose this hoax? The truth is we do pitifully little.

VOICE OF AMERICA'S PROGRAM

Our only official radio propaganda is transmitted by the Voice of America. This has budgeted precisely $40,178 this year for broadcasts to the unimaginably immense realm of Soviet central Asia. A pittance is spent to maintain one daily 15-minute program in the Uzbek language sent from Munich.

Our Uzbek propaganda service has eight employees, three of whom are American citizens. Its single meager message is all our Government sponsors to tell the millions of Soviet Asians, only some of whom are Uzbek, anything about democracy. Compared to the torrent of anticolonialist words emitted by the colonial Tashkent radio it is as if one likened a flea to a grizzly bear.

Nor do other non-Communist countries pay much heed to what goes on within the U.S.S.R.'s own imperial domain. London's B.B.C. says nothing, in their own languages, to the Kazakhs, Turkmenians, Kirghiz, Tadzhiks, and Uzbeks ruled by Russia. Nor do neighboring and racially akin Turkey and Iran. They fear Moscow complaints that they might seem to sponsor irredentist movements. Only Pakistan, in Turki broadcasts, occupies itself with the problem.

To be sure, a private American organization, Radio Liberation, seeks in some degree to fill the gap. For some years it has transmitted in the five principal languages of Soviet central Asia by shortwave from Lampertheim, West Germany. But these programs are generally weak and fragmentary because of successful Russian jamming. Radio Liberation concedes: "We are not producing as strong and as reliable a signal as our engineers would like."

SOVIET TACTICS IN TURKESTAN

Soviet authorities are trying to make the inhabitants of what was known as Turkestan forget they ever had an individual historical heritage. This was one no more connected with the bureaucrats of Moscow than the historical heritage of India was connected with the bureaucrats of London prior to the British Raj.

In its transmissions, Radio Liberation says, "Major emphasis is placed on the Turkestani charge that the Soviet Union—despite its constantly reiterated claims of friendship for colonial peoples—has itself hypocritically erected history's greatest colonial empire in which their own country (Turkestan) is the largest component. Broadcasts disclose, among other things, how the U.S.S.R. oppresses its inhabitants as well as exploits the resources of the homeland."

Nobody, of course, likes the idea of a cold war. Most people hope their statesmen can eventually get together and arrange some basis for a harmonious peace. But the chances of this happening in a hurry are not brilliant.

In the meantime it is absurd for the free nations to sit by almost idly while the Kremlin, from its main colonial capital, boasts that only the Kremlin fights against colonialism. We know the opposite is true. But do we do enough about it?

For example, shouldn't we ask our friends in the Baghdad Pact to supplement the meager description of our views sent out by Lampertheim's tormented engineers? And shouldn't the Voice of America be given more help to tell our tale? Right now it is draining the Caspian Sea with a teaspoon.

MR. KHRUSHCHEV'S BIG LIE

The use of lies and falsehoods by Communists is nothing new and normally does not require special comment. But Nikita Khrushchev's use of the big lie technique before the United Nations General Assembly yesterday had a breathtaking impudence which made it a special insult to the intelligence of all mankind. The lie was as simple as it was enormous: The head of the greatest colonial empire of the present day told the people of the world he has no colonies, and spoke sanctimoniously as the enemy of colonialism. The man who ordered the Hungarian Revolution throttled

in blood dared weep crocodile tears over the fate of the many states now members of the United Nations who have been given their freedom with no struggle of any kind in recent years. It was a shameless performance.

Let us look at the Soviet colonial empire. It consists of two parts. One part is made up of states nominally independent, but enmeshed so completely in Moscow's military, political, and economic power that they cannot act with true independence. These states are: Poland, East Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Albania, Bulgaria, Outer Mongolia, and North Korea.

The other part of the Soviet colonial empire is made up of the non-Russian peoples and lands which were first subjugated by the czars, incorporated into their empire and then resubjugated by Lenin and Stalin so that today they are still vassals of Moscow. Many peoples live in the prison of nations that is the Soviet Union today, but the chief ones among them are the following: Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Armenians, Georgians, Azerbaijanis, Uzbeks, Turkmen, Kirgiz, Tadzhiks, Kazakhs, Tartars, Yakuts, and Buryats.

By all means let all colonialism be ended as soon as possible. But let the United Nations and the world make sure that the Soviet colonial empire be included. That empire, unfortunately, has grown while the other empires of the past have been dissolving before our eyes.

WHO'S THE COLONIALIST NOW?

In his campaign to capture the United Nations Premier Khrushchev rode into the General Assembly on one of his favorite propaganda horses called anticolonialism. Posing as a great champion of freedom he demanded the immediate liberation of all oppressed peoples and the complete and final liquidation of all colonies and non-self-governing territories, including trust territories administered under United Nations auspices. His all too obvious purpose was, of course, to line up behind himself the so-called neutral and uncommitted nations, many of them former Western colonies or protectorates.

As in so many other fields, however, the Soviet ruler underestimated the intelligence of his audience, and effective replies to his attack have been coming thick and fast.

Prime Minister Macmillan could point with pride to the many nations freed within the Commonwealth and now represented in the Assembly, and Prime Minister Diefenbaker of Canada bluntly contrasted this record with the Soviet record of conquest and subjugation. But the sharpest rejoinder has come from Prime Minister Menzies of Australia, who told the Soviet ruler that it is "an act of complete hypocrisy for a Communist leader to denounce colonialism as if it were an evil characteristic of the Western powers when the facts are that the greatest colonial power now existing is the Soviet Union itself."

The record is certainly plain enough. This newspaper published a few days ago the list of Soviet-subjugated peoples, including the former independent states of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Albania, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, with a combined population of 85,395,000, and other people held in bondage, including East Germans, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Armenians, Georgians, Azerbaijanis, Uzbeks, Turkmen, Kirgiz, Tadzhiks, Kazakhs, Tartars, Yakuts, Buryats, and others, comprising another 55 million souls.

In contrast, the West has helped to freedom and self-government during and since the war no fewer than 12 peoples and nations in Asia, including India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Ceylon, Burma, Malaya, the Philippines, South Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Singapore, and Cyprus, with a combined population of 652 million, and 26 more in Africa, including Morocco, Tunisia, the Belgian and French Congo, Somalia, Malagasy, Voltaic Republic, Cameroons, Chad, Ivory Coast, Niger, Dahomey, Togo, Gabon, Republic of Sudan, Ghana, Guinea, Libya, Eritrea, Nigeria, Rhodesia, Sudanese Republic, Senegal, and Mauritania, with a combined population of 120 million.

Let Premier Khrushchev equal this record before he speaks of Western colonialists and imperialists.

THE ISSUE OF COLONIALISM

In preparation for the forthcoming United Nations debate on colonies, the 45 African and Asian nations now constituting the largest group in this world organization are drawing up a manifesto of their own, calling on the General Assembly to proclaim the end of colonialism.

This manifesto is to be their response to Premier Khrushchev's attempt to tie them behind his chariot by means of a grandiloquent but wholly hypocritical resolution on the same issue. In this resolution the Soviet ruler of the biggest and most cruel colonial empire of our day invokes what he praises as the charter's "lofty and humane ideals of equality of rights and the self-determination of nations and peoples" to demand the immediate freedom and independence of all colonies and non-self-governing territories, including those under United Nations trusteeship. He couples this proposal with a demand for the immediate liquidation of all military bases, long a Soviet objective to disarm the free world.

The African-Asian group is apparently not prepared to go that far, especially regarding the bases, on which some of its members depend for their safety. But the group still seems to move within the limited concepts of the Bandung Conference, which approved resolutions calling for an end to the evil of colonialism in all its manifestations, and denounced the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation.

The question is whether the group will still want to limit the application of a similar manifesto to the few remaining African, Asian, and other dependencies of the West, or whether it proposes to make the principles it espouses universal and apply them as well to the nations and peoples "subject to alien subjugation" in the Soviet and Communist Chinese colonial empires—to the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians, to the East Germans, Poles, Czechoslovaks, Hungarians, Rumanians, and Bulgarians, to the Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Armenians, Georgians, Azerbaijanis, Uzbeks, Turkmen, Kirgiz, Tadzhiks, Kazakhs, Tartars, Yakuts, Buryats, and others, to the North Koreans, North Vietnamese, and northern Lao people.

President Eisenhower has already challenged Premier Khrushchev to agree to a universal plebiscite on the right of self-determination. The African-Asian group will show its good faith by supporting that sound principle.

Mr. FLOOD. Many other papers carried similar editorials and articles on totalitarian Russian colonialism. Distinguished columnists wrote about it, and if for the RECORD I may offer another example, the column written by George E. Sokolsky featured the issue with a penetrating article on "Soviet 'Liberation' Really Colonialism." In popular support of my proposal for the creation of a Special Captive Nations Committee, I include this article of November 2, 1960, in my remarks:

SOVIET "LIBERATION" REALLY COLONIALISM

(By George E. Sokolsky)

"Colonialism" has become a bad word. "Liberation" has always been a good word. The Western powers have abandoned colonialism because they do not wish to be smeared by bad words (there are also other reasons, perhaps as pressing). Soviet Russia calls colonialism liberation when it is associated with Soviet Russia. It is only colonialism when someone else does it. Ergo, Soviet Russia engages in a new kind of colonialism.

Let us take Cuba as an example. Spain practiced colonialism in Cuba. The United States went to war with Spain, occupied Cuba, gave Cuba its independence; in fact, liberated Cuba. So, we are gringos for doing that. We are colonialists, imperialists, exploiters because we liberated Cuba. Now Soviet Russia is turning Cuba into a Soviet satellite which is colonialism, but it is called liberation. From whom is Cuba being liberated?

While other countries are revoking their colonial charters and are giving subject peoples their freedom, Soviet Russia has engaged in a new colonialism and so has Red China. Soviet Russia has become a successor to the Hapsburg Dynasty in the Danubian area. It has conquered and taken the Balkan as well as the Baltic countries. Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and Poland have become colonies (satellites) of Soviet Russia. East Germany has become little more than a province of Soviet Russia. Mongolia is a hunting ground between Soviet Russia and Red China. And now, the Kremlin is moving into Ghana and Guinea and the Congo in Africa, while Red China has conquered Tibet and is moving into Ladakh, Nepal, Assam, and is seeking to operate southward until it reaches the Bay of Bengal. As soon as a country gains its freedom, Soviet Russia attempts to liberate it—that is, to control it.

It is estimated that between 1945 and 1960, 38 nations have won their freedom from Western European colonial powers, whereas Soviet Russia has extended its control over more than 25 countries.

The list includes:

A. Nations or areas formally incorporated into Soviet Union: Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, East Poland, East Prussia, Bessarabia and Northern Bukovnia, Sub-Carpathian Ruthenia, Karelia, Sakhalin, Tannu Tuva, Kurile Islands.

B. Nations formally maintained as independent but in fact subject to Communist (Soviet and Chinese) colonial rule: China, Manchuria, North Vietnam, North Korea, Tibet, Outer Mongolia, Poland, East Germany, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania.

The Soviet plan is twofold: It conducts a violent agitation for liberation or it supports a local party which seeks liberation. Then it steps in and takes over. Thus, in Indonesia, where Sukarno believes that he is independent and neutral, he is constantly being forced to move farther to the left and was required to bring with him to the United Nations General Assembly a Communist leader, perhaps because his Communists are so powerful or because he needed a monitor. At any rate, he was afraid of something.

The West has made a grievous error in giving up its colonies, particularly in Africa where in most countries there the people are not ready for self-government and where significant mineral deposits can fall into the hands of Soviet Russia.

The rejection of colonialism by the Western powers was forced by the spirit of the times, a trite and meaningless phrase which can be defined as anyone chooses but which never means anything specific. What happened was that in each Western country many persons, hoping to avert war and to change the world, insisted upon moving helter-skelter into libertarian movements, assuming that others are equally just and upright.

The African leaders do not have sufficient popular support or a long enough tradition to appreciate the values of self-government any more than the various peoples of the vast territory of Soviet Russia know what democracy means, they never having had any experience with its institutions or protocols. An excellent example of the Russian concept of parliamentary majority rule was Khrushchev banging his shoe on a desk to distract attention from an applauded person in the General Assembly. He has had no experience with fair play to an opposition.

The reason that Soviet Russia moves into the so-called liberated areas is precisely because they are now on their own; they are incapable of self-government; and when the Western European power evacuates, a political vacuum is formed which Soviet Russia fills.

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE EXPRESSES ITSELF ON ALL CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. FLOOD. As we look now to the field of diplomacy, we find notable expressions of thought and feeling along the same lines. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest of these expressions is provided in the address delivered last October 2, 1960, by the then Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon. Given at the 80th anniversary banquet of the Polish National Alliance in Chicago, Ill., this address is both significant and meaningful because it deals with all of the captive nations—not just those in central Europe but also those in the Soviet Union and Asia.

In this remarkable message, Mr. Dillon faces up to the full reality of Moscow's colonialism. He minces no words when he states:

The Armenians, the Georgians, the Ukrainians, the Tartars, the Turkomans, Uzbeks, and Tajiks—and many others who attempted to escape from the Tsarist "prisonhouse of the nations" as Marx called it—were thrust by force into the Communist straitjacket.

As further evidence supporting the necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee, I bring this address to the attention of the Members and incorporate it in my presentation at this point:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE, AT THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY BANQUET OF THE POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE, HOTEL SHERMAN, CHICAGO, ILL., SUNDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1960

I am deeply honored to participate in this 80th anniversary of the Polish National Alliance, which has a proud history of service to its widespread membership, and of patriotic dedication to the best interests of our country. Your untiring efforts to help keep the flame of liberty burning brightly in the hearts of the courageous people of Poland command the admiration of all your fellow Americans.

A major factor influencing present-day Polish-American relations is the friendship which has existed between our peoples since the days of the American Revolution. This friendship has been enhanced over the years by a large emigration to our shores of Poles who, as welcome and respected members of the American community, have broadened the ties between our two nations. Indeed, it is difficult to find a Pole without a relative in Buffalo, Pittsburgh, or here in Chicago.

American policy toward Poland reflects these ties, as well as our continuing interest in the welfare of the Polish people. We have advanced substantial credits for the purchase of our surplus agricultural commodities and, in more limited amounts, for the purchase of other necessities. These arrangements have brought great benefits to the Polish people. For example, in recent years we have extended credits to buy polio vaccine which has been used, together with privately donated American supplies, to immunize about 3 million Polish children.

We favor increased trade with Poland. We encourage expanded educational, informational, cultural, and other exchanges between the two countries. The United States distributes a Polish language magazine in Poland, while a Polish publication appears on newsstands in this country. A year ago, we reopened the American consulate in Poznan, and the Poles reestablished their consulate here in Chicago.

Despite differences in social systems, we believe that we should continue to provide tangible evidence of our sympathetic interest in the welfare of the Polish people. We also believe that the Polish people welcome our assistance and appreciate our concern for them.

As we meet here this evening, the world's attention is focused upon New York City, where representatives of nearly 100 countries are gathered for a long and difficult General Assembly of the United Nations which is of critical importance to all men, everywhere. Tonight, I would like you to join me in a broad look at the state of our international relations, at the underlying problems which confront humanity today, and at the efforts we must make to resolve these problems by working with other countries—both friendly and unfriendly—within the framework of the United Nations.

In several respects, the international scene inspires hope and confidence. The last 15 years have witnessed great progress:

Despite serious breaches of the peace, mankind has thus far avoided the incredible horrors of a general war.

Man has moved beyond our planet and begun probing outer space.

Science has developed means to eradicate or control many serious diseases and has helped to increase production of goods vitally needed in the unending struggle against hunger and want.

A great many peoples have achieved national independence. At no time in history have so many new nations come into existence in so short a period. At the United Nations tonight there are representatives of more than a dozen governments who were not there a year ago.

Most important of all has been the growth of international cooperation. Never before have so many nations, both old and new alike, worked together through the U.N. and various regional organizations to promote scientific advancement, to eliminate disease, to mitigate poverty, to assure international security, and to establish and maintain conditions of lasting peace. Despite setbacks, despite the never-ending efforts of the Soviet Union to sabotage relations between nations by demagoguery, deceit, and duplicity, cooperation has become a concrete fact of international life. A dramatic case in point was the action of the United Nations when it firmly rebuked Soviet intervention in Africa and voted 70 to nothing, with the Soviet bloc abstaining, to support U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold's impartial efforts to bring order out of chaos in the Congo.

The progress I have outlined should give us hope for the future. But we are compelled to recognize that the world is confronted today by grave problems which influence every sector of human activity—and even endanger the existence of the whole human species.

The first of these basic international problems is the steady buildup in world tensions deliberately engineered by the Soviet Union—of which Premier Khrushchev's performance at the General Assembly is but the most recent example.

In his intemperate attack upon Secretary General Hammarskjold, Premier Khrushchev made it clear that he seeks nothing less than to destroy the authority of the U.N. by turning executive authority over to a Soviet-type presidium. He does so because Soviet doctrine allows for only one world system—a Communist one, ruled from Moscow—and cannot tolerate any rival organization with effective strength or authority.

The Soviets will not, of course, succeed in their efforts to destroy the authority, the dignity, and the prestige of the U.N. Mr. Khrushchev's statements and conduct since the Assembly began its current work are an affront to the intelligence and judgment of the leaders of all non-Communist countries—and particularly to the leaders of those nations which have only recently achieved independence. For these leaders recognize that the U.N. is a principal vehicle for the advancement of their national interests, and the strongest safeguard of their newly won freedom. They know that it is to the U.N., with its stature as the forum in which the hopes and aspirations of mankind can be freely expressed—and, when necessary, protected—that all countries can turn in time of need. They are anxious to see the U.N. strengthened, rather than weakened.

Mr. Khrushchev's strident and bellicose attempts to convert the U.N. into an instrument of Communist power politics have roots in an even more fundamental problem, which is the second great problem confronting the world today—and perhaps the most important of all. This is the menace of Communist imperialism.

Imperialism is an old problem. But all reasonable men recognize that 19th century colonialism has outlived its day and is fast disappearing. Since the end of World War II, some 35 former colonies, protectorates, and other dependent areas—with a total population of over 800 million people—have won independence as members of the free world. In most cases, they were helped to freedom by the same Western powers they were previously dependent upon, and have received substantial economic aid from fellow members of the free world.

It is against this background that Mr. Khrushchev has just demanded an end to colonialism. This is surely one of the most audacious demonstrations in history of the big lie technique. For, while the colonialism of the Western European powers is steadily and surely making way for independence, the reverse process has been ruthlessly put into operation within the Soviet bloc by the Soviet Communist Party. Today, the world is confronted by a new kind of imperialism—Soviet Communist imperialism—which is more comprehensive and more infamous than anything mankind has ever known.

During the revolutionary events of 1917, in Russia, Lenin proclaimed the slogan of self-determination of peoples What did this mean in practice? After the downfall of the former czarist empire many of its peoples organized their own governments But no sooner had Soviet power established itself than the slogan of self-determination was annulled. Self-determination, yes, the Bolsheviks said for all peoples who wish to escape from the domination of imperial powers—but since we have determined that our Soviet state is by self-definition not an imperialist state no people have the right to escape from it.

Under the banner of this sophistry, Soviet power ruthlessly proceeded to crush every attempt by non-Russian peoples to free themselves from the new colonial yoke of Soviet communism. The Armenians, the Georgians, the Ukrainians, the Tatars, the Turkomans, Uzbeks, and Tajiks—and many others who attempted to escape from the czarist prisonhouse of the nations, as Marx

called it—were thrust by force into the Communist straitjacket.

Nor did the Russian people themselves have any opportunity freely to determine the form of government and economic system under which they would live. The only free election ever held in Russia—the election in 1917 of deputies to the Constituent Assembly—resulted in a disastrous defeat for the Bolsheviks, who thereupon dispersed the Constituent Assembly at bayonet point.

Communist imperialism has also been extended to Eastern Europe, where today 100 million people live in subjugation to an alien and unwanted ideology, maintained by fire and sword—as the bloody massacres of Budapest testify.

Let us consider but a few aspects of this new, 20th century colonial imperialism:

Let us take Central Asia: In Kazakhstan, according to the latest Soviet census, Russians outnumber the Kazakhs, who now account for only 30 percent of the population. In their own country, therefore, the Kazakhs are rapidly being reduced to a minority which, even if the opportunity for true self-determination were ever granted, could not hope to establish a national state responsive to their legitimate aspirations. Today, a growing number of people are being sent to Kazakhstan from the European part of the U.S.S.R. in furtherance of a policy of deliberate Russification. Whereas the cities and the ruling elements of Kazakhstan are now preponderantly Russian, the Kazakhs are the peasants who are allowed to work the collective farms for their Russian masters.

In Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, large numbers of the Baltic peoples have been sent to die in prison camps in remote parts of the Soviet empire, while colonizers from Russia have been moved in to take their places.

Smaller nations, such as the Tatars of the Crimea and the Volga Germans, have simply disappeared.

The fate of 17 million East Germans, cruelly and arbitrarily separated from their kin and compatriots in the Federal Republic is a particularly sordid example of Soviet scorn for the principle of free self-determination.

If anyone should doubt the existence and character of this new imperialism, let him consider that nowhere else in the world—except in the anthill dictatorship of Communist China—do governments find it necessary to fence their peoples in by force. The sealed borders of the Soviet empire, the impossibility of obtaining a passport for foreign travel unless one is a member of the new Communist ruling class—these are the most eloquent testimony to the fate of subject peoples under the Communist colonial system.

The new nations represented tonight at the General Assembly would do well to remember these tragic human realities when they hear Communist boasts of progress. They would also do well to remember that Sino-Soviet Communist leaders have openly and repeatedly asserted their determination to establish a universal Communist dictatorship. Communist leadership is pursuing its goal with tenacious energy, using a massive variety of techniques. Sometimes—as in Korea, Hungary, and Tibet—it employs naked force. Sometimes it seeks to establish control through invasions disguised as revolutions or civil wars. It employs a flood of propaganda, specifically tailored to the prejudices and interests of each country. It employs a vast network of espionage and subversive agents, sometimes masquerading as friendly technicians. It supports Communist political parties in every nation which permits opposing political parties to function. It uses cultural contacts, and economic and technical aid, as well as trade, to serve the purpose of political penetration. There is virtually no aspect of human life which communism has not utilized as a weapon for expansion. Soviet Communist imperialism is not an ideological theory but a sordid fact.

The Soviet imperialists speak of peaceful coexistence. It is important that this jargon be translated into words that ordinary men can understand. The actual meaning is relatively simple: It is the slogan under which these 20th century imperialists aim to conquer the world without risking general war. They utilize economic pressure, political infiltration, and civil disturbances. However, they have proved over and over again, in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Tibet—and Finland, that they are prepared to use violent means whenever their ambitions cannot be realized by other means.

Unquestionably, the threat of aggressive Communist imperialism is severe. However, I have the utmost confidence that the Soviet leaders will not succeed in their ambitions. The lively spirit of independence exhibited by the leaders and peoples of the new nations reinforces my conviction that they will successfully repel Moscow's attempts to subjugate them. Human beings everywhere are demanding freedom for themselves and their children, and they will not lightly barter it away for false promises of material progress when this supposed progress carries with it loss of liberty and human dignity. The new nations now coming into existence will survive and prosper in freedom and independence long after the Communist system itself has become obsolete. And we can be certain that sooner or later the freedom so dear to the peoples of Eastern Europe will be theirs once again. The Soviet Communist overlords will not be able to keep these proud peoples in bondage indefinitely. Certainly we in the United States will never accept the present situation in Eastern Europe as anything but a temporary nightmare before the inevitable dawn of freedom.

A third great problem confronting the world at this time—and one which the United States has actively worked to solve—is to reach agreement on controlled disarmament. The menace of nuclear aggression from the Soviets and the expansion of their military capabilities behind their mantle of secrecy have left us no alternative but to maintain our own defensive position. Thus, we have been forced against our will into an armaments race which obviously contributes to international tensions. It increases the risk of war by accident or miscalculation. It complicates the settlement of political disputes. It involves a tremendous waste of human and material resources. It produces a steady drain upon capital, manpower, raw materials, and industrial production, which might otherwise be used to improve the living standards, health, and general well-being of all mankind.

The United States has sought agreement on disarmament for many years. As early as 1946, we offered to give up our monopoly of nuclear weapons. Since that time we have made many other specific disarmament proposals. Just 10 days ago, President Eisenhower presented to the United Nations bold and far-reaching suggestions that would advance the ultimate goal of verified general and complete disarmament. Among other suggestions, the President proposed the controlled end of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons as a step toward their elimination, and a United Nations surveillance body to reduce the danger of war by miscalculation.

We call upon the Soviet Government to cooperate in removing the shadow of annihilation which hangs over mankind. We are prepared to continue negotiations toward this goal—at any time, at any place, and under any conditions which offer a reasonable opportunity for genuine progress.

We are also prepared to conduct these negotiations in a spirit of sincerity and conciliation. We do not insist that a single disarmament plan must be accepted, and that all other possibilities must be excluded. We will not walk out of disarmament negotiations—as the Soviets have done—simply because our own proposals are not adopted without qualification. We insist only that any disarmament program, to be effective, must embody certain fundamental principles.

The first principle is that any disarmament arrangements must be accompanied by workable measures for verification and control. We have never asked for unreasonable inspection, but we have steadfastly maintained that effective controls must accompany disarmament at every stage. It would be inconceivable for the free world to dismantle its defensive power while permitting the Soviet Union to maintain a wall of secrecy around its armaments. Disarmament must be a verifiable fact—not merely a promise. Verification and control procedures cannot—as the Soviet Union proposes—apply solely to those elements of the military establishment that are to be reduced, but must also be applied to those elements that remain. In other words, it is not enough to know how many soldiers have been demobilized. Even more, it is vital to know how many soldiers remain under arms.

Secondly, it is imperative that any disarmament program proceed in carefully planned stages, which will insure protection for all nations. The world cannot afford, at any step in the disarmament process, to have any nation or group of nations gain decisive military superiority over other nations or groups of nations. A disarmament program which permitted the Communist empire to attain—even temporarily—an overwhelming superiority, would not bring the peace we all seek, but might well precipitate a deadly war.

The fourth great problem confronting the world today is the problem of economic and technical growth of underdeveloped areas. Even if there were no danger of Communist imperialism, we nevertheless could not escape the fact that a large part of the world is still suffering from abysmal poverty, ignorance, and disease. In some areas these conditions have existed for generations. But such conditions are intolerable in a world which has the means to provide a remedy.

We Americans took the lead in providing such a remedy through our bilateral programs of aid to needy peoples which have been underway since the close of World War II. We are now being joined with increasing vigor by our prospering allies of Western Europe and Japan, who have recovered from the ravages of war with our help. But more—much, much, more—remains to be done.

In extending aid, both bilaterally and through international organizations, we are concerned not only with the suffering of human beings, but with the whole fabric of international society. It will be difficult for the newly independent states to preserve their freedom unless they can resolve the problems of economic and social stability. It would be difficult to achieve genuine and constructive international cooperation so long as many peoples of the world remain uneducated and lack the simple necessities of life. We cannot expect men to be calm and reasonable when they are hungry, resentful, and afraid.

The problem of economic and technical development is exceedingly complex. It cannot be solved solely with the resources of the less-developed countries themselves—although their peoples must make an all-out effort in their own behalf. It cannot be solved simply by outside help. It can only be solved through wide, energetic and thoughtful international cooperation.

It is equally clear that the task of economic and technical development cannot be accomplished through any single channel. In many instances, a major contribution can be made through private investment and private industry. In other instances, contributions must be made through bilateral arrangements between individual governments. In still other instances, effective results may be obtained from regional programs. Finally, it is essential that the entire world community, acting through the U.N., contribute to the developmental process.

This last point was the essence of President Eisenhower's proposal at the General Assembly, when he called for massive aid to the new African states, especially the Congo, and asked that such aid be channeled through the United Nations.

While we Americans are justly proud of our social, political, and economic system, we do not proclaim its universal triumph, nor seek to impose it on other nations. On the contrary, we have always sought to maintain friendly relations with nations having political and economic systems very different from our own. We have often given these nations substantial aid and support. In the case of Poland, for example, we have taken steps to develop our relations in many areas.

The United States does not ask that other nations attempt to remake themselves in the American image. We ask only that they maintain a genuine independence of their own—that they not conspire against the freedom of their neighbors—and that they fulfill their international obligations. Friendship does not require conformity. It requires only mutual responsibility and mutual respect.

We Americans seek peace. But there is a war which I believe we must wage. Not a war against other nations or peoples. But a war in alliance with other nations and peoples—endless and relentless war—war against conditions which weaken the bodies and strangle the spirits of human beings. We must wage a powerful and concerted war against poverty, ignorance and disease, oppression and injustice.

Never before has mankind been confronted by such grave dangers, nor by such magnificent opportunities. In the same hand we hold the power of death and destruction and the power of life and progress. We Americans have a profound conviction that mankind will choose the pathway of life. In this conviction—and no matter what the provocations with which we are confronted by Soviet Communist leaders at the United Nations—we must dedicate ourselves anew to the principles of the U.N. Charter and to the pursuit of peace, freedom, and prosperity for all the peoples of the earth.

CANADA, CHINA AND OTHERS TAKE THE OFFENSIVE IN THE U.N.

Mr. FLOOD. In my earlier remarks I emphasized that Khrushchev's objective in launching the colonialist issue in the U.N. was not only to lure the support of the Afro-Asian states, but also and perhaps even more important, to deflect the growing interest and concern shown by the free world in the captive nations, particularly those in the Soviet Union itself. I pointed out how Khrushchev, for the first time, permitted his Ukrainian puppet to speak in his own language. But, Mr. Speaker, in support of my position, there was a far more illuminating and instructive development on this issue about which most American's are unaware.

First it should be pointed out again that the Russian colonialists and their satraps reacted even more vehemently against the truths brought out during our 1960 Captive Nations Week observance than against the passage of the resolution in 1959. It is patently evident that they fear a growing popular knowledge about the breadth and depth of Russian colonialism. As I showed in my address last August, much of the credit for this popular enlightenment goes to the work and efforts of the National Captive Nations Committee. This organization inspired and guided the nationwide observance and when Khrushchev pushed the colonialist issue in the United Nations, this group addressed itself to our U.N. Ambassador, suggesting what could and must be done to defeat the Russian colonialist offensive. I wish to submit here a copy of the telegram sent to the Honorable James J. Wadsworth:

The Honorable JAMES J. WADSWORTH,
U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, U.S. Delegation to the United Nations, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: The unanimous vote by the U.N. Assembly to debate the subject of colonialism is a most welcomed opportunity for us to advance the independence aspirations of all the captive nations, including the majority of them in the Soviet Union. We urge that you take full advantage of this propitious opportunity by (1) giving full expression to the contents of the Captive Nations Week resolution, now Public Law 86-90; (2) reviewing the colonial status of Georgia, Armenia, Ukraine, Turkistan, and others in the U.S.S.R., as well as Poland, Hungary, and the other few captive nations in central Europe; (3) calling for a full-scale U.N. investigation into Russian imperialist aggression against all the formerly independent non-Russian nations now held in colonial bondage, both within and outside the U.S.S.R.; and (4) challenging Moscow on free elections under U.N. supervision in any of these captive nations. The propagandized image of the U.S.S.R. is a spurious one. This is our grandest opportunity to portray its real colonial empire character. To let it slip by us at this time would be incredible.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, one would expect that we, the heirs of the American Revolution and the Declaration of Independence, should have been in the forefront of countering this hypocritical Russian offensive in the U.N. and bringing to the world the truth and full facts of Moscow's colonial system. Unfortunately this was not the case. The laurels of knowledgeability, initiative, and courage graced the shoulders of others instead. The addresses by the Prime Minister of Canada and the Chinese Ambassador will be long remembered. They accepted Moscow's colonialist challenge and the adversary recoiled.

In his eloquent address the Right Honorable John G. Diefenbaker quotes Khrushchev's words:

> It will always be the Soviet stand * * * that countries should establish systems * * * of their own free will and choosing.

And then he asks:

> What of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia? What of freedom-loving Ukrainians and other eastern European peoples?

As I shall show presently, the mere raising of these questions produced such massive repercussions in Ukraine, as well as in the U.N. that many close observers still are stunned by the results. Soon after, the detailed and powerful statement made by Ambassador Tingfu F. Tsiang, of China, produced another impact of the most instructive sort. All Americans would benefit immensely from a careful reading of these two addresses, and in further support of my proposal I ask that they be printed in full:

ADDRESS BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE JOHN G. DIEFENBAKER, Q.C., M.P., PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, NEW YORK CITY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1960

Mr. President and distinguished delegates, I congratulate you on your election. I know that the General Assembly will benefit greatly from your wisdom, experience and independent judgment, qualities which are so essential to the successful discharge of your high office.

I join in welcoming the newly elected member states. I know that they will derive advantage and strength from membership in the United Nations as the organization will benefit from their participation in its work for peace.

It is particularly significant that 13 of these new member states are in Africa—that continent in which such great changes are taking place and which today holds the center of the world stage. Older members of the United Nations have a responsibility to assist these new member states in solving the challenging problems facing their leaders and peoples.

This substantial accretion to our membership is a reminder of the need to consider enlarging the numerical strength of the Security Council and of the Economic and Social Council, so that all the geographical areas may be assured of adequate representation in the various organizations of the United Nations.

To some observers the Assembly gave the appearance at the end of last week of being a circus and a drama of personalities. Whatever the views held in this regard, this is the most representative gathering of world and national leaders in all history. This meeting symbolizes the bringing together of the cultures and philosophies of all races. We must make of it a testament to the capacity of rational men to achieve rational relations, to live at peace and to practice brotherhood and the raising of standards everywhere in the world.

The United Nations constitutes the greatest hope for the middle and small powers, for the new and weak states, indeed, for all the countries of mankind, the strong, the powerful, as well as the weak, and of every social or political system.

The United Nations is at a critical stage in its development. It faces a threat to its very existence.

The Assembly has heard from the leaders of its two most powerful members. Mr. Khrushchev, in a gigantic propaganda drama of destructive misrepresentation, launched a major offensive in the cold war while giving lipservice to the United Nations which would be destroyed by his proposal for a triumvirate. His speech could not have been intended to bring the world closer to peace, yet to bring the world closer to peace is the reason we are here.

In a restrained, wise, and conciliatory speech, President Eisenhower presented a constructive program for a world community at peace. The President opened the door to international conciliation and world fellowship. Mr. Khrushchev tried to shut that door.

I reject categorically the unjust and intemperate attacks that have been made on the office and person of the wholly dedicated and impartial Secretary-General. The proposal

of the Soviet Government to replace the Secretary-General by a three-man presidium requiring unanimous agreement to act is a transparent plan to undermine the prestige and authority of the United Nations. Having thwarted the United Nations so often in the Security Council through the exercise of the veto, the Soviet Union now seems bent on destroying the United Nations by neutralizing its power to proceed effectively and promptly in emergencies as they arise.

Canada is opposed to this absurd proposal which would reduce the United Nations to innocuity and indecision.

The events in the Congo have given rise to one of the most challenging situations which the United Nations has ever had to face, and the results so far attained are a demonstration of what international cooperation can achieve when its members are determined to lend it full support.

Canada has played its part in the United Nations operation in the Congo by providing, at the request of the United Nations, specially qualified personnel—signals, communications, air transport—and emergency food supplies. Other nations have responded expeditiously to requests for assistance from the Secretary-General.

One of the larger tasks of the Assembly will be to insure that sufficient support is forthcoming to sustain the United Nations in its efforts to revive the financial and economic life of the Congo. I take this opportunity, Mr. President, to assure the Assembly that Canada will assume an equitable share of this burden.

Experience in the Congo has demonstrated the need to have military forces readily available for service with the United Nations. For its part the Canadian Government has held in reserve a battalion transportable by air, earmarked for such service. That experience has emphasized as well the need for a nucleus of a permanent headquarters military staff to be established under the United Nations.

Canada's views on the Congo and the larger African problem may be summarized. The African Continent must not become the focus of an East-West struggle; it must be free from the direct interference of the major powers. The African nations must be permitted to work out their own destinies, and if they need help, the best source is through the agencies of the United Nations.

Mr. Khrushchev in his speech advocated a declaration at this session for the complete and final elimination of colonial regimes.

It will be generally agreed that, whatever the past, there can no longer be a relationship of master and servant among the states of Africa or elsewhere. He has spoken of colonial bondage, exploitation, and foreign yokes. These views, uttered by the master of the major colonial power in the world today, followed the admission of 14 new member nations to the United Nations—all of them former colonies.

Since the last war 17 colonial areas and territories, comprising more than 40 million people, have been brought to complete freedom by France. In the same period some 14 colonies and territories, comprising half a billion people, have achieved complete freedom within the Commonwealth. Taken together, some 600 million people in more than 30 countries, most of them now represented in this Assembly, have attained their freedom with the approval, encouragement, and guidance of the United Kingdom and France alone and I could go on to name others.

Few can speak with the authority of Canada on colonialism, for Canada was once a colony of both these nations. We were the first country which evolved, over nearly 100 years, by constitutional processes, from colonial status to independence without severing the family connection.

The Commonwealth now embraces 10 nations, including the United Kingdom, all of them voluntary and free members of this Organization from all the continents, comprising one-fifth of the world's population, and representing virtually every race, color, and creed. The process is a continuing one. Indeed, within the next few days Nigeria, the most populous country in Africa, will attain its independence and remain in the Commonwealth family.

This Assembly has in its membership graduates of empires, mandates, and trusteeships of Britain and the Commonwealth and of other nations. Might I ask how many human beings have been liberated by the U.S.S.R. since the first war? Do we forget how one of the postwar colonies of the Soviet Union sought to liberate itself 4 years ago, and with what results?

These facts of history invite comparison with the record of Soviet domination over peoples and territories, sometimes gained in the name of liberation, but always accompanied by the loss of personal and political freedom.

The General Assembly is still concerned with the aftermath of the Hungarian uprising of 1956. How are we to reconcile that tragedy with Mr. Khrushchev's confident assertion of a few days ago in this Assembly:

"It will always be the Soviet stand * * * that countries should establish systems * * * of their own free will and choosing."

What of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia? What of freedom-loving Ukrainians and other Eastern European peoples? Mr. Khrushchev said at the same time:

"The very course of historic development at present poses the question of complete and final elimination of the colonial regime * * * immediately and unconditionally."

There must be no double standard in international affairs.

I ask Mr. Khrushchev to give to those nations under his domination the right of free elections—to give them the opportunity to determine the kind of government they want under genuinely free conditions. Then, indeed, will his words result in action carrying out the obligations of the United Nations Charter.

One year ago, the world could look forward with hope. There seemed to be promise of a decisive change in the relations among the great powers, a trend away from fear and distrust and toward mutual understanding and cooperation. Preparations went forward for the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee to begin its work in Geneva, and for the summit conference on which the world had placed such high expectations.

These bright prospects were dimmed in May with the collapse of the summit conference, and further darkened in June when the Soviet Government withdrew suddenly from the disarmament negotiations.

The propaganda attacks of the Soviet Union have developed in degree and intensity during the summer. The very violence of these attacks strongly suggested that various issues were being deliberately exploited for the express purpose of raising tension over the widest possible fields of East-West relations.

What good can there be in threats to rain rockets or nuclear bombs on other countries, large and small; to dispatch so-called volunteers into situations already dangerously inflamed; to encourage political leaders to follow the line of extremism in the conduct of their relations with other states?

Peoples everywhere are made more fearful and anxious and their fear and anxiety tend to aggravate the tensions around the world.

There should be a return immediately to the path of negotiation which at the outset of this year seemed to be the course that the great powers would follow. Again it seems incumbent on this Assembly to press for the resumption of negotiations on as broad a front as possible, but particularly as regards the main issues which divide the U.S.S.R. and its allies, from the Western Powers. There is no other road to the relaxation of tension.

The paramount issue is disarmament. The major powers possess the nuclear capacity for mutual destruction—indeed, for the annihilation of all mankind. The middle and smaller powers, if they remain silent, may become the helpless victims of a nuclear catastrophe. Quite apart from our instinct for self-preservation, we are conscious of the futility and wanton waste involved in preparations for war, at a time when mankind is faced with such massive peacetime challenges.

It cannot too often be repeated that, without a return to negotiation, we cannot hope to arrest the arms race or to begin the process of disarmament. This General Assembly has a heavy responsibility to insure that further time will not be lost before effective negotiations are renewed.

The tragedy of the 10-power negotiations was that the breakdown occurred at a time when there had already been an appreciable narrowing of the gap between the Soviet and Western positions.

My conviction in this regard was made plain to Mr. Khrushchev in my letter to him of June 30, in which I also appealed to him to authorize his representatives to return to the negotiating table. Appeals of this kind went unheeded—indeed even the unanimous voice of the Disarmament Commission was disregarded when, at the August meeting, it called for the earliest possible continuation of disarmament negotiations. I believe it is imperative for this Assembly to reaffirm the appeal of the Disarmament Commission.

There is no shortage of plans or principles. No fewer than four disarmament plans, and two sets of principles have been advanced in the past 12 months. Despite the Soviet withdrawal there is nothing fundamentally wrong with the 10-nation forum, whose working methods could be adjusted by agreement. Canada has already suggested the appointment of a neutral chairman with this in mind, and would always be prepared to examine other constructive suggestions. What is lacking is not appropriate machinery, but mutual confidence and a genuine will on the part of the Soviet side to negotiate. That confidence can be promoted by dispelling the kind of secrecy which clouds preparations for war and keeps alive the fear of surprise attack. The leader of the Soviet Union speaks often of coexistence. There can be no easy coexistence with the unknown—no easy coexistence where on one side there is a curtain of concealment.

Canada is prepared to make available for international inspection and control any part of Canadian Arctic territory in exchange for a comparable concession on the part of the U.S.S.R. Why has the leader of the Soviet Union, if he believes truly in disarmament and peace, ignored this offer?

What could illustrate more clearly the cynicism of the Soviet Government in the field of disarmament than Mr. Khrushchev's attempt to make a resumption of disarmament talks conditional upon acceptance of the demands of the Soviet Union for a fundamental change in the office of the chief executive of the United Nations? This is just another illustration of the uncompromising rigidity of the Soviet Union.

If we are ever to cope with the growing problem of disarmament, we must make a start on actual measures, consistent with the more comprehensive plans related to ultimate goals.

As to the kind of measures which deserve the most urgent attention, I have frequently had occasion to urge publicly that imme-

diate consideration should be given to the following:

1. The systematic control of missiles designed to deliver nuclear weapons of mass destruction;

2. The designation and inspection of launching sites for missiles;

3. The abolition of biological and chemical weapons;

4. The outlawing of the outer space for military purposes and especially a ban on the mounting of armaments on orbital satellites;

5. Cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons and the conversion of existing stocks to peaceful purposes;

6. An end to nuclear testing; and

7. The development of adequate peacekeeping machinery within the framework of the United Nations to insure peace and security in the world community after disarmament had been achieved.

I need hardly stress the significance of early agreement on measures like these, carried out under appropriate verification and inspection, for control is the essential element in any disarmament agreement.

With every month that passes, technical developments emphasize the pressing need for orderly legal arrangement and regulations in outer space. Jurisdiction in outer space must be assured for scientific and peaceful purposes only, and all nations, great or small, should have equal rights.

The objective must be to create a regime which will insure (1) that the exploration and uses of outer space shall be devoted solely to scientific and peaceful purposes; (2) that no celestial body shall be considered as capable of appropriation by any state; (3) that space vehicles shall be identified by a system of registration of launchings, call signs, markings, and current orbital and transit characteristics; (4) that frequencies for communications with and among space vehicles shall be allocated on a rational and agreed basis.

The complexity of these tasks requires that the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space begin its work without further delay.

While Mr. Khrushchev dwelt at length on the evils of colonialism, he had very little to say about economic assistance to the less developed countries of the world. There was no pledge by the Soviet Union to make increased contributions to United Nations programs of economic and technical assistance. I would ask the Assembly to compare objectively the most generous offer of material assistance made before this Assembly by President Eisenhower with the empty Soviet proposal for a mere declaration.

There is an urgent need to increase the flow of international economic aid to the less developed countries, especially to the newly independent states of Africa. The material resources available for economic assistance through the United Nations and other programs must be very greatly increased if the needs of Africa are to be met without impairing plans for assistance in other areas.

Canada regards economic and technical assistance as a form of cooperation for worldwide stability and prosperity and we do not condone the imposition upon new nations in Africa or elsewhere of any particular social, economic, or political order.

Canada will not only maintain its contributions to aid programs at their present high level but will make increases. We trust that other member states will find it possible to do likewise, whether within the United Nations framework or through other channels.

In this Assembly we are, of course, primarily concerned with what the United Nations can do, but the need is so great that every source of assistance in addition to the United Nations programs should be utilized to the fullest possible extent.

Canada naturally has a family concern for those countries achieving independence within the Commonwealth of Nations.

Last week, a new program, to be known as the Special Commonwealth African Aid Program, was publicly launched. For this purpose Canada will, subject to Parliamentary sanction, make a contribution of $10,500,000 over 3 years toward the development of African countries within the Commonwealth, including some of the dependent territories.

While the greater part of this bilateral program will be in the form of technical assistance and aids in education, some assistance in the field of capital investment is not precluded.

We regard bilateral assistance within the Commonwealth association as complementary to the United Nations program in Africa, and we will take every means to insure that bilateral aid is closely coordinated with the United Nations programs.

Last year Canada doubled its subscription to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in line with the general increase forthcoming from all members, and added a further $100 million.

This year we are making financial provision for our contribution to the International Development Association—a contribution which is related to our enlarged contribution to the International Bank.

Canada believes that the United Nations Special Fund and the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance are performing a vital task in an effective manner. We will, therefore, be increasing our contributions to these two programs and the specific amounts will be announced in due course. The Canadian delegation will also be ready to support a reasonable expansion in the regular programs of technical assistance which are administered under the authority of the Secretary-General.

One of these—the OPEX program—has proved its effectiveness in providing much needed assistance to new countries in developing their administrative services. Canada is convinced that the OPEX experiment is worthy of the Assembly's support on a permanent and expanded basis.

Canada has been considering a complementary proposal whereby there will be established a roster of Canadian experts in various fields—ready at short notice to be sent under United Nations auspices to newly independent states requesting them. They might, for example, assist in setting up or restoring civil administration under circumstances such as those in the Congo or in disaster areas. National action of a standby nature on the part of member states is obviously desirable to supplement the United Nations OPEX proposal.

Among the fields from which it is suggested experts might be recruited are medicine public health, sanitation, public welfare, communications, transportation, distribution of supplies, and police services. It may be best, however, for member countries to ready themselves in fields in which they are specially qualified.

To set up what might be called an experts bank would make for administrative stability and make it unnecessary to rely on a crash recruiting campaign for this purpose after the need arises.

The problem of feeding the millions of chronically hungry and undernourished peoples of the world is tragic and urgent. The urgency is heightened by the existence not only of great surpluses of cereals and other foodstuffs in some more fortunately situated countries, but also the capacity in many of these countries to increase greatly their agricultural production.

Canada's surplus of wheat alone stood at 536 million bushels last July 31. Surplus food, piled up in sterile storage, cannot be justified when so many human beings lack adequate food and nutrition.

I am well aware, as the Food and Agriculture Organization has stated in its "freedom from hunger" campaign, that agricultural surpluses of the more advanced countries could at best afford only a temprorary relief which, measured against the scale of total world need, would even then be incomplete.

Much will therefore have to be done by the food-deficit countries themselves to raise their own levels of production. It should not, and indeed could not, be for the surplus-producing and food-deficit countries alone to attempt to shoulder this immense burden. It should be the responsibility of the United Nations as a whole to meet this major challenge.

A few countries cannot be expected to underwrite the costs of transferring their surpluses to nations in need, and I hope that other countries represented at this Assembly will also be prepared to join together in contributing to a solution of truly worldwide scope to this pressing problem of the world's suffering and starving peoples.

Canada is acutely aware of their needs. In the last 3 years, Canada's contributions of wheat and flour to underdeveloped countries have amounted to $56 million, and much has also been done by others. But more is needed, and the Canadian Government therefore welcomes and commends the suggestion made by President Eisenhower last week that this Assembly should seriously consider devising some workable scheme along the lines of the food-for-peace program—Canada envisages a world food bank to provide food to member states through the United Nations.

Such a scheme would require the establishment of concerted machinery which would take account of established trading patterns in wheat and flour marketing and coordinate the individual surplus disposal programs to improve the effective utilization of wheat both to raise standards of nutrition and as a means of assisting economically underdeveloped countries.

Mr. President, the International Court of Justice, as the judicial arm of the United Nations, needs the power and the authority to play a larger and more effective role. All members of the United Nations are automatically parties to its statute, which forms an integral part of the United Nations Charter. Canada accepts the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court except in matters of a domestic nature, with the Court deciding whether a particular issue is or is not of a domestic nature. It is to be deplored that less than half of the membership of the United Nations has declared its readiness to accept the Court's compulsory jurisdiction and that the newly emergent states, almost without exception, have so far not found themselves able to accept the authority of the Court.

I have spoken for Canada, a middle power large enough to bear responsibility but not so large as to have traditions of national power or aspirations which might arouse fears or suspicion. A nation of North America, we have our roots deep in two European cultures—those of Britian and France—the equality of which is enshrined and preserved in the Canadian Constitution.

By the accident of history and geography, we find ourselves squarely between the two greatest powers on earth. We have no fortresses facing either, and we want to live at peace with our northern neighbors as we lived so long with our southern neighbors. In any conflict between them Canada would be the battleground.

The world is passing through two great human experiences—the thrust of technology and the thrust of political and social change—each of them moving with rising, almost frightening, speed. Technology has given mankind new perspectives for a better life.

Can we control these revolutions of science and society? Can we harness them for the common good and prevent them from upsetting the all too fragile foundations on which peace rests today? That is our task.

We hear voices speak of victories for propaganda. We are not here in this Assembly to win wars of propaganda; we are here to win victory for peace. We have had enough of propaganda—of confusion, fears, and doubts. Mankind's cry today is not for propaganda, it is for truth. We are not mustered in the United Nations for any race or creed or ideology; we are here for the hosts of humanity, for the people, great and small.

Peoples and nations wait upon us; man's hopes call upon us to say what we can do.

Let us not leave this place without some hope for mankind. Let us, instead, say to the peoples that death's pale flag shall not again be raised in war, and that fear shall be lifted from the hearts and souls of men.

For this could be our last chance to say it.

STATEMENT ON COLONIALISM BY AMBASSADOR TINGFU F. TSIANG, CHAIRMAN OF THE CHINESE DELEGATION TO THE 15TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, BEFORE THE PLENARY MEETING

Mr. President, the United Nations has in the past 15 years frequently debated particular colonial questions arising from different parts of the world. The General Assembly, the Trusteeship Council, and the Security Council have all had colonial questions on their agendas. Hitherto, all such questions considered by the United Nations have been concrete questions relating to a particular country or region. This is the first time that the United Nations is considering colonialism in general.

My delegation has been somewhat reluctant in joining in such a discussion because we are skeptical about the practical fruitfulness of such a debate. If we hope to achieve general agreement on principles relating to colonialism by means of the present debate, it is totally unnecessary. We have had such general agreement for 15 years, for the principles are enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. If, on the other hand, the present debate is intended to apply the principles to the colonial questions that still remain, then, I submit, Mr. President, the debate should be particularized and not generalized. No two colonial problems are alike; each colonial area or country has its special background and its special present-day conditions. What is suitable for one area is not necessarily suitable for the others. It is only through systematic study of each question by itself that we can make progress. I hope the present debate will be useful in some way. I am certain that the present debate is not, and cannot be, a substitute for the systematic study of particular concrete colonial questions.

Among the countries of Asia and Africa, China is one of the earliest to embrace modern nationalism and to fight for emancipation from European colonialism or imperialism. Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the father of the Chinese Republic—indeed, the father of modern Chinese nationalism—began, toward the end of the 19th century, to lead the Chinese people in their twofold task of freeing China from European exploitation and of building up in China a modern state, ready and capable of exercising the full rights of national sovereignty and of providing for the welfare of the Chinese people. In the course of this struggle, he found that there were many peoples in Asia and Africa living under conditions as bad as those prevailing in China, and in many cases even worse. In his last will and testament, Dr. Sun Yat-sen emphasized that the new China should always sympathize with the oppressed peoples of the world and give them, in their struggle for independence and freedom, such support as the Chinese people are capable of.

My delegation and my government have ever been faithful to the teachings of Dr. Sun Yat-sen. When I first came here to represent my country, one of the critical problems that the United Nations faced was the struggle for national independence by the people of Indonesia. In the long debates in the Security Council over that question, my delegation was second to none in its warm support of Indonesian freedom. From that time to the present, my delegation has been consistent in this respect.

It is generally assumed that the problem of colonialism is a problem between certain European peoples on the one side and certain Asian-African peoples on the other. It is also generally assumed that the problem of colonialism concerns the relations between the industrialized nations and the underdeveloped nations of the world. My delegation believes that these two assumptions are in general correct, but we also believe that these assumptions oversimplify the problem of colonialism. There are exceptions to and variations of these assumptions that call equally for consideration in order to get to the full truth. I wish, therefore, to speak first on the variations and exceptions to the general rule.

It is not always true that the problem of colonialism only arises when more-developed nations try to dominate less-developed nations. History records many instances where a less-developed people tries to exercise domination over a more-developed people. I will cite an example which has the merit of not arousing any contemporary controversy. The example is that of the Mongol Empire of the 13th and 14th centuries.

The Mongols, led by Genghis Khan, were predominantly nomads. Their economy was very primitive, limited mainly to sheep raising. Their political organization was, in the main, along tribal lines. Yet, these people conquered China and held China under subjection for almost a century. They conquered and held in subjection also large parts of western Asia and eastern Europe, which were, for the most part, as was China, far more advanced than Mongolia in the 13th and 14th centuires.

The Mongols, under Genghis Khan, were not seeking markets for their export trade, for in fact they had almost nothing to export. They were not seeking foreign fields of investment, for in fact they had no capital to invest in their own country or in other countries. They were not seeking raw materials, for in fact they would not know what to do with coal, iron, rubber, oil, coconut, or tin. They were seeking power and tribute. Nevertheless, such a relatively underdeveloped people, motivated by crude desires for power and loot, built an empire as big as any that the history of mankind has ever seen.

The example of the Mongol Empire demonstrates conclusively that colonialism or imperialism is not the exclusive property of any particular economic or political system. Indeed, if we study history carefully, we find that the peoples in all parts of the world, in all stages of development, from the Stone Age, through nomadism, agriculture, commerce, and modern mechanical industry, have all made attempts at colonization and empire building. Mr. President, the problem of colonialism is as old and as complex as human history itself.

It is also not true that only European peoples have practiced colonialism or imperialism, or that European peoples practice colonialism and imperialism only against non-European peoples. My example of the Mongol Empire is the case of an Asian people practicing colonialism and imperialism against other Asian peoples and against Europe as well. In the medieval period, there was the Moorish Empire, stretching to Portugal and Spain and even at one time threatening to colonize France. In the early modern period, there was the Ottoman Empire covering parts of Asia, Africa, and Southeast Europe. Europe herself has practiced colonialism and imperialism against Europeans, as well as against non-European peoples. I need only cite the case of the Napoleonic Empire. I might also cite the case of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

In connection with the latter case, I wish to remind the Assembly of the Peace Conference at Paris in the middle of the 19th century at the end of the Crimean War. One of the nationalist movements of that time was that of Italy. Led by Cavour and other Italian statesmen and prophets, the Italian people strove for emancipation from Austro-Hungarian domination of Lombardy-Venetia, as well as for Italian unity. At the Paris Conference, France sympathized with Italian nationalism and wished to give Cavour a chance to plead for Italian freedom and unity and to speak about Lombardy-Venetia. The Austro-Hungarian delegation to the Paris Conference protested on the ground that the question of Lombardy-Venetia was one of Austrian domestic jurisdiction, that the Austrian title to Lombardy-Venetia had been sanctified by treaty and even tradition, and that therefore it was an uncalled for interference if the Conference in Paris should touch on problems relating to northern Italy. As is well known, the Austro-Hungarian objections were overruled by Count Walewski, the president of the Conference, and Count Cavour had his chance to speak on behalf of Italian freedom and unity. I recall that episode partly because, although it occurred 100 years ago, it still holds certain lessons for us today and partly because that episode is a good demonstration of the fact that the European nations have exercised colonialism and imperialism over other European peoples.

Colonialism changes with time. It is as varied as human society itself. We would be unrealistic and ineffective if we limited our attention to any one type of colonialism and overlooked the dangers and threats of other types of colonialism.

In the modern period of history, that is in the last four or five centuries, the main trend of colonialism is that of European expansion to the other continents of the world. It is in the main a struggle of the economically and politically better organized states of Europe against the politically and economically less-developed peoples of Asia, Africa and America. In the course of these centuries, the whole world has been, to some degree, Europeanized. If there is one feature in modern history that can be said to dominate the whole period, we can say that it is the Europeanization of the world. The process has been a mixture of the good with the evil. I shall not stop to analyze and differentiate or to assign blame and responsibility. Some of the evil done by Europe to Asia and Africa was unintended; some was intended. Likewise with the good: some of the good done was incidental and unintended; on the other hand, there has been some good that was intentional and planned. The whole process of the Europeanization or colonization of the world is very human—a grand mixture of the good with the evil.

When Europe started on its grand movement for expansion beyond Europe, it divided into two currents. Nations of Western Europe expanded overseas to America, Asia, and Africa. Russia, on the other hand, expanded overland. The Russians crossed the Ural Mountains to conquer and colonize

Siberia and central Asia. Furthermore, Russia took Crimea, the Caucasus, and certain parts of Eastern Europe. It has been an accident of geography that most of the countries of Asia and Africa were reached only by the oversea expansion of Western Europe and were untouched by the overland expansion of Tsarist Russia. As a result of this geographical circumstance, most of the peoples of Asia and Africa today have had the colonialism of Western Europe burned into their consciousness and have almost no room in their minds for the overland colonialism of Russia. For this reason, the present prevailing opinion in most Asian-African countries in regard to European colonialism is one-sided, distorted and, to a certain degree, nonobjective.

The two currents of European expansion, that is the oversea expansion of Western Europe and the overland expansion of Russia, met with relatively weak opposition on the part of peoples of Asia, Africa, and America. In both currents, the participants were a great mixture of adventurers, lawless persons, patriots, religious zealots, and fortune hunters. In the case of Russia, the first expansionist leader was Yermak, who led a band of 840 men across the Ural Mountains in the year 1579. In about 60 years, a succession of Russian expansionists managed to reach the Pacific coast, in the region of Okhotsk. In these 60 years, the entire extent of Siberia became a part of the czarist empire, with a total area of 4 million square miles, more than twice the size of European Russia. In this long march to the Pacific across Siberia, the first organized opposition the Russians met came from the Kuchum Khanate, on the upper part of the Ob River. The Khanate was one of the remnant parts of the great Mongol Empire. In 1583, Yermak captured Sibir, the capital of the Khanate. When the Russians reached the Far East, they met the opposition of China. Here in the region watered by the upper tributaries of the Amur River, China and Russia fought a series of skirmishes. Militarily it was a draw. The military stalemate resulted in the Treaty of Nerchinsk, signed on September 7, 1689. According to that treaty, the valley of the Amur River and its tributaries was acknowledged to be part of China.

In the 19th century, the Russians renewed their aggression along the Amur. By a combination of military action and diplomacy, czarist Russia took from China the northern bank of the Amur River and the eastern bank of the Ussuri River. These two areas today constitute the Amur Province and the Maritime Province of the Russian Far East. The city of Vladivostok was, up to 1860, a Chinese settlement named "Haisenwei"; the Russians changed it to "Vladivostok," which means "dominator of the East." These regions of the Amur and Ussuri, which czarist Russia took from China in 1860, and which Soviet Russia retains, have a total area of 400,000 square miles.

I will not relate here the history of Soviet expansion in central Asia. The so-called Republics of Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kirgizstan, Turkmenistan, and Tadjikistan of today had been independent countries before they were annexed by czarist Russia.

I will also not relate the story of Russian expansion in Europe itself. Others in this very hall know that story even better than I do and probably feel even more keenly about it as they should.

In his long speech before the General Assembly on September 23, which, among other things, opened the present debate on colonialism, Mr. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, had some interesting things to say about colonialism in czarist Russia:

"The czarist government pursued in the border lands of Russia an essentially colonial policy which differed but little from what can be seen today in colonial countries. Uzbeks, Kazakhs, Tadjiks, and other nationalities were scornfully called aliens. They were not considered as human beings and were severely exploited. National differences, hatred, and discord were stirred up between these nationalities, and the czarist empire was held together only by bayonets and subjugation."

With Mr. Khrushchev as our authority, we can conclude that Russia, at least up to the revolution of 1917, had a colonial empire, differing but little from the other colonial empires of the world. What he called borderlands, held together only by bayonets and subjugation, included Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Bessarabia, the Ukraine, the Caucasus, central Asia, eastern Siberia, and parts of Manchuria. They covered 15 million square kilometers of land, or about 70 percent of the total area of the Russian Empire. That is the heritage left by czarist Russia to Soviet Russia. The all-important question is: What has the Soviet Union done with this heritage?

At the time of the revolution of 1917, all former colonial areas of Russia rose in revolt and declared their independence. Some succeeded, some failed. Finland, under Marshal Mannerheim, won her war of independence which was sanctified by the treaty of October 14, 1920. Likewise Poland, under Marshal Pilsudski, by the treaty of March 18, 1921. Likewise Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania by the treaties of February 22, August 11, and July 12, 1920. But not the other colonial areas. Ukrainian independence was suppressed in August 1920. Georgian independence in February 1921, central Asian independence through a long campaign that lasted from 1922 to 1924.

As a part of the fruits of the Second World War, the Soviet Union has retaken Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and has, in addition, brought other European countries under Soviet domination. Today the Soviet Empire is bigger than that of the czars. We know from the example of Hungary how the Soviet Union would deal with any of her subject peoples if they should fight for freedom.

The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union in his speech before the General Assembly on September 23 painted a bright picture of the development of the central Asian republics in the Soviet Union on the one side, and a dark picture of the colonies of Western European nations on the other. Others in this Assembly hall can examine the account of conditions in the Western colonies with greater authority than I. I wish for the moment to call the attention of the Assembly to conditions in central Asia. Mr. Khrushchev admitted, and I quote:

"The conditions of remote areas of the czarist empire hardly differed from Western colonies because they were severely exploited by autocracy, by capitalism."

He went on to say that the picture has greatly changed since the October revolution. Let me quote again:

"Now Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kirgizstan, Turkmenistan, Tadjikistan—all the sister republics of central Asia—have turned from backward colonies of tsarist Russia into advanced, industrially developed socialist republics."

It is true that there has been considerable industrial development in Soviet central Asia. There has likewise been considerable industrial development in many of the Western colonies. The fact remains that in the huge Soviet Empire, industrialization has been very uneven. Take for example the textile industry. According to Mr. Baransky, a member of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., 80 percent of the textile industry of the U.S.S.R. is concentrated in the three purely Russian regions of Moscow, Yaroslav, and Ivanovo, and only 20 percent in the cotton producing areas which are in central Asia.

The natural resources of the Soviet Union are unevenly distributed. The non-Russian republics of Turkestan, Caucasia, and the Ukraine, and some historically non-Russian areas of Siberia are the richest provinces of the Soviet empire. Almost 100 percent of the oil resources are concentrated in the Moslem republics. Basic iron and coal deposits, manganese, nonferrous metals, sugar beets, cotton, grain, cattle breeding, etc., are also mostly concentrated in non-Russian areas, while the ethnic Russian areas are generally poor in natural resources. In spite of this natural fact, industrial development has been much more concentrated in Russia proper and must less significant in the non-Russian territories. According to Soviet official statistical sources, Russia proper produces 75 percent of all Soviet engineering and metalworking products, 92 percent of all automobiles, 87 percent of all finished cotton goods, and 82 percent of wool products.

In addition to the favored position of Russia proper in the huge Soviet Empire, the Russians have migrated in large numbers into many of these so-called sister republics. According to the great Soviet encyclopedia, the population of Kazakhstan, which is the largest of the non-Russian republics, in 1933 was 57.1 percent native Kazakh and only 19.7 percent Russian. According to the Soviet census of 1959, the population of Kazakhstan was only 30 percent Kazakh, 42.7 percent Russian, 8.2 percent Ukrainian, with the remainder consisting of minor ethnic groups.

Mr. Khrushchev on September 23 had also much to say on the cultural development of the non-Russian republics in the Soviet Union. Let me quote him:

"It is known that before the revolution, the nationalities of Kazakhstan and the central Asian republics were almost entirely illiterate. There were almost no people with secondary and higher education. Soviet power has opened for all peoples broad access to education and culture."

Unfortunately, we do not know much about the cultural conditions in central Asia in the earlier periods. Nevertheless, I have the feeling that Mr. Khrushchev's characterization of these peoples as being almost entirely illiterate is a gross caricature. According to the Russian geographer, Khanykov, who explored the Bukhara Emirate in about 1840, schools in the Bukhara Emirate were spread all over the country both in towns and villages. In towns almost every street had its primary school and, according to an approximate evaluation, about one-quarter of the population of the Emirate was literate. During the first half of the 19th century, such a high percentage of literacy was high even for Western countries.

Leaving aside the cultural conditions of central Asia in the pre-Russian period, we know for certain that the cultural development in the Soviet Union is also uneven. Take for example Uzbekistan. The population of Uzbekistan is 14.5 times less than that of Russia proper, but its number of students is 18 times less, the number of books and journals published per year is 44 times less, and the number of issues of newspapers per year is 40 times less.

Or let us take Kazakhstan. The population of Kazakhstan is 12 times less than that of Russia proper, but its number of students is 24.5 times less, books and journals 66 times less, and issues of newspapers 35 times less per year.

Or let us take the Ukraine. According to official Soviet statistics, the population of the

Ukrainian Republic is 2.8 times less than that of the population of the Russian Republic, but the number of students in higher schools in the Ukraine is 3.6 times less than in the Russian Republic, the number of books and journals per year is more than 10 times less in the Ukraine than in the Russian Republic, and the number of issues of newspapers per year is 7 times less. There was a time when the culture of the Ukraine was ahead of the culture of Russia. One cannot possibly argue that the present state of Ukrainian culture is due to its old backwardness.

In his speech on September 23, Prime Minister Khrushchev painted for us a glorious picture of national freedom in the Soviet Union. Let me quote him:

"According to the constitution, each of our 15 Union Republics has the right to remain in the union or leave it if it so desires. The existence of 19 autonomous republics, 9 autonomous regions, and 10 national territories make it possible to preserve the national features and cultural originality of each people and nationality."

It is true that article 17 of the Soviet Constitution does declare that every Soviet Union has the right to secede from the U.S.S.R. Prime Minister Khrushchev, however, forgot to mention to us two other articles in the same constitution: Namely, articles 21 and 133. Article 21 stipulates, I quote: "A single union citizenship is established for all citizens of the U.S.S.R." Article 133 reads: "To defend the country is the sacred duty of every citizen of the U.S.S.R. Treason to the motherland—violation of the oath of allegiance, desertion to the enemy, impairing the military power of the state, espionage—is punishable with all the severity of the law as the most heinous of crimes." In fact, all attempts to obtain any advantage from article 17 of the constitution automatically become a serious offense according to article 133 and article 21.

It should be remembered that while the political structure of the Soviet Union is nominally a federation, actually political power is centralized in the Russian Communist Party. The Communist Parties of the constituent republics are treated as local committees of the Russian Communist Party.

The question may be asked: "Why do the Soviets, while refusing their own captive peoples the right to secede and establish themselves as independent states, propagate the slogan of liberation of colonial peoples in Asia and Africa?" Lenin answered this question in the following words:

"We, as Communists, must and will support the bourgeois emancipation movements in colonial countries when those movements have a real revolutionary character and when the representatives of those movements will not hinder us in educating and organizing the peasants and the exploited masses in the revolutionary spirit."

I take this quotation from "Lenin's Works," fourth edition, volume 31, page 217. Stalin likewise gave his answer to this question:

"The slogan of self-determination of nations at the present moment, when the flame of emancipation is spreading in the colonies, is a revolutionary password for us. While the Soviet states are uniting into a federation of their own will, the nations forming the Russian Socialist Federation will not voluntarily use the right of secession. However, if we deal with colonies still under the claws of Britain, France, America, Japan, if we deal with such countries as Arabia, Mesopotamia, Turkey, India, which are colonies or half-colonies of the entente, then the right of nations to separate becomes a revolutionary slogan and to give it up means to help the imperialists."

This quotation is taken from the "Works of Stalin," volume 5, page 43. In plain language, Stalin's idea was this: The Soviet Union supports the liberating movements in Western colonies because such support will help the Soviet Union to spread its power and its interests the world over. Within the borders of the Soviet Union, the Soviets are naturally against any liberating movements and against any form of federation of free nations. This is the crux of the matter. Let us not misunderstand the Soviet initiative in this session of the Assembly. Lenin long ago declared:

"Marxism cannot be reconciled with nationalism even if the latter is just, irreproachable and civilized. Marxism is moving forward ahead of every nationalism as an international idea of the amalgamation of all nations into a higher whole. National culture is in general the culture of estate owners, clergy, and bourgeoisie."

This is found in "Lenin's Works," volume 20, page 8.

We from China are against colonialism of any type, shape, or origin. A colony is a colony whether it is the product of oversea expansion or the product of overland expansion. We have nothing good to say about colonialism. We wish it to be terminated as early as possible. Wherever people in Asia, Africa, Europe, or America struggle against colonialism, we in China will lend them our support.

Mr. President, the world faces a gigantic contradiction in its developments. On the one hand, we have the development of the colonies of Western European countries into independent nations, many of which are represented here today in this Assembly hall. On the other hand, we have the Soviet Empire ever expanding. I think I am not wrong when I say that the nations of Western Europe are living up to, even though somewhat slowly, the principles of the Charter and the basic aspirations of mankind. The Soviet Empire is today pushing and forging ahead against the ideals of the United Nations Charter and the basic yearnings for freedom of people everywhere. This is the problem that the Assembly faces.

THE EFFECTS OF DIEFENBAKER'S SPEECH IN THE U.S.S.R.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have in my possession an analysis of the effects of Prime Minister Diefenbaker's speech in the U.S.S.R. which I earnestly believe will open many eyes in this body as it has mine. The authoritative and widely respected West European organ, Die Zuercher Zeitung, provided this analysis in its Sunday edition of November 20, 1960, under the title "Colonialism in the Soviet Empire." Whereas, unfortunately, most of our correspondents depend for their news on Moscow's papers, like Izvestia and Pravda, this Swiss paper covers developments in detail in the non-Russian colonies within the U.S.S.R. What it reveals in this analysis has consequently escaped the notice of the American public.

In a vivid and forceful way this report points out how Diefenbaker's remarks threw Moscow's masters and puppets into confusion in the United Nations, fearing that the Canadian's statement was the signal for a whole array of speeches reviewing all essential aspects if imperialist Russian colonialism. It describes in detail how Moscow immediately mobilized all media in Ukraine to protest the Diefenbaker statement and how it soon developed certain qualms about the national assertiveness of the people there. The analysis also shows how Podgorny upon his return to Kiev attempted to reassure his cohorts that the Prime Minister's remarks were "choked in the very germ stage." I seek permission to include this stirring analysis in my remarks:

COLONIALISM IN THE SOVIET EMPIRE—THE UNPROTECTED FLANK OF KHRUSHCHEV'S POLITICAL OFFENSIVE—EFFECTS OF SPEECH OF DIEFENBAKER

A significant event which recently took place in the Soviet Union escaped the attention of Western circles. It was the unexpectedly strong echo of the speech of the Canadian Prime Minister, John Diefenbaker, before the United Nations. The fact that the repercussions resulting from the Canadian's speech were completely overlooked in the bustle of international events, probably was caused by the fact that those diplomats and foreign correspondents accredited in Moscow read as a rule the central newspapers in which many events from various parts of the Soviet colonial empire are only fragmentarily reported, or not even mentioned at all. If one analyzes the developments in the Soviet Union according to Pravda or Izvestia only, one cannot know that the Canadian Prime Minister has provoked with one single sentence a whole avalanche of press articles, radio comments, protest rallies, and letters. This vehement reaction was limited to Soviet Ukraine—for obvious reasons the printing of the news in the other republics of the Soviet Union was stopped.

UKRAINE AS A SOVIET COLONY

Diefenbaker did not limit himself in his answer to the anticolonial blast of Khrushchev, to a general statement on Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe and in the Baltic States: he made one step further and questioned the spurious federation of the Soviet Union by touching upon the problem of the self-determination of Ukraine. It was already heard in New York that this attack of the Canadian statesman evoked at first a reaction of confusion among the Soviets. The Soviet experts had to ask themselves whether the informations they had received from their secret service, diplomats, Tass correspondents and foreign Communist Parties before the session in New York, according to which the West was not prepared to wage a fight on the colonial problem, were true. After Diefenbaker's address they thought it apparently possible that the Western delegations had agreed among themselves to take up a fight against the Soviets on this delicate question. However, when in the days that followed, it became apparent that it was a mistake and that Diefenbaker acted only on his own, they breathed again in relief. The whole affair was to be restricted to a polemical argument taken over by the Ukrainian Communist leader Podgorny at the plenary session of the U.N.—yet the Soviet calculation did not quite work.

Radio Liberty, the American transmitter stationed in Munich, which has a program for the peoples of the Soviet Union, repeated Diefenbaker's statements for several days also in those broadcasts intended for Ukraine. Apparently, this information was heard by so many Ukrainians that after a few days' silence the Soviets started a counterattack of such dimensions as they had done only at the height of the cold war.

PODGORNY'S REPLY TO DIEFENBAKER

Moscow had first sent its Communist satrap from Kiev, the First Party Secretary Podgorny, who as the head of the Soviet Ukrainian delegation, took the floor in New York on October 4 and rebuked Diefenbaker. In Ukraine Podgorny is known as Pidhorny; in the Soviet Russian press and also abroad the Russified spelling "Podgorny" is used. Among Ukrainians abroad he is

considered as a Russian functionary. It seems that those doubts about his national attitude prevail also in his country, for he was instructed to give his first speech in the course of the general debate in New York not in Russian but in Ukrainian, which was later propagandized in Kiev as having been an important event.

Podgorny took over the task to answer the Canadian Prime Minister. So Podgorny protested against the passage by the American Congress of the captive nations resolution, which put in doubt the status of the Soviet Ukrainian Republic, which, he insisted, was a sovereign and free state. He tried to discredit these declarations as cheap masquerade, which allegedly enraged the 42 million Ukrainians at home and hurt the "sentiments of love to the motherland among the working Ukrainian emigration in the United States and Canada," and then went on to a direct attack against Diefenbaker. He said that the statements of the Canadian Prime Minister were gross slander.

To this statement Podgorny added a long lecture on the alleged advantages which the Communist system has brought since 1917 to the Ukrainian people, formerly enslaved by czarist Russia. As usual in such cases, he limited himself to examples from the economic life and boasted with statistic comparisons. He conveniently eluded a discussion of the question of the right to self-determination which was put to debate by the Canadian. Only one sentence concerning it can be found in his long speech: "The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic is a free and equal-in-rights member of the mighty commonwealth of Soviet Republics and we need neither help nor the care of the usurpers-protectors." At the end, Podgorny struck a conciliatory tone, as he pointed out that during the time when Ukraine was enslaved by czarist Russia and the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, Ukraine gave a great human potential to Canada that has done much for the economic and cultural development of Canada. This alone should suffice to establish a friendly relationship between Canada and Soviet Ukraine.

CAMPAIGN IN UKRAINE

In Ukraine itself there was kindled an unprecedented campaign against the declarations of Diefenbaker. The newspapers were ordered, doubtlessly on instructions from Moscow, to unfold a propaganda offensive. In the daily newspapers there appeared at first editorials full of unbridled hate. The tone was set by the official paper of the party, Radyanska Ukraina, which drew in advance the outline of the polemics against the Canadian statesman. However, this immediately demonstrated what narrow frames Moscow gave to its functionaries for the defense. The position taken lacked any reference to state theoretic and constitutional principles of sovereignty and hushed up the unrest of Ukrainians on the question of cultural alienation which already for a long time floats under the surface of Soviet conformism. Also in condemning the czarist regime there could be found only lukewarm reference which did not in any way bear up to the character of the colonial exploitation of the non-Russian areas of the old empire.

This loud and vehement press campaign moved within a circle of evading argumentation. So was the Canadian Premier advised to look up history books to get information on what a heroic and firm resistance did the Ukrainians put up against the invasion of Turks and how they fought against the domination of the "Polish Magnates." Before the problem of Russian-Ukrainian relations the author of the editorial in the Literaturna Hazeta had to make a stop and rewrite the liberation struggle against czarist colonialism into an uprising against the Ukrainian and Russian landowners. In the search for evasive maneuvers the editors entrenched themselves behind the favorite argument of the resistance against the liberation policy of Hitler. The sympathies for the ideal of national freedom of Anglo-Saxon statesmen were compared to the criminal plans of the Nazis. So were brought into the polemics against the Canadian Premier the names of the national-Socialist concentration camps in Auschwitz, Majdanek, Mauthausen, and others. Also Kaiser Germany was repeatedly called in, which, of course, had little to do with Diefenbaker.

Radio Kiev, too, for days was replete with the abusive language against Diefenbaker. Also the provincial broadcasting stations of Kharkiv, Dniepropetrovsk, Lviv, Odessa, Ushorod, Czernitisi, Homel, Vynnytsia, Chernyhiv, and Stanislaviv took part in the campaign. The responsible circles failed just as much in radio as they did in the press, because they hindered the commentators and political writers as well as the representatives of the public who were asked questions in interviews dealing with the head of the Canadian Government.

PROTEST RALLIES

Then a wave of protest rallies and remote control letterwriting actions swept the vast country. Both prominent persons and the ordinary mortals had to give expression of their alleged anger against the statement of Diefenbaker. In the case of the peasants, those who were pulling the strings of action directed the interest toward the historic connections from the time of serfdom. Characteristic for such kind of rallies was a detailed review which appeared in the economic paper, Kolhospne Selo, Prapor Communisma (the Banner of Communism), a meeting was held in the course of which the local party secretary first of all read a petition of serf peasants from the year 1860 to the Governor General of Kiev, in which they complained about the exploitation by the local magnate. Then the functionary went over to Diefenbaker's speech and insisted that the Canadian head of Government offended the free Kolkhoz peasants. As the Kiev newspaper's reporter informs us, the deeply outraged Kolkhoz peasants called out to Diefenbaker: "Shame. Evil slander. We must write a protest to this knave." However, the rally did not end with a protest letter to Diefenbaker, but with a glorification address to Nikita Khrushchev.

Renowned authors and artists were made to join the action. They had little to say, and often issued declarations which supported the correctness of Diefenbaker's thesis. So, for instance, the actor Hnat Yura stated that Ukraine will answer the slanderous declarations by a cultural festival in Moscow. Sometimes painful voices sounded from those forced addresses, as for instance that of the writer Yuri Zbanatsky, who pointed out that the question of who decides the fate of the Ukrainian nation is really a matter of our conscience and of our judgment. In this statement are manifested both the powerlessness of the oppressed, as well as the newly enforced element of opportunism existing since the tragic end of the uprising in Hungary.

The Communists have also instigated noisy protests against Diefenbaker from among the leftist organizations of Canadian citizens of Ukrainian descent, in order to evoke among the Ukrainians in the homeland, a false impression by the publication of such resolutions, as if large parts of the emigration disapproved of Diefenbaker's declaration.

SOVIET IMPERIALISM AND NEWLY ESTABLISHED COUNTRIES

The propaganda effort which Moscow unfolded through its charges in Ukraine to fight Diefenbaker's declarations, did not stand, of course, in any relationship to the statements on the status of Ukraine in the Soviet empire which were included in his speech. Matters must certainly be bad with the thesis of the Soviet leaders that Soviet federalism is supported by the peoples of the Union, if a mere clause from the mouth of a foreign statesman brings them completely out of composure. Psychologically the Soviets emerged as losers out of this affair: while they were poking at one and the same theme for a long time, they unwillingly attracted the attention of the suppressed population toward their fate and incited to meditation and such problems as national freedom and sovereignty, colonial dependence and the question of a real equality of rights of the peoples in the multinational state. Such a sowing can bear fruit which would not quite fit into the concept of the string-pullers of the anti-Diefenbaker campaign.

The whole event merits also full attention, because for a short time the Soviets themselves certified in a striking manner on what weak feet stands their federal system and how highly vulnerable, from the viewpoint of foreign relations, they are on this point. One has only to imagine that in the debate on the colonial question in New York not only Diefenbaker but a dozen other Western statesmen would take up the theme and founded arguments would snatch upon genocide, decimation of national elites in the individual republics, the extermination of religion, especially of Islamism and Buddhism, or the persecution of organizations and personalities which on the basis of their constitutional rights wanted to make use of the secession from the state-union, and would so close right in on Khrushchev. The Soviets would have to do for a long time in their own empire and on the international forum, in order to neutralize the effects of such an offensive. In any case the consequences of Diefenbaker's statements in New York were so surprisingly positive for the West that the question of Soviet colonialism should certainly be used for the future.

The argument against Soviet imperialism on the undeveloped countries will take up many more years, and Moscow will use the slogan against Western colonialism as a ram-block, in order to bring to a crush the positions of the West in the competition for the colored peoples. The case of Diefenbaker and its effects in Ukraine show that the Soviets are not so strong at all on this point as Khrushchev tried to claim in New York. The West would have to make, however, substantial corrections in its present system, corrections which would deal with organizations and institutions as well as with political concepts by which Soviet colonialism was fought against in the last years. The Soviets seem not to count such a possibility yet, for Podgorny declared, for instance, at a rally in Kiev on his return from New York that such attacks as the one of the Canadian Prime Minister were choked in the very germ stage.

THE SPECIAL CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

Mr. FLOOD. After examining this eye-opening report of the Die Zuercher Zeitung, I feel certain that any reader cannot help but agree with one of its conclusions.

The whole event—

It states—

merits also full attention because for a short time the Soviets themselves certified in a striking manner on what weak feet stands their federal system and how highly vulnerable, from the viewpoint of foreign relations, they are on this point.

Here, indeed, is our New Frontier of understanding the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, this record, shown by representative examples, demonstrates

conclusively the necessity that exists for the creation of a Special Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives. I have shown that both domestically and internationally there is an increasing craving for knowledge and understanding of the entire complex of captive nations. I have also indicated the tremendous opportunities that such systematic knowledge and understanding can open for us in our contest of ideas and action with colonial Moscow.

Only last December 27, Reuters reported Khrushchev as saying "subjugated colonial peoples will not find themselves alone if they have to struggle for their freedom." All of us understand the cynical meaning of this remark. But, aside from underlying objectives, can we truthfully say that our demonstrated and sincere interest in all of the captive nations, particularly those in the U.S.S.R. itself, exceeds the cynical interest displayed by Moscow in the peoples of Africa and Asia? I think not.

The creation of a Special Captive Nations Committee would serve not only to remedy this deficiency but also to provide us with a means of systematically and methodically reporting on these nations in the aggregate. Its studies, reports, and inquiries, undertaken in a regular consistent and objective manner, would maintain the spotlight of free world attention and opinion on Moscow's colonial system. No degree or amount of fluctuations in our relations with the Soviet Union can ever be offered as an excuse to be indifferent to or conceal the facts and truths about totalitarian Russian colonialism. The periodic findings of such a committee would establish the rational grounds for many opportunities of practical action in our relations with Moscow, and it would undoubtedly prove to be of immense aid and assistance to both public and private interests in our society.

From the viewpoint of our own national security and on the question of war or peace, the vital importance of all the captive nations should be self-evident. They constitute a paramount political reality to which we should be devoting proportionate attention and resources in a sustained undertaking of methodic study and inquiry.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I submit this resolution to create a necessary Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] for his maiden address to the House.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I enthusiastically support this resolution to establish a Special Captive Nations Committee of the House. The bright flame of man's self-determination once burned freely in each of those nations which are now under domination of the Russian colonialist system. Today only burning embers remain. But they do remain. One of the few ways we can help them stay alive is to indicate here in this body that we are fully aware of the international significance of their experience.

I respectfully suggest that the special committee consider its work to include those nations which nominally are part of the U.S.S.R. but which are, to the same or greater degree, really colonies of the Kremlin. There are several examples. One is the Ukraine, where, for several decades prior to World War I the Ukrainian people maintained their national identity and their ideals even though they lived under the yoke of the Russian Empire. In 1918 they proclaimed themselves independent though it was not long before the U.S.S.R descended upon them and claimed the Ukrainians as subjects. Today there are 40 million Ukrainians still in the homeland. They and others all over the world hold a real and common desire for the privilege of self-determination: a privilege that we must never take for granted—a privilege that we must defend for ourselves and proclaim for all others.

We have a great opportunity here. Let me quote from the distinguished director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania, Prof. Robert Strausz-Hupé.

> Until now the West has let its attention be diverted from the contested ground of eastern Europe. The Soviets have persistently sought to shift the cold war to another battleground—the underdeveloped and uncommitted nations. While the Communists warn the West against proselytizing the subjected peoples of eastern Europe, they insist that the colonial and erstwhile colonial areas are the battleground where the issues between the West and the Communist system will be decided. What behooves American strategy at this juncture of the conflict is not disengagement but commitment—commitment to a dynamic psycho-political strategy to lift the Iron Curtain and shift the diplomatic and ideological struggle onto the Communist terrain. Only in this way can the engine of Communist conflict be brought to a halt.

Our action today, here in this free representative body, should be an acceptance of the significant challenge facing free people everywhere. It should be a signal that we rededicate ourselves to a greater and more realistic awareness of the worldwide threat, and to a more effective means of meeting it.

Mr. FLOOD. My compliments to the gentleman from Minnesota. You are no longer a "maiden." We welcome you to the brotherhood. The highest compliment I can pay you is to say I could not have done better myself.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scranton].

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania for his initiative and exertions in this endeavor from the beginning right through to the present time. I, as a fellow member of the National Committee for the Observance of Captive Nations Week, will bring to the attention of the House the fact that the eminent and distinguished chairman of that committee, to whom the gentleman has referred, namely, Dr. Dobrianski, is presently undergoing severe criticism and castigation by the Communists for his efforts made in behalf of captive nations. I would suggest to the House that we pay attention to this effective presentation by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and that the American Nation as a whole make even greater efforts to commemorate the achievement of these peoples and to encourage them, to do everything possible to favor the observance of Captive Nations Week.

Last year, in July 1960, it was my privilege and my honor to participate in such an observance in my home city. I trust this will be continued throughout the Nation again this year, long remembering the suffering people of those nations who are so restive and defenseless in so many parts of the world.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and also should like to cosponsor, if I may, the resolution the gentleman is presenting here to you to create a special committee of this House to deal with the problems of captive nations. I believe the resolution is in keeping with his great service in the House and to the entire United States in again demonstrating his deep concern and understanding of this problem of captive nations.

I had the great pleasure of serving with the gentleman as chief investigator of the Select Committee investigating the Katyn Forest massacre. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was the key member of that 18-man committee, and the magnificent job he did finally brought a resolution of the mystery and exposed the truth of who actually massacred some 15,000 Polish army officers in the spring of 1940. Had it not been for the persistent efforts of the able gentleman from Pennsylvania perhaps this committee might not have written the great record it did in bringing to the world the truth, that it was the Communists who murdered these men, and that they murdered these men simply because they wanted to eliminate from Poland the intellectual attainment and the intellectual leadership that nation would have needed to resist the machinations of the Communist Party in taking over that nation.

I thank the gentleman for making this speech this afternoon, and I hope the Congress is going to respond to his appeal. I hope the committee will be created, because, as has been stated here before, perhaps the greatest and most important thing that confronts the United States today is to let the people behind the Iron Curtain know that we are not accepting the status quo of Communist militarism in these countries that have over the centuries made such great contributions to the cause of freedom and democracy.

It was quite properly pointed out that the Soviet Union has been trying to stir up a cold war in the Congo, in Africa, and in other parts of the world, simply trying to divert attention from the fact they had captured these nations illegally and in violation of every treaty known at

that time. Therefore, I think this committee is an extremely important one. The committee can do a great job, just as previous committees have done. This committee can help keep alive the spirit of these captive people behind the Iron Curtain, and to show that the free world, particularly the United States, has not forgotten. We know there are Communist rulers dominating those countries today, but we know equally well those people in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, even in East Germany, are not committed to communism, and I do not think the Soviet Union will ever succeed in destroying the will for freedom that has been born in them. This committee could serve a very real purpose in that it would in many ways dramatize and emphasize the fact that the free world cannot rest in peace so long as these captive nations are under the subjugation of Communist rule. These nations are the keystone to peace in the world and, until these nations are free to choose their own governments, as has been promised to these people, we cannot say that the world is at peace, we cannot say that justice prevails. I am sure this committee could help develop programs, develop ideas and theories, develop a program of action that would ultimately see the day when these nations can improve and enjoy with the rest of the world their freedom, and exist as free nations.

I congratulate the gentleman for making this very profound contribution to the House today.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Illinois is very kind and very gracious. I am not sure you know this, but this brilliant and courageous young man from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] in whose veins flows the blood of Polish ancestry, was my right hand on the Katyn committee to investigate these massacres. He was my interpreter, my chief clerk, my chief cook and bottle washer, and everything else. It would have been impossible to have assembled the extraordinary record of investigation that we developed in Italy, in France, in Germany, and throughout this country during the year of that tremendous investigation. So I point out, Mr. Speaker, his worth, because he knows whereof he speaks.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for bringing, as usual, to our attention this one plan or one move that could put Russia on the defensive overnight. If I recall correctly, the great Republic of Poland was invaded on September 1, 1939, not only from the west by Germany, but almost simultaneously from the east by Communist Russia. I shall always believe that the only reason England and France did not declare war on Russia was because of the question of military expediency; but, nevertheless, the invasion of Poland sparked World War II and for us to forget forever that Poland was invaded by Russia and later on swallowed up entirely by Russia will be, I think, to admit defeat and to forever commit this country to a defensive position.

The trouble that Russia constantly stirs up in Berlin, in the Congo, in Laos, and all over the world, is to divert our attention from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Hungary, Rumania, North Korea, China and all of the rest of the world they have taken over.

The only hope of the free world is to get on the offensive and put the Communists on the defensive. I certainly think the gentleman's resolution is timely, and the first one that was ever proposed that will do it. We ought to, every day, from the President and the Congress right on down, shout and demand freedom for Poland, Czechoslovakia, and all of these other captive nations.

Mr. FLOOD. I am glad my friend from South Carolina joins me today, because he and I have been at this, I think, 100 years last Easter Sunday. When I came down here to attack this brute and monstrous Castro when everybody else thought he was a great guy in this town, the gentleman from South Carolina was the first man to stand up to join me in that attack. It seems a long time ago, does it not? So, today I am especially glad to have the gentleman join me.

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

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

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in support of the resolution to establish a House Committee on Captive Nations. Just a few months ago I had the occasion to travel and visit both in the Soviet Union and in East Germany, East Berlin, and in Prague, Czechoslovakia, and Kiev, in the Ukraine. The plight of the captive nations is the most heart-rending result of the Second World War and its aftermath.

I have seen the stark tragedy and depressing conditions that exist with my own eyes. More than a dozen nations of eastern and central Europe and southeast Asia and the Far East, with a population of some 100 million, have become the victims of Soviet aggression and tyranny. About one-third of Europe's prewar population have been robbed of their freedom and have become captives behind the Iron Curtain erected by the Soviet Union. Unfortunately, the same is true in the case of North Vietnam and North Korea, and only constant vigilance will prevent other peoples from sharing the same fate.

During the last 15 years, since the end of the war, the leaders of the free world, spearheaded by the U.S. Government, have tried to help these nations as best they could. However, their situation is extremely delicate, and our dilemma has been how to give support and encouragement to these captive nations without making moves which, instead of helping them, would have the effect of tightening the Communist tyranny over these helpless and freedom-loving peoples.

I hope that with the establishment of a Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives our interest and moral support for these nations will find new channels to help these nations and will hearten them in their struggle against their oppressive tyrants.

Mr. FLOOD. My compliments to the gentleman. Is this his maiden effort?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. It is, indeed, sir.

Mr. FLOOD. I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, to see these young, vigorous Members, coming fresh from the people, bring us these messages from their people. It is significant.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I will be glad to yield to the former distinguished Lieutenant Governor of the great State of Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for calling for an awareness by the American people that the real design of the Soviet is to establish a new colonialism, a vicious colonialism, and that the chains of this new and vicious colonialism are being forged in a climate superheated by the Soviet propaganda that all the ills of mankind have come from the old colonialism and that the United States is the heir and the benefactor of the old colonialism that has passed.

Until the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has rendered many outstanding services to his country, spoke today, the issue had never been put in quite such a plain and understandable presentment. What the gentleman from Pennsylvania is suggesting, as I take it, is a complete change in our manner of combating the false propaganda of the Soviet.

Heretofore we have kept on the defense. The Soviet would cry out against the old colonialism, and, because some of the old colonial powers in Europe were our allies, sought to associate the United States with the hatreds that had been engendered by the old colonialism. We remained on the defensive. We pointed out that the United States had been the first to free itself from colonialism, that the United States had no colonies and no desire for a single inch of the land of any other nation, and that, therefore, the Soviet propaganda was not only maliciously false, but was ridiculous. This was all true enough, but it had all the futility of innocence defending itself when the guilty was escaping in the disguise of the accuser.

What the gentlemen from Pennsylvania is proposing, and it seems to me to make good commonsense, is that we should stop being on the defense and immediately take the offensive. Let us call the vicious colonialism of the Soviet exactly what it is, a system of colonialism that once attached on a free people will take from them all their freedoms and will reduce them to the status of serfs. It is ridiculous that we should waste any time whatsoever in denying that we are any part of the old colonialism. Let us make better use of our time by telling the world and proving to the world that there is a new colonialism in the Soviet design, that it is a colonialism that once established in any nation, as in Hungary, as in Poland, as in the Ukraine, will completely divest the people of any control

over their own affairs, their own cultures, their own ways of life.

I have recently returned from Africa, where the old colonialism has come to an end and new and independent nations are emerging with the hope that under government of, for and by the people, human life in Africa will be on a happier plane than ever it had been in all the long centuries that have passed. The people of Africa do not wish to return to any form of colonialism. All they wish is the opportunity, which under God they are entitled to, the opportunity to work out their own destiny. They do not wish to be a part of the cold war. They do not wish to be a party to the Soviet cause, but when help is offered by the Soviet, and they are told that there are no strings attached they sometimes take the help and hope that they can work things out without involvements. Then the Soviet technicians come in, and propaganda is spread, and the realization begins to come that the hoped-for escape from involvements may be hopeful thinking.

I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania is absolutely right in saying that we should take advantage of Captive Nations Week to emphasize that the Soviet design is enslavement in a new and a vicious colonialism.

I wonder if anyone believes that if the peoples of Poland, of the Ukraine, of Hungary, of any of the other captive nations were given the right to vote at a plebiscite fairly and impartially conducted they would vote to remain under the Soviet heel. Mr. Speaker, if the people in these captive nations could vote whether to remain captive or to have their own independence and the conduct of their own affairs, I would venture to say that the vote would go 100 to 1 against the Soviet.

Again I commend the statesman from Pennsylvania. I trust his suggestion will be followed, and that from this day on we go off the defense and go forward in a stout offensive to alert all the free nations of the world before it is too late of a new and vicious colonialism that threatens them. It would be the tragedy of the ages if new nations, escaping from a colonialism that had been ended, should fall into a new colonialism of a more diabolical nature than any that ever before had been conceived.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has rendered a great service again. He has rendered many great services, but none greater than he has rendered today in calling for an awareness of what is happening, and calling it by its right name—colonialism, the colonialism of the Russians, a vicious and deadly colonialism.

Mr. FLOOD. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that these words from the distinguished gentleman from Illinois have special significance. First of all we recognize him as one of our old-time orators in this Chamber—and there are not many left; and he is their peer. And secondly, and equally important, he is the chairman of the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs dealing with turbulent Africa. So his help is important today.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE].

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, may I extend my compliments to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for the initiative that he has given in this most important area of reemphasizing the fact that the American people will never recognize as final the present line of the establishment of what we call the Iron Curtain. Certainly the testimony that can be had in volume after volume of the terror and the tyranny that has been imposed upon the people in these many nations who once knew a measure of independence in varying degrees stands as a new monument to the tyranny of one man over another.

It is imperative that we in the year 1961 not just utilize words, not just repeat cliches, not deal alone in semantics and dialectics, but undertake a reanalysis of the entire policy of the United States and our influence in the rest of the nations outside of the Iron Curtain.

Certainly the evidence of the Hungarian revolt, where the Hungarians accepted, even with doubts, an offer to negotiate in their critical hour, which ended up in the murder of the men who were sent to negotiate, should be a classic example of the fallacy of having any faith in any promise or any pledge of any Communist anywhere in the world.

Certainly, we have studied and analyzed the Communist philosophy and writings and documents. We must recognize the moral code under which they operate which states:

> We shall use every ruse, dodge, trick, cunning and unlawful method, concealment, veiling of the truth. As long as capitalism and communism exist, we cannot live in peace. In the end a funeral dirge will be sung over one or the other. But until that takes place our principal role is to dodge and maneuver.

This is their moral code. This is the nature of the enemy with which we deal, the nature of the enemy that is causing turbulence in the Congo.

The Communists have a goal. They have stated it—the conquest of the world. They have a blueprint. It is clearly written. They have never directly deviated from it except for expediency. And with the goal and with the blueprint, this minority of gangsters that has seized government after government, has established a will to reach their goal.

We in the non-Communist world must redefine our goals, aware of the fate of captive nations, reaffirming our willingness never to accept this as final; we must reevaluate our entire program and approach on the world scene, noting that a Castro is but a symbol of the presence of the disease, noting that elsewhere in South America, in Africa, there are symbols of the presence of a worldwide disease but that the direction still issues from one place, the Moscow-Peiping axis. Dealing alone with a Castro in Cuba, dealing with a Lumumba in the Congo, and dealing with others throughout the world who are just symptoms of the disease, will not bring victory, will not rekindle the flame of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close with this—I know the gentleman could go on, I know all of us could go on for hours—but I would like to close with a quote which I think is a historic one which came to the world at 2:34 p.m. November 4, 1956, from a radio broadcast in Hungary from free Radio Station Petofi. It is a message that is haunting in its portent of things to come.

> The civilized peoples of the world, listen and come to our aid.
>
> Not with declarations but with force, with soldiers, with arms. Do not forget there is no stopping the wild onslaught of Bolshevism. Your turn will also come, if we perish. Save our souls! Save our souls!
>
> Civilized peoples of the world, we implore you in the name of justice, freedom, and the binding principle of active solidarity to help us.
>
> Our ship is sinking. Light is failing. The shadows grow darker every hour over the soil of Hungary.
>
> Listen to our cry, civilized peoples of the world, and act. Extend us your fraternal aid.
>
> S O S! S O S!
>
> May God be with you.

Mr. Speaker, the shadows are growing darker, the light of liberty is growing dimmer.

I beg the gentlemen of this House of Representatives and the American people in this hour of the greatest peril in the history of civilization to forget that we are Democrats or Republicans, to forget our partisan feelings, forget the differences between us, and unite in the understanding that we must rededicate ourselves first of all to the understanding of the principle of individual liberty upon which this Nation has been founded, the divine rights of the individual man, and secondly, with all haste pursue and understand and develop programs which will not bring compromise but will bring what must come eventually, victory, with the opportunity of individual liberty for all.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I hear the gentleman from Indiana, a strong voice. I believe I can feel a strong heart, a dramatic and effective contribution. I am sure we will hear this rich baritone many more times.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the weakness in our foreign policy is its failure to initiate policies and programs that will put communism on the defensive. All that we mean as a free people, calls upon us to assist in the liberation of those who were never free. Above all, it shames us with the awareness of our own inertia in standing by while other people were enslaved. It was not that they expected us to help by armed intervention, but they did rely upon our moral support. Even this has been spasmodic and ineffective.

A flickering of conscience has moved us to observe Captive Nations Week each year, devoted in part to statements and speeches exhorting the 100 million

victims of Soviet imperialism to keep up their spirits and their resistance. The other 51 weeks in the year, in our concern with the many problems confronting our Nation and the world, we forget the captive nations. To the victims, our perfunctory observance of Captive Nations Week appears to be a half-hearted and meaningless gesture. Something more is needed.

I am happy to join with my forward-looking colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman FLOOD, as one of the cosponsors of his resolution to establish a Special Captive Nations Committee of the House. The longing for independence on the part of the people of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania is the "Achilles heel" of the Soviet Empire.

The Kremlin screams when this telling evidence of communism's treachery and tyranny is exposed to the view of the world. By ceaseless propaganda, and by provoking trouble elsewhere, the Communists divert our attention away from the one problem that worries them most. By building up crises and engaging in veiled threats, they expect that we will acknowledge their sovereignty over the captive nations in exchange for a so-called concession on their part, concerning some other international problem.

Recognition on our part of the status quo in east-central Europe would be a surrender of our belief in the right of all men to be free, and would deal a mortal blow to the hopes of the enslaved peoples who can be liberated, without war, only by the combined impact of their own pressure and that of the free nations.

In his state of the Union address, President Kennedy said:

> Finally, while our attention is centered on the development of the non-Communist world, we must never forget our hopes for the ultimate freedom and welfare of the Eastern European peoples.

This statement was greeted by applause from the joint session of the House and Senate that listened to his statement of national policy as he outlined the objective of the United States.

The President went on to say:

> In order to be prepared to help reestablish historic ties of friendship, I am asking the Congress for increased discretion to use economic tools in this area whenever this is found to be clearly in the national interest. This will require amendment of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act along the lines I proposed as a Member of the Senate, and upon which the Senate voted last summer. Meanwhile, I hope to explore with the Polish Government the possibility of using our frozen Polish funds on projects of peace that will demonstrate our abiding friendship and interest in the people of Poland.

Again he was applauded by the Members of Congress.

This spontaneous approval expressed our desire to do even more. We must arouse ourselves from complacency and put the moral initiative of freedom to work. By mounting a sustained counter-offensive of truth, we shall hearten the victims of communism with the knowledge that we will strive for their peaceful liberation until it is won.

Approval of the resolution to establish a Special Captive Nations Committee of the House will release our own practical idealism, and give a powerful boost to their morale. This committee will make a searching and continuing study of conditions within the captive nations of Europe and Asia, and serve as the means by which their hunger for independence and freedom will be expressed.

They have no voice in the United Nations. Their satellite rulers are heard but not the oppressed peoples. We must help them to be heard, and in conjunction with our own exposure of the force and fraud and hypocrisy by which the Communists suppress their inalienable rights, focus world attention on the cruel despotism that is communism.

The creation of a Special Captive Nations Committee to reveal the facts of the Communist tyranny, will serve notice to the world of the sincerity and the will of the U.S. House of Representatives to do everything possible for the peaceful liberation of the captive nations.

I think this is something we have wanted to do for a long time.

Here we have the opportunity to put it into action.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is an old friend and I might say an old hand in this very program. I am glad that he came today.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership in advocating a House Committee on Captive Nations. His superb presentation on this floor today deserves the applause of all Americans.

I am privileged to associate myself with him as a cosponsor of this most significant resolution.

The merit of this proposal lies in the fact that it is directed at our main antagonist in the cold war, the Soviet Union. To many Americans, the Soviet Union is regarded as a vast geographic-political entity inhabited only by Russians. Many of us are not aware of the fact that the U.S.S.R. is actually a forced union of many captive peoples in which the great Russians constitute barely a half.

In past years the Russian Empire had been referred to as a prison house of nationalities.

The same can be said for its successor, the U.S.S.R.

The Soviet Union is a multinational state consisting of ethnic groups variously estimated from 177 to more than 200. One hundred and twenty-five different languages and dialects are spoken, and 40 different religions practiced. There are Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Armenians, Georgians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Tartars, Uzbeks, Kazakhs, Azerbaijani, and many others—all individual ethnic groups with separate historical, cultural, political, religious, and social traditions and institutions. Soviet Russia is far from a melting pot of nationalities; it is a forced union of people who resist assimilation into the Soviet mold.

There can be little doubt that these many captive peoples represent a source of potential weakness for the Soviet rulers. Here is a source that we of the West have neither appreciated nor fully exploited. We know from the experience of Mr. Nixon's visit to Russia, which coincided with the celebration of Captive Nations' Week, that the Soviets are extraordinarily sensitive in matters dealing with the national minorities. Their fears and anxieties for the loyalties of the nationalities must have some basis in fact, or else a leader so hard and supremely confident as Khrushchev would never have betrayed his own concern as he did.

Beyond the U.S.S.R. other captive peoples yearn for greater freedom. Along the borderlands of Eastern Europe from Poland to Albania the restless masses continue to exist in a state of prolonged oppression.

Within Communist China, national minority groups in addition to the indigenous Chinese suffered much when the Chinese Communists established their system of communes on a national basis.

Specialists in Communist affairs are aware of current conditions within the captive Communist world, but regrettably much of their findings, generalizations, and speculations never penetrate the outer walls of a university to the public at large.

I believe the creation of a Captive Nations Committee in Congress can serve that purpose. You will recall the excellent work done in the past by the Special House Baltic Committee and its successor, the Select Committee on Communist Aggression. Much rich data was collected by these committees and their findings were widely circulated throughout the free world and no doubt even in the Communist world.

A new Captive Nations Committee can serve the same purpose. It can serve, to use a military term, as a staging area for congressional action. Its main function would be to inform the American people on the state of affairs within the Communist world and to assist the National Government in the general formulation of policy.

By establishing such a committee we can give heart to the captive peoples and demonstrate to them that they have not been forgotten. We can also encourage elements within the Communist world to resist their rulers and thus effectively build up a credit within the fortress of the Communist bloc itself in the event of some future contingency.

Mr. Speaker, I trust this Congress will see fit, without delay, to act favorably on this resolution and create this committee. It will reflect gloriously the cause of freedom and justice everywhere.

Mr. FLOOD. I may say that I welcome the support of the gentleman from New York. Coming from a great State that has so many hundreds of thousands of these people as citizens, he would be in the particular position to know whereof he speaks.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the leadership he has taken in connection with this important subject, and I express to him how happy I am to join with him in sponsoring this resolution and in the hope that this Captive Nations Committee can be formed in the very near future to symbolize, as has already been expressed by the gentleman and by other Members of the House, the determination of this Congress to make certain that the freedom of these great peoples in Eastern Europe, who are now under the Communist heel, has not and will not be forgotten.

The gentleman well knows, of course, the furor that was caused in the Communist camp when this Congress passed a resolution with respect to the captive nations a short time ago. I realize, and I am sure the gentleman realizes, that the adoption of this additional resolution of his and the creation of a Captive Nations Committee of this House would throw even greater consternation into the Communist world and would underline to our friends abroad that they have indeed not been forgotten, and that we are determined that they will not be forgotten. We should certainly help them, because as long as they are in bondage we here in America cannot consider ourselves wholly free, either. No man is an island, and no nation is an island unto itself either. I know that the action of the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the floor of this House is going to send a surge of hope and confidence into the hearts of many millions of people abroad—in Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Byelorussia, Ukraine, and all the other captive peoples of Eastern Europe.

Mr. FLOOD. That was very kind of my friend from New York. This is not the first time he has joined me here. The very first day he came to the House, Mr. Speaker, he joined me in an effort to pass legislation to help the people of the depressed areas. He in his district suffers as I do in my district with that problem. I would expect him, knowing his great heart, to help in that regard.

I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I should like to join my colleagues in saying that I appreciate the fine leadership the gentleman from Pennsylvania is furnishing in calling attention to the need that is very apparent in the areas that we are discussing as captive nations. They are really and truly captive: Captive physically and captive mentally, and it is very unfortunate for all humanity that this is so.

I would like to point out that what the gentleman from Pennsylvania is doing in advancing this proposition, in telling the story, is in line with the finest sort of Americanism.

It is something that we in the Congress throughout the years have been identified with many times. It is really a part of what we are doing in our mutual security program. It is consistent with our objectives in that regard.

So, what he is doing is not new. He is doing a fine service in calling special attention to this particular problem. I feel like it would be secretly applauded in the hearts and minds of millions of people everywhere in the world who yearn sincerely for liberty and freedom.

This was never more important, however, it seems to me, than when the candidate for the Presidency on our ticket last year was visiting Poland, where, as you know, he was accorded a tremendous welcome, even though the Communist government officials did everything to keep the people away. This was their way of saying "Thank God for America." They would applaud this type of thing very much. It would give them great heart and hope.

Therefore, I commend the gentleman for the leadership he has taken and assure him of my interest and support. I want to do everything I can to make his objective successful at the very, very earliest time. I say to you, sir, good luck and God bless you in this very wonderful, worthwhile effort.

Mr. FLOOD. That is very nice, Mr. Speaker. My reason for recognizing the gentleman from Iowa is because when anyone in the House takes a look at the gentleman from Iowa he thinks of Abe Lincoln. The gentleman from Iowa is one of our academic scholars here. He has been leading the programs and the ceremonies commemorating the 100th anniversary of the inauguration of America's great President, Abraham Lincoln. So his voice today certainly emphasizes and points up a long tradition of the belief and feeling in the problems of my resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I wish to indicate very firmly that I join the gentleman from Pennsylvania in his effort. I would point out that the gentleman should feel an immediate impact on the importance of his resolution by the fact that three Members of the House decided to make their maiden speech in support of his resolution.

Mr. FLOOD. I blush with all of this recognition.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I feel that the gentleman should also realize that he has achieved a surprisingly large effectiveness, obviously bipartisan support.

If the gentleman, in this vein, will permit me, I would like to make one constructive suggestion.

Mr. FLOOD. Any suggestion the gentleman from Illinois would make would not help but be constructive.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would like to point out that the gentleman is known throughout the United States, and for that matter, I understand, throughout the English-speaking world, as one of the outstanding orators of the day, if not of the century. In the gentleman's earlier remarks he used on a few occasions the term "New Frontier" in conjunction with this resolution. In discussing the New Frontier, let me point out that there are certain variations of the New Frontier that are subject to some question. It is my hope there will be no controversy in the House when it comes to establishing this committee. Therefore, I would think, with all due respect to the gentleman's loyalty to the principles of the New Frontier as it has become a political term, that we accept the establishment of this committee as something even over and above all that the gentleman hopes of the New Frontier.

In this way it will not be embroiled in perhaps occasional disagreements and aspects of the New Frontier in a political sense.

Mr. FLOOD. In the words of a distinguished jurist when he was Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Holmes, of Massachusetts, who was faced by a young, ambitious lawyer who raised a question. Mr. Justice Holmes said:

> When that situation arises, we shall endeavor to deal with it.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep feeling of urgency that I join my colleagues this afternoon in support of the resolution to establish a Special Captive Nations Committee of the House. On reflection, I feel that this resolution is long overdue and the House could well have approved such a committee as far back as 1946 when the Kremlin enslavement of the captive nations became obvious to all.

I am convinced that the formation of this committee will be one of the truly progressive steps of this congressional session and would serve the legislative branch of the Government in a most effective fashion. I am further convinced that we have an obligation to the American citizens, to freedom-loving people throughout the world, and especially to the oppressed people of the captive nations to vigorously enter into a thorough study of the misery that is inherent under Soviet domination of the captive peoples.

Eighteen months ago it was my privilege to serve as one of the U.S. delegation to the Interparliamentary Conference in Warsaw, Poland. That Conference gave us an opportunity to observe actual conditions behind the Iron Curtain. It gave us other opportunities to pierce through the barrage of Soviet propaganda and observe the actual conditions existing in their false Utopia.

The people of the captive nations are obviously anti-Communist and represent an untapped source of strength for the free world.

It would be most appropriate for the Congress of the United States, the most vigorous legislative body in the world, to devote special attention to the plight of the captive nations, to reassure them that their present enslavement is considered temporary, and that we hope to see the day when they, as well as the Russian people, will truly live in the world of peace and freedom.

I fervently hope that the House will give overwhelming support to this resolution, and that as rapidly as practicable the Captive Nations Committee be approved, organized, and commence work in this arena of utmost importance.

Mr. FLOOD. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, all of the Members of the House know that

there is no Member of Congress who has a firmer and a broader grasp on world affairs and a knowledge of our defense posture than our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]. The people of his district are justified in feeling proud of the character of service that he renders in the Halls of the Congress, because my dear friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] reflects great credit upon the people of his district.

Mr. FLOOD. May I say for the first time in a long career I am speechless.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, as the poet once said, truth is sometimes sweet and sometimes bitter. But, what I have said is the truth just the same.

Mr. FLOOD. You are very kind.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Pennsylvania supports the statement I just made reflecting the opinion of his colleagues by making the speech that he has made today on the floor of the House of Representatives, in relation to over 100 millions of persons behind the Iron Curtain, living in captive nations, as a free American and a Member of the greatest deliberative body in the world, wherein sit the representatives of the free people of America. He is thinking of human beings abroad who are denied liberty and freedom and who see their own countries denied independence. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has repeatedly taken the floor of this House in support of a strong foreign policy, in support of firm leadership, and in support of a strong national defense, because he realizes, as few persons in our country do, the cold, calculating, sinister, and evil minds of the Communists. He knows that the most probable way that the road to peace might be taken is when America is strong and following the policy of peace through strength.

Now, it happens that when the captive nations resolution was adopted by this body that I offered the resolution. I think the House of Representatives paid a great compliment to the people behind the Iron Curtain and in the captive nations when the resolution was adopted without being formally introduced and referred to a committee and reported out of committee. The adoption of the resolution under that unusual procedure shows the unanimous opinion of all of the Members of the House as to our feelings in relation to the peoples of captive nations. I think the best evidence of the action of the House and the Senate in passing the captive nations resolution is the expression of pain and anguish thereafter by Mr. Khrushchev and other prominent leaders of the Soviet Union. And, their surprise of pain has not yet subsided. It is well we pause and keep alive the hopes of the people in captive nations so that they will know we are thinking of them and that America is not letting them down because, as I said on the floor of the House only a few weeks ago and on a number of occasions prior thereto, one of the two links of the Communist world conspiracy is the 100 million or more persons behind the Iron Curtain and in captive nations who not only despise but hate the Communist overlords that dominate them and deprive them of their liberties and deny their country their independence.

One of the greatest reservoirs of strength the free world has is that which is behind the Iron Curtain in the 100 million or more people who despise and hate communism and the Communists, who are waiting for the day of deliverance. If the Soviet Union ever undertook to engage in a world war those 100 million or more people would represent one of the greatest military assets that the free world would have. So it is well to keep alive their hopes for early restoration of the independence of their country and the early beginning of their liberty under their own law.

Mr. Speaker, again I congratulate my distinguished friend and my dear friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for rendering, as he has today, this really constructive service.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for over a quarter of a century, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has been leading this House on just the program he outlined. The greatest honor that could be conferred upon him is to know that if, God forbid, the Reds ever got hold of us, No. 1 on the list to be purged by them would be the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. And I cannot think of a more eloquent compliment and tribute to his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have submitted their statements today be permitted to insert them in the RECORD following this discussion.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, in 1946, in Fulton, Mo., Mr. Churchill made his famous statement that from the Baltic to the Adriatic an Iron Curtain had divided Europe.

The division still stands. But the saddest part of this division is that the eastern section is under the worst system of oppression the world has ever known.

Nearly 100 million freedom-loving people of Eastern European countries have been subjected to the cruelties of Communist rule. Communist propaganda has failed to break the spirit and love of liberty of these peoples. Living examples of their love of liberty are the attempts toward freedom that were made in the past by the workers in East Germany, Poland and Hungary. On the other hand, the ruthless handling of those revolts by the Russian Army indicates the determination of the Soviet Union to maintain enslavement of Eastern Europe at any cost to the region.

It is the moral responsibility of the United States, the leader of the free world, to keep a sympathetic watch over the lot of the people of Eastern Europe who were unfortunate enough to fall under the yoke of Communist tyranny. The principle of self-determination expressed by President Wilson more than 40 years ago was mainly to be applied to Eastern Europe. The entire opposite has happened there since World War II: totalitarian Communist regimes have been set up without any regard as to the peoples' wishes.

The world at large looks upon us as the champions of democracy and as a force from which freedom springs. Therefore, in this hour of trial for those peoples, let us support the proposal to offer them hope and to show them that this country is aware of their unfortunate lot.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, one of the basic tenets of the American philosophy is the right of nations to determine for themselves the system of government under which they shall live. In Europe this ideal came close to full realization in the period between the First and Second World Wars. Many nations of Central and Eastern Europe achieved independence after centuries of foreign domination and in their new found freedom their cultures flourished. This happy situation came to an end with the Second World War, however. One by one of the countries fell victim to Hitler's ambitions of world domination, from whose tyranny they were ostensibly "liberated" by the Soviet Union. They soon realized that they had not been liberated at all but had only fallen captives to the new tyranny of Soviet communism.

Today one-third of the world's population lives behind the Iron Curtain. There are some hundred million persons living in the nominally independent but actually Soviet-dominated nations of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania. There are millions more in such nations as Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and the Ukraine who have been unwillingly incorporated into the Soviet Union. This plight is not confined to Europe. In the Far East there are millions of additional involuntary subjects of Communist rule in China, North Korea, Mongolia, and North Vietnam.

The military power of the Communist leaders of the Soviet Union and China is such that there is very little the captive peoples can do to free themselves, however much they despise their Communist rulers or long to regain their liberty. Even we, their friends in the free world, find it difficult to take concrete action to help them. We want to give them such material assistance as we can, but in doing so we must take care that it does not strengthen the Communist regimes instead of helping the people. We want to assist them in their continuing struggle, but we do not want to do anything which would bring about tighter, more restrictive control by the Soviet Union or involve the whole world in a holocaust in which the captive peoples would be the first victims.

Because of the extreme difficulty in choosing and carrying out the policy which will best promote the interests of the unfortunate people behind the Iron Curtain, there is a real need for a continued and reinvigorated search in this direction. There is also a real need for demonstrations, such as we find here today, that the American people are aware of the plight of the peoples behind

the Iron Curtain. We wish to help them in every way we can and we pray that they will find the courage and patience and hope which will be necessary in the years ahead.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for his forthright exposition of the nature of Communist tyranny in the captive nations.

The record of Communist conquest and growth is written in duplicity of a thousand sorts and the blood of millions who innocently misunderstood the dangers they faced or who blindly acquiesced to those whose purpose is world domination.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize that freedom is the birthright of mankind. The harsh denial by one nation of the fundamental rights of others can only be termed by the rest of humanity as tragic.

We cannot, it is true, eliminate the policy mistakes of the past which allowed these tragedies to occur; but we can, through honest examination and a sincere attempt to face frankly what already has occurred, prevent repetitions of surrender and build the moral strength necessary for eventual liberation of the enslaved. Independence cannot come from mere wishes. We must see that the only real opportunity for liberation rests in stemming the Communist tide and building the free world's ability to defeat tyranny everywhere.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join Congressman FLOOD in this tribute to the captive nations. I am pleased, also, to cosponsor the resolution to set up a Captive Nations Committee, as I did last year.

I believe it is imperative that we seize every opportunity to focus national attention on the plight of the captive nations. We must continually emphasize, and reemphasize, that the captive peoples of Europe shall never be forgotten. We must reassure these peoples that we are not deceived by Soviet propaganda; that we know of their cruel suppression; and that we shall continue to assert their right to live in freedom.

This is why I urge the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. It has been emphasized by this administration as well as the last administration that U.S. foreign policy is vitally concerned with the future of these peoples. I believe the House of Representatives could manifest this concern most dramatically by the enactment of this resolution.

Let us remember, above all, that despite the tactics of the Soviet police state, the captive peoples have nurtured their strong aspirations for liberty. We must recognize and encourage these aspirations, in order to help the Soviet-dominated nations and, at the same time, the cause of world freedom.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the sad plight of the captive nations is a most tragic result of World War II. Before the outbreak of that war freedom was reigning in Eastern Europe in countries extending all the way from the Baltic lands in the north to the Balkan Peninsula in the south. Peoples in most of these countries, including Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Albanians, and others, had regained their freedom at the end of the First World War and enjoyed it during the interwar years.

However, the last war, fought for the cause of freedom, proved fatal to the freedom of all of them. Some of these countries had already fallen behind the Iron Curtain during the war, and by the end of the war nearly all of them had become victims of Soviet deceit and duplicity. The remainder were soon added to the list of Soviet victims.

Today, more than 15 years after the war, they still suffer behind the impervious Iron Curtain and are subjected to Communist totalitarian tyranny. In voicing and echoing the genuine desires of these peoples for freedom, let us hope that they will attain their goal.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolution offered by my distinguished colleague, the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania. I certainly endorse the program to unleash from the yoke of tyranny these enslaved captives of world communism.

This is especially close to my heart as the Representative from San Francisco—a city of many diverse and varied nationalities who have come to the land of freedom from overseas.

In these perilous and dangerous times, Mr. Speaker, it certainly behooves the Members of this distinguished body to be aware of and cognizant of the plight of these oppressed peoples who are clamoring for the rays of light and freedom from world democracy.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has my high regard for his sponsorship of this move to create a special Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives.

I am pleased to cosponsor this legislation as I was pleased to be a member of the National Committee on Captive Nations Week observance last year.

We all know how effective the observance of Captive Nations Week has been. It is best illustrated by the vehemence shown by the Soviet reaction.

I believe the House of Representatives would be doing a wise and just thing in establishing a special Captive Nations Committee. It would be a focal point for support for the freedom-loving peoples being held behind the Iron Curtain. It would continually show the world that we in the United States recognize how demagogic are Soviet urgings that colonies be made free countries. It would—I hope—encourage the people of the captive nations to resist the Soviet influence and keep alive their hopes for freedom and independence.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the captive nations, whom we honor today, is the heart-rending story of helpless and innocent peoples who, through no desire of their own, find themselves imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain. It is inconceivable to think that the inhabitants of all the countries in Eastern and Central Europe, extending from the Baltics to the Balkans, with a population of over 100 million could be treated as prisoners in their own homelands. But that is the tragic truth, brought about by Soviet conquests and by the ruthless policy pursued by men in the Kremlin.

These unfortunate and unhappy people of Eastern Europe, who enjoyed freedom before World War II, and who had hoped to be independent again at the end of that war, have instead become captives of the Soviet system, and are now suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny. In every one of these countries, in the Baltics, in central Europe, and in the Balkans, Communist regimes were imposed by the Soviet Government, and are maintained there still with the aid of Soviet armed forces.

Against the mighty Soviet steamroller these freedom-loving people are helpless to obtain their liberty. Their one hope is the moral and spiritual support they have in the free West, led by the United States. Let us echo their fine sentiments and demonstrate our continuing hope that they will someday be free again.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I join the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD and our colleagues in recognition of the captive nations of the world. In this country which gave to the world the Declaration of Independence, this is a time of rejoicing and a time of sadness. It is a time of rejoicing because many former colonies have achieved their independence. It is a time of sadness because so many once-free nations have lost their independence. We should not forget those countries who have lost their precious freedom, not through any fault of their own, but because they border the flanks of an aggressive political power. Some of these countries—I think especially of Poland—contributed much help to our own struggle for freedom nearly two centuries ago—help from men like Pulaski as well as sound theories of democratic government.

Now it is our time to help. President Kennedy has already suggested that our frozen Polish funds be put to use on projects of peace in that country. And I hope that our Peace Corps plan may give to the captive nations dedication of the kind given to our country by the many, many great emigrants who have worked and fought here. And finally, may we help these countries gain health and strength they so grievously need by sending them some of our agricultural abundance.

May we do these things not out of a feeling of indebtedness but because of our unshakable belief that freedom is man's inalienable right.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania

[Mr. FLOOD] for introducing a resolution to establish a Special Captive Nations Committee of the House. I am glad to cosponsor that resolution as I did the original resolution which established the third week of July of each year as Captive Nations Week.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has rendered a real public service in pointing up the fact that our national observance of Captive Nations Week for the past 2 years has become a matter of grave concern to the leaders of Russian communism. I am convinced that the concern of the Kremlin heirarchy over Public Law 86–90 is very deep and upsetting. The greatest fear held by the leaders of the international Communist conspiracy is that the people of the free world will awaken to the true nature of the vast empire which they have established by subversion, terror, and armed aggression. They have every reason to believe that should the full facts become common knowledge in the free world, the popular demand for justice toward the many non-Russian nations submerged behind the Iron Curtain will reach proportions which no democratic government can ignore, and this will lead to action, that is, positive action in support of the just aspirations of the captive nations. This is precisely what the Russian leadership has long sought to prevent because they would have no defense, their position with regard to imperialism and colonialism is indefensible.

I would like to stress another aspects of the purposes for establishing a special Captive Nations Committee of the House. Such a committee would be a factfinding group. It would, by the process of hearings and studies, permit a continuous and systematic study of all the captive nations of Europe and Asia.

While a beginning has been made on this necessary work, particularly by the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression of the 83d Congress, of which I was a Member, much has transpired during the past 5 years in all the captive nations which should be documented and printed in convenient form for use by colleges and universities, students of world affairs, government officials, and others interested in learning about the realities of the world in which we live.

I am also convinced that the work of such a House committee would strengthen the work of hundreds of committees set up by Governors, mayors, and private groups in the United States for the purpose of carrying out appropriate ceremonies about the captive nations during the third week of each July. Such committees, by the very nature of their work, are bringing the American people closer to the realities of life under communism. Such knowledge not only strengthens our national will to resist, but provides the stimulus for positive political actions in support of human and national rights the world over.

President Kennedy has well said—The enemy stands without our gates. The threat of Red dictatorship is now only 90 miles off our coastline. This threat is real; it is close by. The American people are clamoring for positive action and programs in support of our own political ideals and way of life. A special Captive Nations Committee of the House would be one of the answers to the call for action at the national level.

There is another important consideration. The people behind the Iron Curtain, the people living in the captive non-Russian nations, look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom. They are our proven allies against the common enemy. They are the victims of the common enemy. They continue to resist the imposed order of communism and await the opportunity to cast off the Red chains of Moscow. Their hopes were lifted when Congress enacted the Captive Nations Week resolution. They saw in this action an affirmation that the people of the United States had not forgotten them and that our primary national objective remains individual and national freedom for all. The establishment of a special committee of the House to promote the ideals of Public Law 86–90 would lift up the spirits of millions of people behind the Russian Iron Curtain.

The platform of the Democratic Party carries a promise that this administration will never acquiesce in the enslavement of the captive nations through acceptance of a status quo with the men in the Kremlin. We must, by affirmative action, give purpose to this promise. No better evidence of our will to carry out this commitment could be given than the establishment of a special Captive Nations Committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the observance of Captive Nations Week by the people of these United States demands a renewal of our pledge to the cause of freedom for all peoples in the world. Today the millions behind the Iron Curtain live under the shackles of totalitarian governments. In fact, it is ironical that there are more people living in captive nations today than at any time in modern history. It is ironical because we engaged in two great world conflicts since the turn of the century to insure the freedom and dignity of men everywhere. And yet we who have enjoyed the heritage of freedom too often take it for granted.

The resolution which was presented before this House this week is a true reflection of the deep sentiments not only for freedom-loving Americans but those who detest oppression and its ruthless inconsiderations.

Can we, in our land of freedom, begin to realize how we would feel if we were suddenly to find ourselves a captive nation like Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Bulgaria, or the other nations that now stagger under the burden of the Soviet and Chinese Communist yoke? I submit that this would be difficult, but it is something about which we must think.

We must have definitions of the various types of tyrannies inflicted on these unfortunate peoples, who, like so many of us, must at one time have said to themselves, "It can't happen here." We must understand simple things like the fact that Socialist Russia preceded Soviet Russia; know that Socialist Italy preceded Fascist Italy, and that Socialist Germany preceded Nazi Germany. Then, too, we must recall that, for these nations, it was only one short step for them to take before they suddenly found themselves under the yoke of dictators at the best, or occupied and completely subjugated, at the worst. These socialized countries did not realize what was happening to their beloved lands until it was too late to take effective action and free themselves.

Although sad to recall, many of the presently captive nations once enjoyed freedom, and had civilizations of a high order. Czechoslovakia before World War II was regarded as the best-armed nation in Europe and one of the most prosperous and advanced in education, cultural activities, and industrial development. Yet today we face the fact that that great nation is wallowing in the dismal swamp of hopelessness; it cannot seem to figure out a way to extricate itself from this morass of utter discouragement. Yet some of the best brains in all Europe still live in Czechoslovakia.

Other countries too numerous to mention find themselves in the same frustrated situation. I cite the plight of the Czechs only because we seem to have known more about their country than about others and to have been completely shocked when we realized how rapidly the modern barbarians conquered and then occupied and subjugated them. No less have the other, smaller, and less well-known nations suffered than did Czechoslovakia. Our hearts go out to the Czechs in the long and unreasoning tortures they have suffered, and the personal indignities and regimentation which have all but destroyed their individual personalities and which has made them, to all practical purposes, puppets on the strings of their conquerors, leaving them no choice but to do as they are told.

One of the most effective objectives that Captive Nations Week should have is the teaching of other nations how to recognize and counteract the devious and diabolical schemes of those who would use these methods until they had succeeded in enslaving all of the known civilized world. Mere observance of Captive Nations Week in the future will not be enough; we must devise ways and means of halting the hordes of barbarians. The world has faced this same dilemma many times before. Let us not neglect this opportunity—the same kind of opportunity which other civilizations failed to grasp; their reward has been oblivion.

Celebration of Captive Nations Week, although as yet unofficial in the United States, has been a great source of irritation to the Kremlin; it therefore must be a sound proposal and one toward which all of us should bend our every effort to have enacted into law. The practice of freedom can well prove the Achilles heel for the enslavers of so large a part of the world that only recently enjoyed the same freedoms that we now enjoy in the United States.

It is significant that this Captive Nations Week proposal was adopted and we

shall make it a cornerstone in our continuing fight for the freedom of all peoples. The stand that the United States has taken is crystal clear; it is written for all to see in our beloved Declaration of Independence; it is part and parcel of our national fabric; an inextricable part of our national morality; let us offer hope to enslaved nations through it.

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, one aspect of the age in which we live which has often been criticized by commentators is the fact that too often the cause of world peace and the preservation of human freedom and dignity seems such a complex task that the average citizen finds himself unable to make a contribution.

Americans from every walk of life dearly love peace and liberty, but it is difficult for them to understand always what they can do to make the world safe for their children.

May I submit that the resolution calling for the establishment of a Captive Nations Committee in the House presents an unusual and precious opportunity for the Congress to provide leadership in a field where the American people, wherever they live, can make a real and substantial contribution.

Because I come from northeastern Pennsylvania, a part of this Nation particularly blessed with the richness of the varied cultures that were carried there from every corner of the world, I am very well aware of the tremendous emotional, intellectual, religious, and family ties that bind so many of our people to enslaved nations across the world. These northeastern Pennsylvanians, and thousands more like them across America, have a very deep appreciation of the facts which have led to the enslavement of the nations from which their ancestors came. These people know that Soviet unity is a myth. They know that it is only an Iron Curtain which manages to keep their blood relatives within the Soviet orbit.

Congress, by establishing a special Captive Nations Committee in the House, will be in effect encouraging not only Americans whose ancestors have come from the captive nations, but all Americans, to take a very deep and personal interest in the fate of the enslaved peoples. If we are able to enkindle a spark, a feeling of personal obligation, a sense of mission among the American people in regard to the Communist menace, and if through this committee we can maintain a constant spotlight of public opinion on the problem, then I would predict that before too long, this spark could very well spread across the world.

I know I speak for everyone in northeastern Pennsylvania when I say that all of us hope that this committee will be established, and that Congress and the entire U.S. Government will lend their great moral leadership to the cause of the captive nations—a cause which our people want to serve and are able to serve.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that the U.S. House of Representatives should devote this time to recognition of the plight of the oppressed peoples of the so-called captive nations. These are the little countries which have lost their independence and liberty through the forcible seizure of their governments by international communism. These unfortunate and tragic people are kept in subjection by ruthless military power—the gun and the tank. No thoughtful person can doubt that if these little nations had a choice, if their Communist rulers would permit a plebicite in which they could vote as free men and women for a government of their own, they would throw off the rule of their oppressors in overwhelming numbers.

The real importance of this observance is the message which will be carried back beyond the Iron Curtain to these people who exist under the yoke of Communist slavery that the Congress of the United States, the leader of the free world, continues to recognize their tragic situation and is ever mindful of their desire for freedom and independence. This may reassure them that the people of this Nation and of the free world have the deepest sympathy for their aspirations and that there is among us a unity of hope and determination that they will eventually regain their freedom.

Government whose power is derived from the sword and the secret police rests upon a thin reed indeed. Such governments cannot endure indefinitely. It is the universal desire of mankind to be free. Hope for the deliverance of these nations has a solid basis in the conviction that while they have captive governments they are not really captive peoples, as long as the torch of liberty still burns in their souls.

May God speed the day of their liberation.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in support of the resolution to establish a House Committee on Captive Nations and to commend the gentlemen from Pennsylvania for his action and comment on the subject. The United States certainly should pursue every peaceful means to help the people of those nations achieve their desire to regain their national and individual freedoms.

In addition to the establishment of the Committee on Captive Nations, I believe we should enact a formal program, such as proposed in my bill H.R. 1012, to assist the captive nations, once they have thrown off the yoke of Soviet oppression, in establishing free governments. I realize, of course, that the President and the Department of State do have a certain amount of latitude in that respect, but I believe we should have a statute on the books designed specifically for the captive nations. It would be concrete evidence to the enslaved people that we are interested in their fate and are prepared to help them at the appropriate moment.

Under my bill the President would be given specific authority to furnish technical assistance and services, agricultural and other commodities, and other assistance to strengthen the newly formed, free government and to promote the continuation and growth of freedom and security within the nation, after it was demonstrated that the nation had freed itself from Soviet domination.

I believe it is imperative to have this law enacted now, so that whenever these captive nations do cast off their bonds of tyranny, there will be no delay in rendering them the help in stabilizing a free government.

TEXTILE IMPORTS BECOME MORE SERIOUS EACH YEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of the Congress, and I hope to arouse the sympathetic understanding of the Members of Congress and of the Nation as a whole, to the growing problems of the textile industry of the United States, arising out of the rushing and swelling tide of the textile imports which flood this country in increasing volume, and in increasing dollar value each year. The situation has progressed from an atmosphere of growing apprehension and tension over the possibility, to a situation appalling in its realistic impact. The domestic industry is in trouble, and, unless something is done, will be in greater trouble in the next few years. I am concerned not only with the fact that a great industry is on the threshold of greater and increasing difficulty, but that thousands of jobs are at stake, and thousands of brave Americans, hard-working and important consumers in the economy of the country, have their jobs threatened by the textile imports.

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

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from my neighboring district, he coming from South Carolina, adjoining the 11th District of North Carolina which I am privileged to represent, for bringing this important matter to the attention of the Congress again today.

The gentleman from South Carolina has been steadfast in his desire and his efforts to help many others of us who are concerned about the unfortunate plight of the textile industry in this country. Recently we received figures that between December 1960, and January 1961, there had been a loss of approximately 11,000 jobs of American textile workers.

This comes with a particular impact upon the district which I am privileged to represent, which is the largest textile producing district in the United States. I know that it comes with almost equal impact upon the great district which my friend from South Carolina represents. I know that from his recent report upon his study of this problem in Hong Kong

and in other areas the gentleman from South Carolina can speak with outstanding ability and eloquence of the truly dangerous situation confronting the jobs of approximately 800,000 others who are still employed in the textile industry.

I commend the gentleman again for bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress and I express with him the hope that there will be others not only from the textile producing areas but from other industrial areas who are affected by excessive imports who will help in bringing a halt to this threat to the jobs of the American people.

I think that the gentleman from South Carolina would agree with me that had it not been for the vision of the American textile people in developing a synthetic textile product, had we not had this great development, today there would be more unemployed people in the textile industry. Our people because of the policies of our Government are not able to compete with the low-wage countries in the production of cotton textiles. Fortunately for us, the foreign invasion of the synthetic market has not been as acute as in the cotton market.

I am hoping that before such an invasion is experienced by our people the proper steps will be taken by our Government to help us in protecting the means of livelihood enjoyed by thousands of Americans in the districts which the gentleman from South Carolina and I are privileged to represent.

I again commend the gentleman and wish him well as we march along together in this fight for the preservation of the economy of this great country of ours.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina. As he has noted, his district and mine adjoin. The textile people have been his friends, as they have been mine. He has been the kind of Congressman they would want. His efforts in this field have been unfailing. We came here together and since that time we have fought together for some relief. I congratulate him and I congratulate his people on the fact that he is here. In my work here no other man has aroused my admiration so much for his diligence and his work in the interests of his constituents.

Recently, I was privileged to make a trip, in which I visited not only the textile plants in Japan, but a textile plant in China, that is, the British Crown Colony we think of as Hong Kong. Not only did I go and see, firsthand, but I talked to numbers of people who were acquainted with, or using, the production of Red China, where the labor is slave labor, where they are waiting to take advantage of our Government's soft approach in defending the textile industry, and take our domestic and foreign markets wherever they can find them.

In Japan, I found that the Japanese were complaining that the Chinese were taking their markets. These were the same markets that the United States of America had, in which formerly we realized profit to the American industry, jobs for the American worker, wages for consumer purposes in the American economy, but which no longer exist. I speak of the markets in southeast Asia, the markets in the United Kingdom, Australia, and Western Europe. I also speak of the markets in Africa, and other places where we were formerly able to sell our goods, until we developed, but did not control, competitors who are now determined, ambitious, and seeking our markets.

I would like to quote here from a letter which I recently wrote to my distinguished chairman, the Honorable OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, about a recent trip I made to textile plants in the Far East. I confess I did not have the time I wanted, as I was on other business for my committee and my country, but I saw enough to give me concern, and to spur me on to lift my voice in behalf of my people, lest the jobs be reduced in numbers, and the industry be so hurt by imports that it can no longer present the American people the picture of a thriving, throbbing industry hard at work.

> It is obvious to me that the administration of Mr. Kennedy holds the key to the textile situation in 1961. I do not care to hazard a guess as to what will be done, but I have high hopes that something will be done. I know in my own heart something must be done.

We now have a Democratic administration, which is traditionally, and actually, sympathetic to the problem of the workingman. This new Democratic administration has a great opportunity to do something to curb the low-price import from low-wage areas especially in Hong Kong. The Government's attitude, alone, on foreign imports will have much to do with the prospects of the textile industry in our country within the next few years. I have every belief that our distinguished North Carolinian, recently selected to a deserved post as Secretary of Commerce, recognizes the unsoundness of permitting rapidly increasing imports which will cause factory idleness, joblessness, and other difficulties to an industry whose people, and whose investors, have contributed so much to the American scene of the past and the present.

Textiles are the backbone of the district I represent in South Carolina. Textile curtailment during the last half of the last year affected retail sales in grocery, department, furniture, jewelry, and all other retail establishments. We know that the textile worker in the mill is not only of value as a citizen of the community, a worker, and a producer, but he is also a consumer upon whom the rest of the economy of my particular area directly depends. Furthermore, he is my neighbor, my friend, my fellow American, and I love him for his great contribution to the American way of life, the American economy.

As I pointed out above, the import situation in 1960 has deteriorated even worse than 1959 and 1958. I do not know what to expect of 1961, but I share the hope, if not the optimism, of the textile people that something will be done. Since the beginning of this new year, many jobs have been curtailed, many are not making enough to meet their weekly demands. I have every sympathy for these people, every determination to continue to champion their cause, to secure relief and insure a healthy textile economy for the future.

Recently there appeared an article in one of the papers of my district which had the caption "These People Are Ambitious," and "Modern Oriental Textile Plants Impress HEMPHILL." In some ways this article was misinterpreted to say that I admired the effort overseas. Such was not the import of the article. I sought to tell the people of my country, through this press release, what we are faced with. This is no longer an ethereal, fanciful threat on our shores—it is a realism.

We must realize that with modern machinery and with modern methods, low wages, and techniques be either borrowed or bought from other countries, such as the United States, Switzerland, and others, that they are in the market to take our market. We must not underrate their ambition. We must not underrate the fact that they will work, and that what they are after is a profit, not on so large a scale perhaps as we seem to require in America, but such as would keep their mills running. We must realize that the import problem of the textile industry shares a brotherhood with other industries suffering the shutdowns, the curtailment, the unemployment caused directly or indirectly by foreign imports.

We must not be archaic in our thinking about our foreign competitors. We must not think that they cannot do the job, or that they are not out to compete. The plants they have are modern. The plants they have are clean. The people want work, and need work, and will work, and while the wage scale is much lower than ours, for their standard of living, the wage scale is sufficient to have plenty of people waiting to do the work that has to be done. I know this is true, because I have seen it, in person.

Now, we who are in the textile area know the manner in which the textile exporters to the United States operate. They have quotas, and they will tell you that the volume does not matter. But what really does matter is the fact that when once they concentrate on any segment of the industry, usually they can condemn that industry by underselling. They have already condemned and almost put out of business the gingham and velveteen segments of our industry in the United States, and they have the power, with their low wages, low cost cotton, low overhead, and other factors which are in keeping with the standard of living not one-half as high as ours, to enable them to sell their goods in America very cheap. Once they zero in on a textile target in the United States, that segment of the industry is in for trouble, if not sure and certain death. This fact has been ignored by the past administration, and ignored by many of the officials who should know better, who could know better, if they would have an open mind, and would visit and see, or would talk to the textile people of our area and learn what it is to have their particular part of the industry a target for the import.

Recently, I have had people who were concerned with industries related to, or

dependent on, the textile industry tell me of the alarm they feel at the flood of imports in their particular fields. They wonder that our Government expresses so much alarm at the unemployment situation, and so little concern over the quick relief needed to stop the curtailments in the textile and related industries.

As you can readily see, once a particular segment of the industry has been put out of business, it is no longer in competition with those importing to the United States, and so the particular bureau of the Government can say that it no longer represents a problem. The bureau of the Government which has been responsible for failing to appreciate the difficulties of the industry, ignored the impact, or just became incompetent or inefficient, or perhaps infiltrated, has an easy out. I am determined that this shall not happen to another segment of our industry, and I beg the sympathy and help of every Member of Congress, of the administration, and of the executive department of our Government.

To indicate the employment situation in the textile industry, I quote from a letter sent to me on February 28, 1961, from the Textile Workers Union of America, as follows:

Employment of production workers in the textile industry in the United States dropped in January 1961 to 807,300 which is the lowest level on record.

The drop from 818,500 in December was slightly more than the usual seasonal drop. But what was even more significant was the decline in average weekly hours to 37.8 per week from 38.1 in December and 40.3 in January 1960. Total man-hours dropped measurably below the expected seasonal drop.

The apparel industry maintained manhours at the December 1960 level.

The unemployment rate in December 1960 among the insured textile workers was 8.6 percent. This rate no doubt rose in January and February 1961.

On the basis of experience, it is expected that poor business conditions and heavy unemployment will persist through March and possibly April. It is hoped that an upturn might occur in May.

From others I have learned that the situation has not only been bad, but that the likelihood of improvement is very thin unless some sort of relief is forthcoming.

As early as September of last year we were in a textile slump in my part of the country, and I quote from an article by Mr. J. A. Daly, business editor of the Charlotte News, and included in the Lancaster (S.C.) News of September 29, 1961:

The economy of the Carolinas is being affected adversely and progressively by readjustments in the markets for raw cotton and for cotton textile products, especially cotton cloth.

Textile analysts admittedly are hopeful this readjustment is approaching its "bottom" and will stop short of a cyclical setback. However, predictions are varying widely as regards the duration of the resulting uncertainties.

Some analysts are convinced that curtailment of cotton textile production, largely in fabrics, in Carolinas mills is the result of unwarranted refusal of textile printing and finishing concerns and the apparel industries to anticipate their needs and make contracts with textile mills to cover these needs through this year's final quarter.

Reports from numerous representative mills spinning and weaving cotton emphasize that their cautious customers are continuing to call for liberal and steady deliveries of fabrics and yarns to meet their current consumption requirements. The previous contracts soon will be filled as these deliveries are continued and thereafter shortages of supplies, especially of the market leading fabrics, may be experienced in the trade.

The current curtailment of weaving at Carolinas mills is keeping mill stocks of cloth down to minimum volumes. That policy also is being followed by mills spinning cotton yarns for sale to knitting and weaving mills.

Amid this condition of severely and persistently depressed trade in cotton fabrics and yarns, managements of leading mills are emphasizing informally the comment that often in the past severe depressions for this industry were attributed to excessive inventories at the mills and consequent price weakness.

To reflect on the thinking in the textile industry, I quote from a statement released by Edward Goldberger, treasurer and secretary of M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc. This has been put before the Senate committee and I salute Mr. Goldberger for his foresight. M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc., has a marvelous plant in my district known as the Rock Hill Printing & Finishing Co., and has other mills in my district and in South Carolina, and their continued operation is absolutely necessary for the economy of a major part of my district and of South Carolina. This statement was reprinted in the September 10, 1959, issue of the America's Textile Reporter, and is as follows:

TEXTILES SHOULD NOT BEAR FULL BURDEN OF U.S. GLOBAL STRATEGY

Our industry has had its share of problems. It is still one of the largest employers of labor in the United States, and the value of its product is among the highest of any manufacturing industry.

At one time the industry was a prosperous one but it has had its ups and downs, mostly downs.

At one time the industry was the largest exporter of textiles in the world. Today this has changed. The industry, at the turn of the century, had 25,812,000 spindles. This has steadily dropped until in 1957 there were 21,195,000 spindles in the United States.

I need not dwell upon the migration of the industry from the North to the South. The fact is that today the industry is, in large measure, a southern industry.

Unlike most industries in this country, there is little concentration of ownership in few hands. Less than 5 percent of the industry is represented by one ownership and the balance is in much smaller fragments.

The recent hearings before the special Senate committee, headed by Senator PASTORE, brought from one of the departments of the Government the statement that in World War II the textile industry was considered No. 2 in importance insofar as national security was concerned.

Immediately following World War II the industry had a sharp upturn, in large part due to the pent-up demand of the domestic market for textile products as well as the great scarcity of textiles in the countries abroad. Since 1948 the industry has had a downward trend. There have been liquidations of plants and equipment, with the consequent loss of jobs for thousands of workers.

One of the first areas in which countries seeking to industrialize have sought to become self-sufficient is textiles. The result is that, coupled with the policy of our Government to assist other nations to better their standards of living and to have the means of providing basic manufactures, many countries which prior to World War II made little or no textiles became manufacturers of textiles.

Japan had for many years been a rising textile power and prior to World War II was a definite threat to the textile manufacturers of the world. During World War II the textile manufacturing facilities of Japan were, in large measure, liquidated. The main reason for this was their need for the scrap metal for war purposes. Following the war that industry was rebuilt, in part with imported machinery—much of it from the United States—and in part with machinery of their own manufacture. Today Japan is the leading exporter of textiles in the world.

Other areas which in prior years were importers of textiles have ceased being importers and have become substantial exporters of textiles. As an illustration, take Hong Kong—in 1946 Hong Kong had no textile manufacturing industry; today it is one of the substantial exporters of textiles to this country. This was brought about, in large measure, by Chinese manufacturers from Shanghai establishing plants in Hong Kong and expanding their production there.

Today one hears names like India, Formosa, and even Portugal, as exporters of textiles.

What has happened is that many areas, with the object of providing for their own needs, in their industrialization planning have used their textile production for sales in the world market, particularly the United States, in order to secure hard currency.

Having this situation in mind, let us look into the picture to see what has given this a big assist.

In the first place, our Government has set out on a program to grant economic assistance to other nations of the world in various forms. We do not criticize this policy. We recognize the political expediency of it, to say nothing of the laudable humanitarian motives. Our Department of State has a global strategy to contain communism, and part of that is through economic assistance to various nations. This is a problem of the whole United States. It is the price that our country must pay for its own security, but the cost of it must not be saddled upon the textile industry of the United States.

When our Government insists upon unrestricted entry of foreign manufactured textiles which displace American textile manufacturing and displace American textile workers, the burden of this global program is being borne by the textile industry and the textile workers. Our State Department says we must allow these nations to have markets for their products and if we close our doors to them they cannot improve themselves.

Unfortunately, the products that these countries want to export are not spread over the entire list of American manufacturers; they are concentrated in some of the basic, simpler industries such as textiles. Accordingly, we find a flood of textile products coming into this country.

It stands to reason that we have not had much importation of electronic computers, and in the past our automobile industry has been relatively free from foreign imports. In fact, industries in which America takes particular pride have had the field pretty much to themselves. Many of them have had large foreign markets and have had the domestic market exclusively to themselves. These people have not had to bear the brunt of the cost of this global strategy; they have been free from foreign competition both abroad and here. The ingredient that has made them distinctive has been their particular specialty, either the large size of

their operation—that is, steel—or the economies of mass production, plus advanced scientific skills; that is, automobiles and airplanes (maybe now missiles).

Now, what is the secret ingredient that allows foreign countries to take over parts of the American textile market in competition with American firms? America is one of the largest exporters of cotton. It has traditionally been so. Competition through cotton grown in various parts of the world has been on the increase. For some time our Government's export policy with respect to cotton provided for a subsidy of approximately 6 cents a pound. On August 1, this subsidy was increased to 8 cents per pound. This means that a foreign manufacturer can buy American cotton at 8 cents per pound below the price at which an American manufacturer must pay for it.

I might add parenthetically that our industry has recognized the need for the export of cotton as such and has not opposed a subsidy, but it has advocated that cotton be priced on a single pricing basis and that it be made available to American manufacturers at the same price that it is made available to foreign manufacturers.

In order to further fill in this picture, I would add that the provisions for subsidy on cotton are followed through in relation to the export of cloth manufactured of cotton. The cotton content of exported fabrics is entitled to a subsidy of the cotton in the same amount as the cotton subsidy. This was designed to help American fabrics compete in the world market with persons buying this American cotton and manufacturing same into fabrics.

I have mentioned the cost of cotton to the foreign manufacturer but that is not his main advantage. This brings us to what is really the heart of the matter and it goes to the essence of the whole problem that our industry faces and that other American industries will face, and that is the disparity in the standards of living of the United States of America versus the foreign countries producing textile products. These countries pay a fraction of the wage rates that are paid in the United States. It is utterly impossible for American manufacturers to compete with foreign manufacturers in many fabrics because of this disparity in manufacturing cost due to low wage rates.

As an illustration, the average textile wage rate today in the United States is $1.58 per hour. In Japan the rate is approximately 13 cents an hour. Can the U.S. manufacturer compete with that differential? Now, an interesting commentary is that Hong Kong has become an important exporter of textiles to the United States. The Japanese, with their 13 cents an hour rate, now complain that they cannot compete with Hong Kong which pays much lower wages. In fact, in Hong Kong the men work 12 hours a day, 7 days a week. They receive about 1 U.S. dollar per day. I might add that the labor laws give greater protection to women in Hong Kong; they work only 10 hours per day, 7 days per week, for this same U.S. dollar equivalent.

The labor of India probably would consider the Hong Kong pay as very munificent and is content for a fraction of that.

I need not comment on the wage rates paid by Communist China which is now a world exporter of textiles.

It is obvious that the great disparity in wages is the essential reason for the influx of textiles into the United States. This move, which started as a trickle, is developing into a flood. As an illustration, the number of bales of cotton imported into the United States in textile form, including yarn, cloth and fabricated articles, has increased from 37,510 in 1948 to 286,630 in 1958.

As an indication of the trend, imports from Hong Kong prior to May of this year have never exceeded 2 million yards of cloth per quarter. Reliable reports indicate that orders have been placed for future delivery for more than 35 million yards of soft filled sheetings alone from Hong Kong.

Recent textile imports in the 1st quarter of 1959 were:

India	691,000
Korea	2,535,000
Formosa	72,000
Pakistan	11,000
Hong Kong	1,426,000
2d quarter:	
India	1,414,000
Pakistan	444,000
Hong Kong	1,847,000

Fabricated articles from Hong Kong in the first quarter of 1959 amounted to $8,284,000.

The Journal of Commerce of April mentions imports from Hong Kong of various types of cotton wearing apparel in 1957 were $2,089,000 and in 1958 were $12,080,000.

Foreign imports are now at an alltime high and are increasing at a very fast rate.

Foreign countries have recognized the advantage which they have in low wage rates. While once their exports were comprised of fabric, they have now followed through to have this fabric manufactured into garments and other made-up articles, with the result that while heretofore there was injury to the manufacturers of cloth, now the injury has been extended to the finishers of cloth and to the manufacturers of garments. In short, textile workers are being displaced from mills to sewing factories.

There is a statute, Public Law 480, which in substance, allows American exporters to sell certain products to foreign countries and our Government will give dollars to the American exporter for the soft currency paid by the foreign country. This applies to the sale of cotton. It has been extended to the sale of cotton products but only to the extent of the cotton content. In other words, an American exporter of cloth could avail himself of this law but would receive dollars not for the total selling price but only for the cotton content. This is a very impractical situation. This law should be amended to provide for availability of dollars on the sale of American fabrics in the same manner as the sale of American cotton.

Our ICA program has furnished large amounts of money for textile products. The great bulk of these products have been manufactured in foreign countries. Through the ICA program foreign purchasers in an approved country can purchase, say, textiles with local currency. The U.S. Government will make available to the local government dollars as counterpart funds. There are provisions in the ICA regulations which require the Government to use a certain percentage of American ships for transportation of products delivered under the ICA program. There is no requirement for the use of any percentage of American textile products in this program.

I have mentioned some of the areas in which our industry has been discriminated against but the basic fact is that the low wage rates of foreign countries, with an assist from the two-price cotton system, enable foreign manufacturers to compete unfairly in the U.S. domestic market. The industry must have relief in the form of effective quotas if it is to survive.

Currently there has been filed with the Secretary of Agriculture a petition by the National Cotton Council for relief against manufactured textiles under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Section 22 contains provisions for relief against imports if it is found that they tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with the agricultural programs of the Government. Under this act quotas have been placed on the amount of cotton that can be imported into this country. If the products of cotton, in the form of cloth or manufactured articles, are to be imported in large quantities into the United States, that will deprive the American farmer of his domestic market for his cotton. I need not recite the chain of events that follow—closed mills, displaced workers, contraction of buying power. It becomes a vicious circle. Who will do the buying of these American products when American payrolls are eliminated?

This petition is now before the Secretary of Agriculture. We feel that the decision on this petition is of vital interest not only to the textile industry but to industry generally in the United States.

I have referred in this memorandum only to the textile industry but every day the papers contain news items of additional industries being affected by foreign competition. In 1958 there were more foreign cars imported into the United States than American cars exported from this country. Mr. Blough, chairman of United States Steel, in his statement in the New York Times of July 29, referred to the foreign competition that is affecting the American steel industry. What a few years ago was considered an isolated problem—namely, foreign imports into this country—is becoming the No. 1 problem of an increasing list of American industries.

The committee of the Senate, headed by Senator PASTORE, held extended hearings and made findings consistent with the points emphasized here. An advisory committee has been appointed to deal with the problem of the textile industry.

I feel that favorable action upon this petition under section 22 will be the basis for a real examination into the problems that result from our policy of unrestricted imports and urge that action be taken under it.

In summary:

1. The policy advocated by our State Department, of assistance to other nations through opening American markets to those countries, is being disproportionately paid for by the American textile industry.

2. The American textile industry cannot compete with foreign manufacturers producing their products under the disproportionate standards of living between our country and these other countries.

3. A system of higher tariffs would not solve the problem.

4. A system of rigid quotas is the only answer to this problem.

5. The problem of the textile industry is one that is having increasing application to American industry generally every day.

6. The current petition of the National Cotton Council to the Secretary of Agriculture under section 22 is a salutary means leading to a solution of this basic problem.

Not long ago the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., of Charlotte, N.C., Clemson, S.C., and New York, issued from its Washington office, a statement entitled, "Three Years of Textile Foreign Trade," and "United States Loses Export Markets as Imports Rise." I enclose parts of this report as follows:

In 1958 U.S. imports of cotton cloth were approximately 142 million square yards. These imports increased to 242 million square yards in 1959—nearly doubling from the already high 1958 level. Cotton cloth imports jumped to a new record high of 455 million square yards in 1960.

The trend is unmistakable. Not only is the import level at a record high, but the rate of increase is such that, if it continues

unchecked, the entire market for domestic cloth will be supplied by foreign production.

An even sharper rate of increase is seen in cotton yarn imports. After a steep rise from 1958 to 1959, cotton yarn imports shot up from about 1.4 million pounds in 1959 to 15.1 million pounds in 1960.

No fiber and no fabric of the U.S. textile industry is insulated from this onrush of foreign competition. For example, imports of man-made fiber fabrics, which averaged about 5 million pounds in 1958, doubled to more than 11 million pounds in 1959 and continued at over 10 million pounds in 1960.

Woven wool cloth imports moved up from about 34 million square yards in 1958 to 47 million yards in 1959 and attained a new level of 62 million square yards in 1960.

Broad silk fabrics, recorded at about 55 million square yards in 1958, rose to 81 million yards in 1959, and continued at 72 million yards in 1960.

The same alarming trends appear beyond the cloth manufacturing end of the textile industry—in apparel import statistics. From a level of $138 million worth of apparel products in 1958 to $202 million in 1959 there was an additional increase of 13 percent to $220 million worth of apparel products imported in 1960.

While other examples can be drawn from the multiplicity of textile products that flow into the United States from low-wage countries, it is significant to understand that U.S. textile trade has been reversed in recent years. The United States has lost its historical position as a net exporter of textile manufactures.

The United States moved $1.4 billion worth of textile manufactures into world markets in 1947 and absorbed $336 million worth of foreign-made textile manufactures. By 1957 these textile exports had dropped to $667 million, but imports had increased to $635 million. In 1958, exports of textile manufactures of $600 million failed to equal the $636 million imports. The import balance was $36 million. By 1960 imports had risen to $932 million, while textile exports were $694 million—a net import balance of $138 million worth of textile products.

The impact of these trends on the U.S. textile industry with its billions of dollars invested in machinery and equipment is clear to see. Uncertainty about spending for new plants and equipment in the United States and increased search overseas for possible investment in textile plants in countries where foreign governments favor the development of industry is the logical outcome.

At the same time, the U.S. Government continues to pursue a two-price cotton program under which domestic mills must buy U.S. raw cotton and pay 25 percent more than the special export prices provided to foreign mills. And wage rates paid by these same foreign manufacturers range from one-half to as low as one-tenth the average wages paid by U.S. industry.

Such raw material cost and wage advantages held by foreign textile manufacturers, over which the U.S. textile industry has no control whatever places the U.S. industry in an intolerable competitive position due to factors beyond its control.

3-year summary of textile foreign trade

U.S. merchandise	1960	1959	1958	Percent change from—	
				59 to 60	58 to 60
Trade (millions of dollars):					
Exports	20,299	17,383	17,728	+17	+14
Imports	14,654	15,207	12,982	−4	+13
Textile manufactures (millions of dollars):					
Exports	694	634	600	+9	+16
Imports	932	837	637	+11	+46
Cotton cloth (thousands of square yards):					
Exports	436,749	472,299	500,501	−8	−13
Imports	454,898	240,371	141,540	+89	+221
Cotton yarn (thousand pounds):					
Exports	10,690	13,772	12,921	−22	−17
Imports	15,141	1,380	835	+997	+1,713
Manmade fiber fabrics:					
Exports (thousand square yards)	154,449	168,004	156,767	−8	−1
Imports (thousand pounds)	10,215	11,012	4,865	−7	+110
Woven wool cloth (thousand square yards):					
Exports	1,348	713	853	+89	+58
Imports	62,020	46,610	34,328	+33	+81
Broad silk fabrics (thousand square yards):					
Exports	1,439	1,641	1,589	−12	−9
Imports	71,942	81,374	54,827	−12	+31
Apparel (millions of dollars):					
Exports	81.1	71.4	72.5	+14	+12
Imports	229.6	202.4	138.4	+13	+66

Source: Compiled by the Economic Information Division of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute from data of U.S. Department of Commerce, Mar. 1, 1961.

Recently, Robert T. Stevens, president of J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., which company has numerous fine mills in my district and other parts of South Carolina, including a very fine bleachery known as Delta Finishing Plant just east of Cheraw, S.C., made a statement before the Textile Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and although this was made in the Senate, I think some of it bears repeating here:

It is, indeed, unfortunate that most of the subcommittee's recommendations were not acted upon. Two years have now been lost with resultant further serious industry deterioration and loss of American jobs. During that 2 years, imports of textile products from cheap-wage foreign countries have skyrocketed. For the year just ended, over a billion yards in cotton textile products entered the American market. This is an increase of nearly 2½ times in the 2 years since your report was issued. In addition, during that period, imports of wool and manmade fiber fabrics also increased substantially. Practically all of these imports were unneeded. If the facts of 2 years ago were a source of concern then, the facts of today are truly devastating now.

In coming before you today, I do so as an individual American businessman. I do not represent any group or organization. I speak only for the Stevens Co. and the folks who gently in our company to keep our people fully employed in spite of this flood of imports. We did a reasonably successful job in this regard until several months ago. Then the roof fell in.

The collapse which the industry had been predicting to our Government for several years arrived with a bang. We had to cut out almost all overtime. Most of our plants had to go on greatly reduced operating schedules. Even so, industry inventories have gone up. Market prices have gone down drastically under the weight of these unwanted and unneeded imports. The result is that textile earnings are now in a rapid downward spiral. Expenses are being cut. Forward planning is being curtailed. It is increasingly difficult to maintain adequate research. Capital expenditures are going down.

What does this all mean? It means more textile plants are going out of business. It means more textile workers will be out of jobs. It means the purchasing power of the remaining textile workers will be further curtailed. It means the export of American jobs goes on at an accelerated pace. With 5,400,000 American workers already unemployed, is this the best that can be done for our 2 million excellent workers in the combined textile and apparel industries of the United States? Must their earnings continue to be reduced? I, for one, do not subscribe to that. I think it is all wrong.

I believe that textile workers in these United States have a right to look forward with confidence to a higher standard of living. They are not responsible for the imports which have now caught up with us. But they are the ones who feel the burden most keenly. So do their families. Likewise, their community and their State.

I am not against foreign trade. I recognize that it is both necessary and desirable as an instrument of foreign policy. I also recognize that we, as a nation, must pay a high price for our survival and the survival of the free world in this nuclear age. Speaking again for our company, we are ready to pay our share of that price. As good citizens we do not complain about that.

But what we do complain about, is that the textile and apparel industries, as of today, are being called upon to pay a disproportionate share of that high price in terms of unrestricted imports. This is not in accord with the fundamental American desire for fairplay. Let our industry pay its full share but don't ask textile employees to bear far more than their fair share.

Once our proper share of the load is determined, then we can plan and build for the future with confidence. As it is now, we don't know how much more of the American market is going to be handed over to foreign producers. Is it any wonder that, with this unlimited foreign threat, shares of textile companies sell on the stock exchange at about half book value. This fact tends to foreclose access to the capital market for the necessary funds to plan, to research and to build for the future. That access depends on earnings. Earnings, as we have seen, have been undermined by this unbridled foreign competition.

Two million American textile and apparel workers and their families are becoming increasingly aware of why their security and their purchasing power are in danger. They are learning more and more about imports. They are looking to their representa-

tives in Congress for a solution to this problem. I believe that if the right of the American worker to look forward to a better standard of living is destroyed, the foundation of the American free enterprise system would definitely be jeopardized.

Last week, I visited three of our plants, which make a wide variety of textile fabrics. I inspected those plants with a critical eye from the standpoint of their efficiency and productivity, based upon my 40 years in this industry. I found the plants which I visited to be highly efficient. This efficiency, typical of the industry, makes it possible to price textile products to the American consuming public at approximately the same basic level which existed in the 1947–49 period. What other major industry can say that? There is no question that we must strive to increase productivity still further. When our employees understand the problems in this connection they are most cooperative. They do not mind fair competition but they know that much of the foreign competition is unfair.

In spite of these low existing prices of textile products, it is increasingly difficult to compete with imports. Why should two identical garments, for instance, men's cloth cotton shirts, one manufactured in the United States and the other manufactured in Japan or Hong Kong, encounter different laws in interstate commerce. Included in the price of the American-made shirt are such items as manufacturing taxes imposed by Federal, State and local taxing authorities, wage and hour laws, health and safety laws and others. They apply also to the fabric maker and his suppliers, as well as to the suppliers of buttons, thread, and the box maker, too. We want to comply with these laws, but, of course, they are not applicable to the imports. Is this fair competition?

On September 29, 1960, Mr. Leon Lowenstein, head of M. Lowenstein & Sons, which operates the Rock Hill Printing & Finishing Co., at Rock Hill, S.C., was visiting that plant in my district. At that time he warned of the competition of foreign textiles, the danger of unemployment, and made these remarks:

If it were not for the import situation, our situation would be 25 to 50 percent greater with more employment and better standards of living.

Now if we want to increase employment, can we afford to ignore such statements as this? This gentleman is a veteran of 60 years in the textile industry. I quote further from his statement, which I think is a fair and a decisive statement of the import situation which existed in September of last year, and which exists today:

The import situation must affect directly or indirectly all industries in America. Everybody talks about the textile industry being affected, but it affects all industries—steel, automobiles, all of them.

When imports hurt us, they hurt other industries and unemployment goes up.

When unemployment is up in one industry that means that those people are not buying. When they don't buy, it hurts another industry and that's when unemployment spreads.

Unemployment is the big danger sign we must watch. People talk about welfare states. Well, when the people are hungry and unemployed, they are more receptive to talk about welfare state.

I don't say cut Japan off in textile imports. I believe in imports. I say they should be regulated by legislation. I want foreign countries to get a fair deal, the same as I want the U.S. industries to get a fair deal.

In January 1961, the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, published a little booklet entitled, "Dangers Clear and Present." Previously, in 1957, they had adopted a facsimile of a highway sign, a danger ahead symbol in a case before the Office of Defense Mobilization, based on the belief wool textile imports were threatening national security. At that time, the Office of Defense Mobilization agreed that wool textiles are essential, but said that such imports did not threaten our security. In this booklet, addressed to, "All Americans," the opening statement presented:

The U.S. textile industry and its chief customer, the apparel industry, are big—in combination or alone. Together they employ over 2 million production workers—more than any single U.S. manufacturing industry—and have an annual payroll of about $7 billion. Textiles and clothing are basic necessities and the two industries have made Americans, civilian and military, the best clothed people in the world.

The textile industry also supplies a vast array of household products and industrial goods. It is the primary consumer of U.S. cotton, wool, and manmade fibers, and huge amounts of other materials and services.

The importance of the industries to the owners, employees, and the economy is evident. But there is still another even more vital factor—national security—which in today's perilous world, means national survival. Concerning defense essentiality, the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization said as recently as January 30, 1959: "On this point there need be no equivocation. The OCDM regards the textile industry as an essential industry and considers it an essential part of the Nation's mobilization base."

You may ask, "So what?" Just this: The essential textile industry has been seriously damaged by rapidly rising imports. Now imports of apparel are mounting, compounding the injury to textile mills and posing a serious threat to U.S. clothing producers. The two industries and their 2.2 million employees are fighting for survival and they generally believe the Government, in the national interest, must "establish textile and apparel quotas for each country exporting these products to the United States, with the quotas divided into product categories to prevent concentration in any particular type of goods."

The two industries solicit your support. Make their fight your fight to keep the United States self-sufficient in textiles and clothing under all conditions, in peace or in war.

I have cited this report from the wool industry because it is a part of the textile industry, separate from the cotton textiles and synthetics which are produced in my own Fifth District of South Carolina.

I daresay there are few Members of Congress, having industry in their immediate area, that are not affected by imports from abroad. We, who have the textile industry as our principal source of economic strength, and to whom we owe the duty of continuing efforts to gain some relief, are sympathetic to those in other parts of this country who have the import problem. We have tried, from time to time, to join with them, or support them, or have them support us, in impressing upon the leadership of both parties, the Congress, the Department of Commerce, the Department of State, and the administration in power, the importance of action, the necessity of relief in this area.

In the Chester Reporter, published in my hometown of Chester, S.C., in the issue of February 8, 1961, in the special section which is devoted to a report to and of the textile people of the Springs Cotton Mills, which has three fine plants in my own city, and others, including a very modern bleachery, in my district, an article on the cheap imports from Japan and Hong Kong was classified as a "Threat to U.S. Mills, Employees." This article, written by John Harris, the New York Journal-American, went on to say:

A tidal wave of clothing imports from Japan and Hong Kong is rolling across the Pacific Ocean, threatening to wash out of their jobs thousands of American workers.

Made by a labor force that lives on a few cents a day, men's suits and shirts; women's blouses, brassieres, slacks, shorts, hose, scarves and pajamas are pouring into the United States.

Here's an example: Eight years ago only 1,800 dozen men's cotton shirts were imported into this country. In 1960 this had rocketed to 2,214,629 dozen.

Japan, land of the rising sun, is one of exquisite beauty. But its crowded millions must toil hard and sell overseas to eke out a living.

Historically and geographically, Japan's soundest economic market has always been China. But realities of today's world preclude this to a great extent.

So, Japan is sending the products of its advanced technology to the United States—and industry and labor here are up in arms.

William F. Sullivan, president of the Northern Textile Association, Boston, Mass., said:

"To the New York manufacturers in the cotton, manmade fiber, woolen and worsted lines, the threat from Japan and Hong Kong is exceedingly serious.

"It is a threat not only because of the amounts that have come in, but because of their steady, upward trend.

"The pattern of the last 2 years has shown that exports from Japan and Hong Kong into this country are shifting into manmade goods, such as men's suits and slacks, and women's foundation garments.

"The reason: more labor involved in manufactured articles—and 75 percent of imported textile goods are from countries where average wages are 17 cents an hour or less.

"Some cotton blouses from Japan sell in the United States for $1 and even for 55 cents.

"What do wages like these, in faraway Japan and Hong Kong, mean in terms of American retail prices?"

Well, for $40, for instance, you can buy a hand-tailored suit of good worsted, with hand-sewn buttonholes and waistbands, bellows pockets and deluxe trimmings. Made in Japan.

The same suit, American-made, would sell for at least $85.

From Hong Kong comes men's silk suits and women's dresses, blouses and lingerie at a fraction of American-made clothing.

Hong Kong is one of the brightest jewels in the British crown. Lying against the mainland of Red China it is famous for its magnificent vistas and beautiful women.

It is 391 square miles in area, its population is about 3 million—and its average income is less than $300 per year.

Here a vast garment center has grown up among one of humanity's most tragic groups—the thousands of destitute refugees from Red China.

Great numbers of those do not even work in factories—they are homeworkers in shanties and huts. Often they toil 72 hours a week under shocking health and sanitary conditions.

But Hong Kong is a boom town—through an export trade largely dependent on the American market.

Hong Kong's exports in 1960 were a healthy 22 percent over those in 1959. The jump brought their value to $150 million.

Clothing and textiles accounted for 71 percent of the crown colony's shipments to this country.

Figures tell the story, and they're worth a glance.

Men's dress, sport and work shirts: We received 635,000 dozen from Hong Kong in 9 months of 1959. In the same period of 1960 the figure was nearly 800,000 dozen.

Knit shirts: Hong Kong sent 180,000 dozen in 1959—and nearly 1 million dozen in 1960. Sold at one-half American-made prices.

In every other category—shorts, raincoats, robes, slacks, pajamas and T-shirts—the figures tell the same tale.

The colony's garment industry, riding high, has announced plans for expansion.

Its influential Chinese Manufacturers Association maintains implacable opposition to any quota limitations on these exports.

Danger signals can also be seen in other parts of the world.

Spain, Okinawa, Formosa, the Philippines and Jamaica, British West Indies, are all reported to be planning massive invasions of the American clothing market.

Now there are many who believe that we have high U.S. tariff walls. That is not true.

In actual fact, U.S. tariffs are among the lowest in the world. Since 1934, American tariffs have been reduced some 75 percent. More than half of our imports are admitted duty free.

In 1958, our average tariff on all imports was about 5 percent. By way of contrast, it was about 30 percent in the United Kingdom; in France, about 25 percent; Switzerland, 10 percent; Canada, 9 percent; and West Germany about 7 percent.

Among the 36 leading trading nations of the free world, 28 have higher average tariff rates than in the United States.

Certainly, our mythical high tariff walls have not prevented a flood of foreign-made chemicals from entering the United States. More than 250 different intermediates and 100 types of naphthols, fast color bases, and salts are being imported into the country.

More and more frequently, items in the Chambers Works production forecasts are appearing in ship cargoes at U.S. ports of entry and include such well-known intermediates as H acid, Chicago acid, J acid, gamma acid, anthranilic acid, benzidine, the chlor anilines, 1-2-4 acid, BON, metanilic acid, para-nitro-toluene, MPD, ortho and para toluidines.

In addition, about 1,200 types of dyes are being imported into our market with a domestic market value of $12 to $14 million.

The high U.S. tariff walls, if ever they existed, have long since crumbled and, under our misguided tariff policy, are fast on their way to complete extinction.

Are we importing ourselves, and pricing ourselves, out of business. I would like to quote from an editorial, again, from the Chester, S.C., Reporter, of April 29, 1959.

ECONOMICS CONFUSED

We have just about given up trying to understand the national economy. We used to think that nations had to follow the simple rules of individuals or small businesses. From our own experience we knew that if we didn't keep money in the bank, we'd better not write checks; if we didn't keep our expenses down within speaking distance of our income, the sheriff would come to see us.

But these rules don't apply to nations. Here in the United States prices, wages, and deficits can increase indefinitely. The result is an expanding economy and more of everything for everybody. No small boy ever blew up a big balloon more happily than we puff up our standard of living. We have our statistics to prove that even though a new refrigerator costs twice as much as it did several years ago, the average wage earner works less hours to buy one than when it was cheaper.

Everybody has just gone upstairs to live. Yet, there are some signs of trouble ahead. Not long ago a British freighter docked at Jacksonville to unload 12 bright red tractors carrying the familiar nameplate of the International Harvester Co., the world's largest manufacturer of farm equipment. These 12 tractors were made in the company's factories in Europe and were the first of some 300 the company plans to ship back to the United States to be sold to American farmers at prices no domestic manufacturer can meet.

The facts are plain. International Harvester Co. employees are paid $2.59 an hour in the United States, International Harvester Co. employees in Great Britain are paid 82 cents an hour, in Germany 67 cents, and in France 64 cents. Other manufacturers in this country are also taking advantage of this wage differential and the trend is causing considerable uneasiness to organized labor.

There has been much talk lately of this country's decreasing export trade. We are pricing ourselves out of foreign market, according to the experts. If those 12 tractors mean anything, it would also seem we are pricing ourselves out of the domestic market at the same time. But we note that most of the big unions are girding themselves for another round of wage increases, goods are inching up in price, and the national budget is deeply in the red. We have repealed the law of gravity in economic affairs.

To show that other industries are affected, I quote from a resolution of the Motor Transportation Association of South Carolina, Inc., showing the effect on a related industry:

Whereas, in South Carolina, total manufacturing employment in November 1960 was 238,000 jobs; and

Whereas 129,000, or 54 percent, of those jobs were in the manufacture of textile products; and

Whereas South Carolina's textile employment and wages represent approximately 15 percent of the United States totals for textile employment and wages; and

Whereas jobs in the U.S. textile industry declined from 1,280,000 in 1948 to 832,000 in 1960, or a decrease of 35 percent; and

Whereas the great economic influence of textile industry is felt by every U.S. citizen and is especially vital to South Carolina, South Carolina motor carriers; and

Whereas this decline in large measure has been caused by the fact that tariffs on textile imports into the United States have been regularly and drastically reduced under Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and that foreign textile manufacturers, using cheaper cotton and cheap labor, have capitalized on this advantage and flooded the United States with textiles which South Carolina manufacturers cannot match in price; and

Whereas the continued prosperity and economic health of the United States, generally, and the South Carolina textile industry in particular, all of those employed in it, and the other thousands of South Carolinians who benefit from it are critically and desperately threatened by the lack of protection against this unfair competition provided by foreign imports; and

Whereas the recent session of the Southern Governors' Conference at Hot Springs, Ark., recognized this problem at its solution by its unanimous adoption of a resolution asking our Federal Government to enact protective legislation and to provide all possible protection by exercise of the Presidential powers: Therefore

Resolved, That the Motor Transportation Association of South Carolina, Inc., herein urge that the U.S. Senators and the U.S. Congressmen from South Carolina use their influence toward enactment of legislation so as to establish protective tariffs and quotas toward the end that thousands of South Carolinians shall not suffer for the sake of giving advantage to foreign competitors; further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded immediately to the U.S. Senators and Congressmen from South Carolina.

Unless something is done in 1961, it is my fear, and my prediction, that conditions will be so definitely worse by 1962 that the textile industry of this country will be in the most serious trouble it has been in in over 20 years. We do not want this to happen to the textile industry. We shall keep hammering at this problem. We shall sound our voices, we shall write letters, and we shall do whatever else is necessary to impress upon those who can help us, and there are those who can, in this very Government today, that we must have help, and we will join others who seek help in other affected and afflicted industry in trying to get help for them, too. I, for one, do not intend to let up my fight, for my textile people, and for their economic survival.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2 OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PRACTICAL NURSES SCHOOLS

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a companion bill to H.R. 4104, introduced by Congressman GIAIMO, of Connecticut.

I introduced this because I am heartily in favor of the practical nurses schools which have benefited the people of South Carolina as well as other sections of our country.

This is also in keeping with what I consider the President's concern for the people who are old and sick and need nursing help and who cannot afford any other kind of nurse. I think this will be a great boom to helping people get medical care and I urge the early consideration and passage of this legislation.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 9 of March 7, 1961, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 3390–3391, I am listed as not voting. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I was necessarily absent from the House Chamber attending a conference. Had I been present in the House I would have voted "yea."

HON. WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, JR. AND HON. WILLIAM ATTWOOD

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my gratification over the nomination of two individuals to important ambassadorial posts.

Mr. William B. Macomber, Jr., my close friend for many years, who served with distinction under President Eisenhower as Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, has been appointed Ambassador to Jordan.

Jordan is one of the most important countries to the United States. It is a sensitive area and one that commands the very best in representation. Mr. Macomber will meet these responsibilities with skill and diplomacy. As Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations under the prior administration, Bill Macomber won the high regard of Republicans and Democrats alike in the Senate and the House.

Prior to his successful career as Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Macomber was Special Assistant to the late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, and in that capacity became thoroughly familiar with the State Department and its farflung functions and responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I spent a considerable amount of time in Jordan last fall, and I know how much effort is required in that part of the world. I am confident that the United States will be well represented in Jordan by Bill Macomber who by training and aptitude should fill the post with distinction.

Mr. Speaker, I should like also to applaud the nomination of William Attwood as Ambassador to Guinea. I have known Bill Attwood for several years. He is eminently qualified for this tremendously important post in west Africa. He knows west Africa and he knows Guinea, having spent time there when he was a foreign correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune. I am pleased to note also that both Bill Attwood and his charming wife, Sim, are fluent in French, the language of the country to which he is accredited.

Bill Attwood is a young man—41 years of age—which is excellent for this young country, also run by young men. His appointment has been extremely well received by the Guineans. In taking this post he resigns from Look magazine where he has had a distinguished career for 10 years, most recently as foreign editor, prior to that as national editor, and prior to that as European editor. Some of Bill Attwood's writings as foreign editor have been recognized and applauded in many parts of the world.

Mr. Attwood and his wife have lived and traveled extensively abroad. Between 1946 and 1954 he was a foreign correspondent and writer at various times for Look magazine, the New York Herald Tribune, and Colliers.

Bill and his family live in New Canaan, Conn., and one of the nicest things about his nomination is the recent action by the good residents of New Canaan in launching a fundraising drive in order to bring a Guinea resident to the United States. This is a great tribute to their neighbor, Bill Attwood, and is the kind of neighbor-to-neighbor policy that will do more good than anything else. Mr. Speaker, Bill Attwood is a splendid appointment. He will do a good job, and I wish him well.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the New Canaan Advertiser about this community effort.

[From the New Canaan (Conn.) Advertiser, Mar. 2, 1961]

GOOD WILL AMBASSADORS

Extending a sincere hand for the traditional handshake, time-honored gesture of neighborliness and good will, is one of society's simplest but warmest acts of friendship and congeniality. It takes so little effort and requires only genuineness, but can do so much toward establishing a new relationship, or continuing an old one, on a solid foundation.

In a sense, this is what New Canaan residents are now being offered the opportunity to do—extend the hand of friendship across the sea to Guinea, an independent nation less than 3 years and one of the newer republics in troubled Africa. We need only to support a program seeking to bring a student from that country to the United States for undergraduate college work, and we will excel in our new-found role of good will ambassadors.

Even a nodding acquaintance with the news of the day is enough to convince anybody that Africa is one of the world's powder kegs. Potentially explosive Africa finds its fuse being shortened by internal strife and by the interference of outside interests striving to woo the newly independent nations emerging on the Dark Continent.

The friendship of these nations is vital if we are to maintain some semblance of a balance of power between the free Western World and the enslaved Communist bloc. Moreover, it cannot be purchased—if it is to be lasting and loyal—with the conventional foreign aid dollars, arms shipments, or even food and clothing shipments. No; the best way is to help these people help themselves, to show a genuine interest in their affairs, their troubles, their people.

Into this delicate and tense situation goes William Attwood, of New Canaan, appointed Ambassador to Guinea and charged with the responsibility of promoting our best interests by cultivating the friendship of that new and troubled nation. It is vital that his work be successful.

We can help him put his best and friendliest foot forward as he undertakes the heavy responsibilities of his new post. Our support of the Guinean Scholarship Fund of New Canaan will be our handshake. As small a gesture as it may seem, it will convey sincerity of feeling and a genuine interest in being friends. This is important.

There is little doubt that the small amount of funds required, $2,500, might not be raised more easily from single organizations, individuals, or government and educational agencies. To have the student sponsored by the people of New Canaan will mean much more, however. It will be a fine exemplification of real person-to-person diplomacy.

HON. WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, JR.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. WEIS] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from the Department of State where I was privileged to attend the swearing in of William B. Macomber, Jr., a distinguished constituent of mine, as U.S. Ambassador to Jordan.

My good friend and colleague, Representative JOHN LINDSAY, has already detailed the outstanding record of service which Bill Macomber has provided for the country in recent years, and rather than repeat what he has said I shall merely associate myself with his remarks, which I share completely.

I would not want the occasion to pass, however, without a further brief word about Bill Macomber, who grew up in the shadow of my own backyard and was a close childhood friend of my children. I have known Bill, whose parents are old and dear friends and neighbors of mine, almost since the day he was born. I know from personal observation over many years that he combines those qualities of courage, integrity, high intelligence, and dedication to responsibility which make for outstanding success in any field, and I am extremely pleased that he has chosen to make the public service his career.

The Nation is most fortunate to have young men of the caliber of Bill Macomber representing the United States abroad during such a period of international crisis, and he has my warmest best wishes as he prepares to embark on this latest assignment.

TAX RELIEF FOR RETIREMENT PLANS FOR THE SELF-EMPLOYED

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEROUNIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to correct an inequity in the tax laws which now prohibits self-employed individuals from being included in tax deferred retirement plans. Legislation on this subject has been before Congress since 1951, and has passed this House during the

past two Congresses. The bill which I introduce would correct a glaring inequity and seeks to meet the objections previously voiced by the officials of the Treasury Department.

Under the present law, a corporation may establish a tax deferred retirement plan for it's executives and employees. Some 20 million persons are presently covered under such plans. The law also permits a self-employed individual to establish a qualified tax deferred retirement plan for his employees but denies him the right to be included in such a plan. Legislation which I introduce would correct this obvious discrimination against self-employed individuals by permitting them to participate in qualified pension plans provided that such plans cover employees on a nondiscriminatory basis.

There has been much discussion and study about the financial problems of our senior citizens. I believe that legislation of this type is in the public interest in that it provides an incentive for millions of Americans to set aside part of their earnings for retirement years, thus reducing the need for reliance on government for assistance. This legislation potentially affects an estimated 19 million Americans.

I hope that the Ways and Means Committee will act promptly on this matter so that Members of this House will have an early opportunity to vote for its passage. Further delay in adjusting this tax inequity against the millions of self-employed cannot be justified.

VOLUNTARY PENSION PLANS BY SELF-EMPLOYED PERSONS

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, individual enterprise is one of this Nation's most precious commodities. Freedom to earn one's wages at the occupation of one's choice—freedom to spend those wages as the individual sees fit—freedom to set aside a part of his earnings against retirement years—these are liberties we all cherish.

More and more the Federal Government is being drawn into this latter area—providing for the economic needs of older citizens. Very often this is right and just. But, is it not also the duty of the Federal Government to encourage and even to abet individual thrift and foresight? I say it is. For this purpose I have today introduced legislation familiar to every House veteran, a bill to encourage establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed persons.

In 1942, Congress amended the Internal Revenue Code to give added incentive to the participation of employed persons in group pension plans. Employees have taken fine advantage of this tax-deferment incentive—thanks to it, thousands today are living in retirement independence. As of last year, an estimated 20 million employees were enrolled in pension plans, and their number is increasing at the rate of a million each year.

But what about the self-employed person who puts aside a regular sum in a pension plan? For 19 years a glaring omission in the tax code has denied him the same tax deferment benefits granted to employed persons. More than 10 million self-employed men and women are thus discriminated against.

Let me emphasize that the bill I introduced today to correct the inequity is neither a "raid on the Treasury" nor a tax escape hatch—it merely defers payment of taxes on a maximum of $2,500, or 10 percent of self-employment earnings, whichever is less, set aside yearly for retirement purposes. Taxes will be paid on these funds when they are drawn upon as income by retirees.

As I suggested earlier, the House is well acquainted with the merits of this legislation. It was overwhelmingly approved by my senior House colleagues in the 85th and 86th Congresses. My hope is that this session will finally see it travel the full legislative route through the whole Congress, to the White House, and finally into the United States Code as law.

The Nation owes this to the initiative and prudence of millions of self-employed Americans.

BUILDING PROGRAM OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GLENN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which seeks to extend the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act to construction work by the Post Office Department. There is no reason why laborers and mechanics should not have the protection of this act in the work to be done under the building program of the Post Office Department which the President has recently ordered to be accelerated. The fact that the construction will be by a lessor under a lease-agreement contract with the Department does not detract from the principle of consistency in all Government operations regardless of the form under which they are undertaken.

If the construction work is a direct Government contract on its own property under the Davis-Bacon Act, all contractors and subcontractors must pay wages at rates not less than those prevailing in similar construction in the locality.

The Post Office Department under its new post office buildings program has been authorized by Congress to use a lease agreement method which has worked out very well. The Department first chooses the location where the new post office is to be built and obtains an option on its purchase from the owners. The Department then assigns the option to purchase to the low bidder, who erects the building according to specifications and leases it back to the Post Office Department for a number of years with options of renewal. In this way the building remains privately owned—pays municipal taxes and charges—and the arrangement has proven quite satisfactory. Except for one thing and that is the propensity of the low bidder to pay lower wages than prevail in the local labor market, and in many instances brings in cheaper labor from another area or another State. All this while there are unemployed mechanics and laborers in the local area who have a right to expect and demand the prevailing wage scale of that area.

My bill will make it mandatory that such a lessor-contractor pay the prevailing wage scale in the new post office area as determined by the Secretary of Labor under the Davis-Bacon Act. It is fair and just that this be so.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HOSMER, for March 9 to 14, inclusive, on account of official business in his congressional district.

Mr. LIPSCOMB (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for March 9 and 10, on account of official committee business in the Fifth Indiana Congressional District.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS, for 1 hour, on tomorrow, March 9.

Mr. DOMINICK (at the request of Mr. DERWINSKI), for 15 minutes, on Thursday, March 9.

Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. HEMPHILL), for 1 hour, on Wednesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ASPINALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KEE.

(At the request of Mr. DERWINSKI, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. RAY in two instances.

Mr. HALPERN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HEMPHILL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ZELENKO.

Mr. DADDARIO in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Thursday, March 9, 1961, 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:

648. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the establishment of a Junior College Division within the District of Columbia Teachers College, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

649. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report pursuant to section 708(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4435. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of certain calcines and matte proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 66). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Science and Astronautics. Report on chronology of missile and astronautic events (Rept. No. 67). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Report of delegation of the U.S. House of Representatives on the sixth NATO Parliamentarians Conference (Rept. No. 68). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KITCHIN:

H.R. 5337. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of interstate retail enterprises, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.15 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 5338. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 5339. A bill to require certain fire safety installations in buildings used for school, convalescent, nursing home or hospital purposes in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 5340. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit producers of agricultural commodities to make an election with respect to the taxable year in which income under certain grain contracts will be included in their gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 5341. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to provide 12-year terms for full-time referees, increase the maximum salary limitations of referees, increase the salary of the Chief of Bankruptcy, authorize compensation for service of a retired referee and to amend certain provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for a more liberal retirement annuity for referees in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5342. A bill to amend section 373 of title 28, United States Code, so as to authorize retired judges of certain territorial courts to perform judicial service when designated and assigned; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5343. A bill to amend section 5021 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5344. A bill to withdraw from the district courts jurisdiction of suits brought by fiduciaries who have been appointed for the purpose of creating diversity of citizenship between the parties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 5345. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5346. A bill to create a Department of Urban Affairs and prescribe its functions, and to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Metropolitan Problems; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 5347. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize for all taxpayers the amount which may be taken into account in computing the retirement income credit thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 5348. A bill to amend title II of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, relating to practical nurse training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 5349. A bill to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 5350. A bill to amend section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in the compensation of medical personnel of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5351. A bill to amend section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, to provide increased compensation for medical personnel of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 5352. A bill to provide for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 5353. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall construct a fish hatchery for the purpose of increasing the public benefits of the Greers Ferry Dam and Reservoir project, Little Red River, Arkansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. PFOST.

H.R. 5354. A bill to establish a price support level for milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 5355. A bill to provide that tips received by an employee in the course of his employment shall be included as part of his wages for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCRANTON:

H.R. 5356. A bill to provide for a program of Federal financial aid to the State of Pennsylvania for the purpose of assisting such State in projects of filling certain abandoned mining operations for the protection of the public health and safety, for the conservation of natural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H.R. 5357. A bill to require the expenditure of 75 percent of the funds expended for the conversion, alteration, and repair of naval vessels to be expended with private ship repair yards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 5358. A bill to dissolve the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 5359. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to include a pro rata share of the income of foreign corporations in the gross income of taxpayers owning, directly or indirectly, 10 percent or more of the voting stock of such foreign corporations, to repeal the foreign tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 5360. A bill to make available to children who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments the specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5361. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, relating to the excise tax on matches; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 5362. A bill to permit States or other duly constituted taxing authorities to subject persons to liability for payment of property taxes on property located in Federal areas within such States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 5363. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and certain transportation expenses paid by him in connection with the education of himself, his spouse, or any of his dependents at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 5364. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 5365. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of child's insurance benefits to disabled children of an insured individual even though such individual has not himself become entitled to benefits or died; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 5366. A bill to amend section 4242 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the club dues tax certain charges made by nonprofit clubs for the use of facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5367. A bill to amend section 4241 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce

the club dues excise taxes from 20 percent to 10 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 5368. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $1,800 a year the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H.R. 5369. A bill to require the expenditure of 75 percent of the funds expended for the conversion, alteration, and repair of naval vessels to be expended with private ship-repair yards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 5370. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 5371. A bill to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of a U.S. Travel Service within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 5372. A bill to provide that lease agreements for the construction of post office buildings must require observance of the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 5373. A bill to provide a special program for upland cotton for 1961; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 5374. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide an exemption from the provisions of such part for the emergency transportation of any motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce by towing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 5375. A bill to create an Agricultural Research and Development Commission, to provide for more effective research programs designed to expand markets for agricultural and forestry products, to reduce surpluses, to increase farm income, and to benefit consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 5376. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the persons for whose benefit imported articles must be marked with the country of origin; and for other purposes; to the Committee an Ways and Means.

H.R. 5377. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the persons for whose benefit imported articles made of cotton fiber must be marked with the country of origin; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H. Con. Res. 190. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. Con. Res. 191. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the use of aircraft capable of excessive speed in the carrying of passengers for hire; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. Con. Res. 192. Concurrent resolution to recognize Samuel Wilson, of Troy, N.Y., as the progenitor of America's national symbol "Uncle Sam"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. Con. Res. 193. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Res. 211. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Res. 212. Resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Res. 213. Resolution to establish a House Committee on Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Res. 214. Resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 5378. A bill for the relief of Carlos Licea Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 5379. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Picone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 5380. A bill for the relief of Dah-Jong (James) Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5381. A bill for the relief of the Smith Canning Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 5382. A bill for the relief of Marie Haladjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5383. A bill for the relief of Krystyna and Jan Kornak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5384. A bill for the relief of Kazimiera Przyborowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5385. A bill for the relief of Jadwiga Osetek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 5386. A bill for the relief of Dr. Dominic Schepis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL (by request):

H.R. 5387. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the Burnham Chemical Co. against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

86. By Mr. WILLIAMS: Petition of Clay B. Tucker, William H. Catchings, W. H. Coon, and others, Woodville, Miss., opposing the minimum wage bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

87. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Robert T. Holman and others, Santa Barbara, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to praising the House Committee on Un-American Activities for its valuable and necessary work of exposing Communist treason and subversion, and requesting that this most valuable committee be continued in full force; to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Byelorussian Independent Democratic Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, there is no real peace in the world today. Everywhere we look there is terror, anxiety, hate, and bitterness. The shores of Africa tremble with violence. The mountains of Laos reek with suffering. Indeed man's eternal hope for world peace seems far from realization.

Let as long as aggressive forces continue to spout their line of hate and destruction, of control and oppression, as long as these forces continue to deprive peoples of their universal desire for national independence, for human dignity, for freedom, this struggle must go on. By right, there should be no struggle—for independence, dignity, and freedom should belong to the heritage of man—yet by necessity it exists. It is not an easy struggle. It is not a short struggle.

I make these remarks, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the impending 43d anniversary of the establishment of the Byelorussian Independent Democratic Republic. It was on March 25, 1918, that this nation, for centuries the pawn of czarist Russia declared its independence. From the cities of Minsk and Homel, to the marshlands of the Dneiper, the Dvina, and the Nieman, 10 million people announced their intention to live in dignity and self-respect.

The little Republic did not last long, and within 3 years another Muscovite power—that of the Soviets—overthrew the fledgling government, again imposing the dreaded yoke of tyranny. For 40 years now the Communists have continued to hold sway over Byelorussia. But those 3 short years of freedom whetted the appetites of the Byelorussians, and the memory of them continues strong. Those of us familiar with the wonderful White Russian people are well aware of their cultural tradition, their common language, the history of their