

Mr. SALTONSTALL reported favorably three groups of nominations for appointment in the Army, and

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

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

The nominations of James Y. Adams et al., which were received by the Senate on March 3, 1960, and which appear in the executive proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date; and

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

#### IN THE AIR FORCE

##### JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, U.S. AIR FORCE

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

##### RETIRED LIST

The following officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code:

Lt. Gen. Glenn O. Barcus, 87A.

Lt. Gen. Richard C. Lindsay, 476A.

Lt. Gen. Oliver S. Picher, 540A.

The following groups of nominations for appointment in the Air Force were favorably reported by Mr. SALTONSTALL, and

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

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

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

The nominations of Arthur H. Ahrens, Junior, et al., for promotion in the Regular Air Force, which were received on March 16, 1960, and which appear in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date;

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

#### IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

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

Vice Adm. Maurice E. Curtis, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Vice Adm. Thomas S. Combs, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of such section, I nominate them

for appointment, to the grade of Lieutenant general while so serving:

\*Joseph C. Burger, USMC.

\*Edward W. Snedekar, USMC.

\*Thomas A. Wornham, USMC.

\*John C. Munn, USMC.

\*Wallace M. Greene, Jr., USMC.

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

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

Vice Adm. Ruthven E. Libby, U.S. Navy.

Vice Adm. Edward W. Cleton, U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. Frank T. Watkins, U.S. Navy.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Rear Adm. Ulysses S. G. Sharp, Jr., U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. Charles L. Melson, U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. George F. Beardsley, U.S. Navy.

(NOTE.—Asterisk (\*) indicates ad interim appointment issued.)

The following nominations for appointment in the Navy and in the Marine Corps: Mr. SALTONSTALL reported favorably three groups of nominations in the Navy and in the Marine Corps, and

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate considered and confirmed the said nominations en bloc, as follows:

The nominations of James B. Glennon et al., for appointment or promotion in the Navy, which were received on January 18, 1960, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the Senate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date;

The nominations of Andrew C. J. Harnett et al., for appointment in the Navy and the Marine Corps, which were received on March 8, 1960, and which appear in the Senate executive proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date; and

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

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

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

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

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

Help us to see that the less we give ourselves to Thee, the more we contribute to our own despair. Teach us that uneasiness tomorrow is born of failing to seek Thy will today.

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

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

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

#### THE JOURNAL

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

#### KING OF NEPAL VISIT

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

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

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 10234) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution requires no explanation. When it is passed, the civil rights bill, with Senate amendments, will be cleared for the President. The Senate amendments, however, do require some

explanation, and consequently I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] 15 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I arise in support of House Resolution 503.

I am mindful of the fact that there are Members here today who, for opposite reasons, are far from satisfied with the legislation we are about to vote upon. I, too, am not entirely satisfied with this legislation. However, under the circumstances, I believe it would be a futile gesture to send this legislation to a conference. To the opponents of the legislation I say that this bill is a moderate one. To the supporters of strong civil rights legislation I say that this bill is meaningful and can be effective.

The Celler Civil Rights Act of 1957 was a historic advance because it breached the barrier to civil rights legislation as it stood for 82 years. This was a first step and experience has shown that it was a halting one. The opposition which has arisen since 1957 to my bill demands the enactment into law of the legislation before us now.

We must understand that it is no light matter to undo a century or more of unequal treatment. The task of changing deeply entrenched patterns of racial segregation demands the full resources of our Government and our Nation. The task, moreover, has been complicated and aggravated by the instances and incidents of disorder and violence in the field of desegregation, by the enactment of States' statutes designed to impede and obstruct the carrying out of Federal court orders in the field of desegregation, and particularly in the field of elective franchise.

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

The enactment of this legislation will be a challenge to the Attorney General of the United States to proceed forcefully and effectively to provide and guarantee to qualified citizens the right to cast a ballot in any and all elections.

In casting my vote in favor of this legislation—the Celler-McCulloch bill—I do so with a firm conviction and an unalterable promise that should for any reason, be it the statute itself or the administration or enforcement of the statute that fails to achieve the objective of the legislation, I would once again introduce, as I have done in the past and as I did during the course of debate on

this bill, legislation—strong, effective legislation—to achieve the goal of equal opportunity for all of our citizens.

I wish to point out briefly the substantial differences between the Celler-McCulloch bill as it passed in this body and as it was amended in the other body.

In title I, obstruction of court orders, the House version was limited to the obstruction of court orders dealing with school desegregation. The other body broadened the scope of this title to include all Federal court orders and increased from 6 months to 1 year the penalty of imprisonment. It also deleted from the title the word "corruptly" and eliminated the section requiring that the criminal penalty imposed be concurrent with any other penalty imposed under the same section. In addition the language which would have made it a crime to interfere with or obstruct the court order of "a threatening letter or communication" was deleted.

In title II, the other body eliminated from the House version the proposal which would have made it a crime to travel in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution for having given a false tip regarding a bombing. However, the version before us includes a provision making the conveying of a false tip itself a crime. In addition, the Senate version makes it a Federal crime to transport in interstate commerce any explosive for bombing purposes.

In title III, Federal election records, the provision requiring the preservation of voting records for 2 years from the date of election has been reduced to 22 months and the requirement that such records were to be made available at either the principal office of the Custodian or the office of the local U.S. attorney was limited to require production of such records only in the office of the Custodian.

In title IV, dealing with the Civil Rights Commission, the Senate eliminated the House proposal which would have authorized the Commission to hire personnel without regard to the civil service classification laws.

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

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

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

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

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 52]		
Alexander	Forand	Meader
Alger	Gavin	Mitchell
Andersen,	Glaimo	Montoya
Minn.	Grant	Morris, N. Mex.
Anderson,	Hays	Moulder
Mont.	Hollifield	Norblad
Auchincloss	Holland	Oliver
Barden	Horan	Powell
Brock	Jackson	Rogers, Tex.
Burleson	Kearns	Rooney
Cooley	Keogh	St. George
Davis, Tenn.	King, Utah	Sheppard
Dent	Lafore	Sisk
Derounian	Lipscomb	Taylor
Diggs	McGinley	Teague, Tex.
Durham	McGovern	Tuck
Fenton	McIntire	Withrow
Fisher	Mack	Young

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

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

#### CIVIL RIGHTS

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

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

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

Now, in simple language, that means that when we adopt this resolution, we will be agreeing to the Senate amendments to the House bill, H.R. 8601, which was the original House measure on civil rights. In other words if we will agree to those amendments, when that vote is taken, or if the resolution is approved, the bill H.R. 8601 as amended in the Senate will then be on its way to the White House for the President's consideration.

Mr. Speaker, when I opened the debate in the House on March 10 on this measure, I believe I predicted then that the final result would be such that perhaps neither the opponents or proponents of the measure would be entirely satisfied with its contents. Yet, this bill, containing, as it does, the features of the original McCulloch bill, which was made in order as an amendment by the Committee on Rules, which sets up the voting rights protection as the main feature of the bill, I believe that which I said in March is still true; that if you give to all qualified citizens the right to vote, they, in turn, can and will cure many of the practices to which they now object.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

That title requires the retention of State voting records for 22 months after

a Federal election and the handing over of such records upon the demand of the Attorney General.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I am confident that the title will be successful in that aim.

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

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

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

Our off-base military children, white and Negro, would suffer irreparably unless the Federal Government could provide for their education.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yes, it may be aimed at my section of the country but, I repeat, you will live to rue the day that you had any part to play in this infamous thing. Frankly, I do not think either party is going to get any credit out of it. As individual Members you can go back home and tell this minority group how hard you fought for it. But mark you again, this is not the end. This is taking another step in the attack upon the American system and its institutions, putting the Federal Government in purely local matters.

Maybe not this year but year after next, in another election year, my friend from New York [Mr. CELLER] or others will be in here asking for more and more discriminatory—and I mean just exactly what I say—discriminatory legislation in favor of a minority group. This group will not be satisfied with what you have done here today. They will demand further discriminatory legislation in their behalf. I wonder how many of your constituents realize that this bill actually discriminates against white people in favor of Negroes?

Mr. Speaker, time will not permit to go into detail but I should like to sum up some of the most obvious and serious objections to this bill which we are going to pass in the next hour and send on to the President. I seriously doubt that it would have a ghost of a show if the people from the other sections than the South had realized its full effect and

implications upon them, the country as a whole, and its cherished institutions.

In brief, these are some of the evil effects of the bill:

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

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

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

Fourth. For obvious political reasons, the proponents wrote into the bill on the floor of the House the so-called referee plan which goes further into the field of Negro voting rights than anything passed by the Congress in the dark days of the Reconstruction Period. The Federal supervision of Negro voting rights in that period only applied to elections of Federal officers. This would apply to all elections from constable to Governor.

Fifth. It unquestionably violates article I of the Constitution providing for freedom of speech, and so forth, as well as other provisions of that immortal document. It particularly violates the 10th amendment which reserves all powers of government not specifically delegated to the Federal Government to the States, or the people.

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

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

Finally, those of us who believe in conservative government here in the House have given our dedicated best efforts to prevent this deadly assault upon the priceless heritage bequeathed us by the Founding Fathers. We can now only hope that the day will be hastened when its evils will become so manifest in its operation that a wiser and less politically minded Congress will repeal it—even as a similar bill—the old Davenport Act—enacted in the unfortunate Reconstruction Era was repealed at the turn of the century.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

I am pleased, indeed, to have introduced both the original administration

bill on civil rights and the bill which, in substance, became the Federal voting referee section of the final legislation which we are considering today.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

For all practical purposes, I believe that the voting provisions of the bill

have not been changed and that they reflect the will of the great majority of this House.

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

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

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

Title IV and title V have also been amended. Title IV gives the members of the Civil Rights Commission the authority to administer oaths or take statements of witnesses under affirmation. The original version of this title, it is to be remembered, largely became moot with the amendment to the Mutual Security Act during the 1st session of the 86th Congress, which extended the life of the Civil Rights Commission to 2 years.

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

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

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

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, weighed in the balance, the civil rights bill passed in the other body, while still materially defective, represents a substantial technical improvement in the version which passed

the House. This evaluation is based on a purely legal analysis. That analysis, section by section, is as follows:

#### TITLE I

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

In the motion to recommit which I was privileged to offer, I incorporated an instruction to amend title I by deleting the words "or by any threatening letter or communication." In my judgment, those words, if left in the bill, would have raised a serious question of infringement of freedom of speech and freedom of the press as guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution. Apparently, a majority of the members of the other body concurred in that opinion; the words are no longer in the bill.

During the course of the House debate, I criticized the use of the word "endeavors" as an unsatisfactory substitute for the word "attempts." The word "attempts," which is a word of art refined in the case law of our American jurisprudence since its inception, was employed in title I of the bill as approved by the other body.

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

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

#### TITLE II

Under title II, the other body added a new section which makes it a crime to transport explosives in interstate commerce with the purpose or knowledge that such explosives will be used to damage real or personal property. This new section also makes it a crime to use the mail, telephone, telegraph or other instrument of commerce to convey a threat concerning an attempt to damage such property.

As the bill passed the House, the criminal threat was a part of the unlawful flight section of title II. Since essentially the same provision was incorporated in the new section added by the other body, the threat provision in the unlawful flight section was deleted. Of this change I have no criticism.

In connection with the language in the new section by the other body, it is significant to note how the question of legal presumptions was treated. In that language, the possession of an explosive creates a rebuttable presumption that the explosive was transported in interstate commerce. In order that there could be no doubt about the meaning of that phrase, the other body was careful

to add the proviso "that no person may be convicted under this section unless there is evidence independent of the presumptions that this section has been violated." Parenthetically, I must add that it is regrettable that similar language was not incorporated in title VI, the so-called voting referee plan.

#### TITLE III

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

#### TITLE IV

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

#### TITLE V

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

#### TITLE VI

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

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

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

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

It should be noted that the other body made no change whatever with respect to the ex parte proceeding before the referee or with respect to the irrefutable presumption. As currently written, the

bill makes available to a citizen who was never a party to the original suit an arbitrary presumption which, so far as his individual case is concerned, is based on no evidence and which is subject to no rebuttal by the defendant registrar. Accordingly, the constitutional question of due process is still unresolved and can now apparently be resolved only by the courts. Undoubtedly, this constitutional question will be tested in the courts as soon as the plan is invoked.

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

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

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

Mr. BOLLING. I will do that later on.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

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

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 13 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of clarifying the effect of the Senate amendment to the provisional voting portion of H.R. 8601.

When title VI of H.R. 8601 was under consideration by this House, I offered an amendment which in part provided:

In the case of any application filed 20 or more days prior to an election which is undetermined by the time of such election, the court shall issue an order authorizing the applicant to vote provisionally.

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

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

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

The majority leader said that:

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

Referring to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS], and myself—said the O'Hara amendment provided at the time.

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

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

The fear had been expressed that the provisional voting section, as it passed the House, might require the courts to permit provisional voting by applicants who had not even attempted to register with the local officials within the time permitted by State law. To clarify this point, I should like to briefly restate the intention of the membership of this House with regard thereto.

Before an order providing for provisional voting may be entered, it must appear that the applicant has attempted to register with the local election officials within the time prescribed by State law. If he has, and then presents himself to the Federal court 20 or more days prior to the election to which the provisional voting order will apply, and appears otherwise qualified, the court shall issue such order. If he has, and then presents

himself to the Federal court less than 20 days prior to the election in which he seeks to vote provisionally, the court, in its discretion, may issue an order entitling him to vote provisionally. In short, the 20-day period referred to in the provisional voting paragraph of title VI applies to the time of application to the court. The time of application to local officials is still determined by State law.

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

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

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

The proviso makes it clear that the court is expected to examine any application it receives before it issues an order permitting the applicant to vote provisionally. Lines 4 through 7 on page 18 provide that an applicant's statement under oath "shall be prima facie evidence as to his age, residence, and prior efforts to register or otherwise qualify to vote."

From the applicant's sworn statement as to these matters and the referee's report, if available, the court can readily determine whether or not the applicant appears to possess the necessary qualifications under State law. The court then should issue an order entitling an applicant to vote provisionally, unless it appears from an examination of these documents that, under State law, he is not qualified to vote.

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

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

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. I would like to state for the RECORD that the remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan are in accord with my understanding of the intention of the provisional voting portion of H.R. 8601, and it is in ac-

cordance with my understanding of the effect of the language added thereto by the Dirksen amendment in the other body.

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

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

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

Mr. LINDSAY. If the gentleman will yield further. Does the gentleman from Michigan contemplate that an applicant before the Federal court must have attempted to register within the time permitted by State law even when registration has been closed before the court finds the pattern or practice of discrimination?

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

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

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. CELLER. I think the interpretation that the gentleman from Michigan places upon the provisional voting portion of H.R. 8601 is highly important, and also important is the colloquy between the gentleman who now has the floor and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], because it would be the criteria that will govern the courts in their interpretation of these sections.

Under the provisional voting paragraph as it now reads and as we intended it to be interpreted when we presented it to the House, the 20-day time period does not affect registration periods set by State law, as I understand it, and I am sure that the gentleman will agree, and has relevance only with regard to

the time within which an applicant appears before the referee to seek redress. Am I correct?

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

Mr. CELLER. The language added by the other body does not require a final determination of the applicant's qualifications under State law before an order entitling him to vote provisionally is issued. The effect of the proviso is to avoid any inference that the court is required to issue an order permitting provisional voting to a person obviously not qualified under State law.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I thank the gentleman from New York, and I will state that is in accordance with my understanding of the statute.

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

The other area of neglect is the citizen of the District of Columbia. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, I offered an amendment to grant these rights to the disfranchised citizen of our Federal city. It was ruled out of order. The distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee claimed a constitutional amendment was required to grant these rights. I claimed, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress now has constitutional authority. I still maintain that position.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I practiced law 30 years before coming to the Congress. The question of law as to the powers of Con-

gress over the Capital City has fascinated me. I have studied the legal and constitutional question carefully. I am convinced what I advocate can be done. I submit to the House and to the Judiciary Committee a memorandum of law I have prepared. Under unanimous consent I include it with my remarks.

#### MEMORANDUM

##### QUESTION PRESENTED

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

##### FACTUAL BACKGROUND

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

In 1788 and 1789, Maryland and Virginia ceded territory to the Federal Government and Congress, by acts which were approved on July 16, 1790,<sup>1</sup> and March 3, 1791,<sup>2</sup> established the District of Columbia, which was finally proclaimed to be the national capital after the national elections of 1800. Jurisdiction over the District of Columbia vested in the United States on the first Monday of December 1800 (*United States v. Hammond*, 1, Cr. C.C. 15 (1801)).

The city of Washington was made a municipality by act of Congress in 1802.<sup>3</sup> That form of government continued until 1817, when Congress established a territorial form of government for the District of Columbia. This form of government lasted for approximately 3 years, after which a temporary commission form of government was installed; by act of Congress in 1878,<sup>4</sup> the present commission form of government was established in the District of Columbia. Under this present form of government, all legislative powers with respect to District affairs are retained by Congress, while an executive board of three commissioners appointed by the President is vested with ordinance powers.

District citizens voted in the national elections of 1792, 1796, and 1800, but have not participated in any national election since the election of 1800. Under the territorial form of government established by the act of 1871, the District was given a delegate in the House of Representatives; this act was superseded, however, by the act of 1878, and in consequence the District lost its last vestige of any form of national representation.

##### APPLICABLE LAW AND ARGUMENT

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

A. The Hepburn case: The Members of the House of Representatives are chosen by the electors in each State (art. I, sec. 2, of the Constitution), Members of the Senate are elected by the people of the respective States (amendment 17 of the Constitution of the United States), and the President and Vice President of the United States are chosen by electors who are appointed by the legislatures of the several States (art. II, sec. 1). Proponents of the view that it requires a constitutional amendment to grant citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote in national elections and to have national representation in the Congress argue that because Representatives, Senators, and the

President and Vice President are chosen, either directly or indirectly, by the citizens of the several States, citizens of the District of Columbia cannot exercise these rights because they are not citizens of a "State" within the meaning of that term as used in the Constitution. This view rests squarely on the decision of *Hepburn v. Ellzey* (2 Cr. 445 (1805)) and its progeny.

In the Hepburn case the Supreme Court of the United States was confronted with the question of whether residents of the District of Columbia could maintain an action in the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Virginia under an act of Congress which limited the jurisdiction of the circuit courts to cases between a citizen of the State in which the suit is brought and a citizen of another State. Chief Justice Marshall, in an extremely brief opinion, held that citizens of the District of Columbia were not citizens of a State within the meaning of that term as used in the act of Congress conferring jurisdiction on the circuit courts. In interpreting the term "State," Chief Justice Marshall made note of the fact that under the Constitution Members of the House were chosen by the people of the several States and that the Senate was composed of Senators from each State, and from that he concluded that the term "State" as used in the Constitution designates, and is limited to, a member of the Union of the United States. In the course of his opinion, however, Chief Justice Marshall prophetically commented:

"It is true that as citizens of the United States, and of that particular District which is subject to the jurisdiction of Congress, it is extraordinary that the courts of the United States, which are open to aliens, and to the citizens of every State of the Union, should be closed upon them. But this is a subject for legislative, not for judicial, consideration" (2 Cr. at 452).

Careful examination of the opinion of the Supreme Court in *Hepburn v. Ellzey*, *supra*, thus discloses that proponents of the necessity for constitutional amendment (to permit citizens of the District of Columbia to vote in national elections and to have representation in the Congress) are relying upon a decision in which the question of whether citizens of the District of Columbia were citizens of a "State" within the meaning of the term "State" as used in the Constitution was not before the Court. The decision interpreting the term "State" as used in a statute, therefore, does not interpret the term "State" as used in the Constitution and is, clearly, subject to the maxim:

"That general expressions, in every opinion, are to be taken in connection with the case in which those expressions are used. If they go beyond the case, they may be respected, but ought not to control a judgment in a subsequent suit, when the very point is presented for decision" (Chief Justice Marshall, in *Cohens v. Virginia* (6 Wheat. 264, 399 (1821))).

B. The National Mutual Insurance Co. case: In the century and a half since *Hepburn v. Ellzey*, *supra*, there has been some significant disagreement with the views which Chief Justice Marshall expressed in that case. In *Watson v. Brooks* (13 F. 540, 543-544 (1882)), for example, the Court, in reluctantly following *Hepburn v. Ellzey*, *supra*, commented:

"But it is very doubtful if this ruling would now be made if the question was one of first impression; and it is to be hoped it may yet be reviewed and overturned."

"By it, and upon a narrow and technical construction of the word 'State', unsupported by any argument worthy of the able and distinguished judge who announced the opinion of the court, the large and growing population of American citizens resident in the District of Columbia and the eight territories of the United States are deprived

<sup>1</sup> 1 Stat. 139 (1790).

<sup>2</sup> 1 Stat. 214 (1791).

<sup>3</sup> *U.S. v. Simms* (1 C.R. 252, 256 (1803)).

<sup>4</sup> 2 Stat. 103, 104 (1801).

of the privilege accorded to all other American citizens, as well as aliens, of going into the national courts when obliged to assert or defend their legal rights away from home. Indeed, in the language of the court in *Hepburn and Dundas v. Ellzey*, *supra*, they may well say: 'It is extraordinary that the courts of the United States, which are open to aliens, and to the citizens of every State in the Union, should be closed upon them.' But so long as this ruling remains in force, the judgment of this court must be governed by it."

Much more recently, and far more significantly, Mr. Justice Rutledge with whom Mr. Justice Murphy concurred, in *National Mutual Insurance Co. v. Tidewater Transfer Co., Inc.* (337 U.S. 582, 69 S. Ct. 1173 (1939)), taking exception to the decision of Chief Justice Marshall in *Hepburn v. Ellzey*, *supra*, stated:

"Marshall's view of the 1789 act, iterated in his later dictum, Corporation of *New Orleans v. Winter* (1 Wheat. 91, 94, 4 L. ed. 44); cf. *Sere v. Pitot* (6 Cranch 332, 336, 3 L. ed., 249), has been consistently adhered to in judicial interpretation of later congressional grants of jurisdiction. And, by accretion, the rule of the *Hepburn* case has acquired the force of a considered determination that, within the meaning of article III, sec. 2, 'the District of Columbia is not a "State" and its citizens are therefore not citizens of any State within the article's meanings.'

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

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

"And Marshall's sponsorship in such matters always is weighty. But when long experience has disclosed the fallacy of a ruling, time has shown its injustice, and nothing remains but a technicality the only effect of which is to perpetuate inequity, hardship and wrong, those are the circumstances which this Court repeatedly has said call for reexamination of prior decisions. If those conditions are fulfilled in any case, they are in this one.

"The *Hepburn* decision was made before-time, through later decisions here, had destroyed its basic premise and at the beginning of Marshall's judicial career, when he had hardly started his great work of expounding the Constitution. The very brevity of the opinion and its groundings, especially in their ambiguity, show that the master hand, which later made his work immortal, faltered.

"The sole reason Marshall 'assigned for the decision was a conviction that the members of the American Confederacy only are the States contemplated in the Constitution,' a conviction resulting as he said from an examination of the use of that word in the charter to determine 'whether Columbia is a State in the sense of that instrument.' 2 Cranch 445, at page 452, 2 L. Ed. 332. 'When the same term which has been used plainly in this limited sense (as designating a member of the Union) in the articles respecting the legislative and executive departments, is also employed in that which respects the judicial department, it must be understood as retaining the sense originally given to it' (*ibid.*)".

In *National Mutual Insurance Co. v. Tidewater Transfer Co.*, *supra*, the Supreme Court was confronted squarely with the issue of whether Congress could constitutionally extend the jurisdiction of Federal courts outside the District of Columbia to actions by a citizen of the District of Columbia against a citizen of one of the States. Congress, in 1940, had enacted a statute conferring jurisdiction upon Federal courts in actions between citizens of different States, or citizens of the District of Columbia, the Territory of Hawaii, or Alaska, and any State or Territory.<sup>5</sup> The plaintiff, a resident of the District of Columbia, had commenced an action in the U.S. District Court for Maryland for a money judgment arising out of an insurance contract.

The district court judge, whose judgment was later affirmed on appeal by a divided court of appeals, concluded that, while the action met the jurisdictional requirements of the congressional act, it did not comply with the diversity requirements of the Constitution, and therefore dismissed the action. The Supreme Court, by a divided Court, reversed. Mr. Justice Rutledge and Mr. Justice Murphy, constituting two-fifths of the majority, voted to overrule *Hepburn v. Ellzey*, *supra*, and concluded that the District of Columbia was a State within the meaning of the diversity clause, article III, section 2, of the Constitution. The remaining members of the majority, however, Mr. Justice Jackson, Mr. Justice Black, and Mr. Justice Burton, rejected this argument, and refused to overrule the *Hepburn* case, but concluded that Congress constitutionally had the power to legislate for the District of Columbia with respect to the matter under review, and thus gave life to the prophetic words of Chief Justice Marshall in *Hepburn v. Ellzey*, in which he had said that the subject was one for legislative, and not for judicial, consideration.

## II. Article I, section 8, clause 17

A. Plenary power to legislate: The District of Columbia is the permanent seat of the Government of the United States.<sup>6</sup> By virtue of article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution, Congress possesses "the combined powers of a general and a State government" over the District (*Stoutenburgh v. Hennick*, 129 U.S. 141, 147, 9 S. Ct. 256 (1889)). The power conferred by this article is plenary (*O'Donoghue v. United States*, 289 U.S. 516, 53 S. Ct. 740 (1933)). This plenary power has been recognized in numerous decisions of both the courts of appeal and of the Supreme Court. In *Grether v. Wright* (75 F. 742, 756 (C.A. 6, 1896)), Circuit Judge Taft, afterwards Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, after reciting the foregoing clause and outlining the organization of the District under it, said:

"It was meet that so powerful a sovereignty should have a local habitation the character of which it might absolutely control, and the government of which it should not share with the States in whose territory it exercised but a limited sovereignty, supreme, it is true, in cases where it could be exercised at all, but much restricted in the field of its operation. The object of the grant of exclusive legislation over the District was, therefore, national in the highest sense, and the city organized under the grant became the city, not of a State, not of a district, but of a nation. In the same article which granted the powers of exclusive legislation over its seat of government are conferred all the other great powers which make the Nation, including the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States. He would be a strict constructionist, indeed, who

<sup>5</sup> This was later reenacted by Congress as part of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C., sec. 1332.

<sup>6</sup> 1 Stat. 130, sec. 1 (1790).

should deny to Congress the exercise of this latter power in furtherance of that of organizing and maintaining a proper local government and maintaining a proper local government at the seat of government. Each is for a national purpose, and the one may be used in aid of the other."

In *O'Donoghue v. United States*, *supra*, the Supreme Court, faced with the issue of whether Congress constitutionally had the power to reduce the rate of compensation to judges sitting on the Supreme Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, held that courts in the District of Columbia were constitutional courts within the meaning of article III of the Constitution, and therefore subject to its provisions. The majority of the court noted, however, that Congress could, under its power to legislate for the District of Columbia, extend the jurisdiction of the Federal courts sitting in the District of Columbia to matters over which purely constitutional courts could not take cognizance. The court said:

"In dealing with the District, Congress possesses the powers which belong to it in respect of territory within a State, and also the powers of a State (*Keller v. Potomac Elec. Power Co.* (261 U.S. 428, 442, 443, 43 S. Ct. 445, 448, 67 L. ed. 731)). 'In other words,' this court there said, 'it possesses a dual authority over the District, and may clothe the courts of the District, not only with the jurisdiction and powers of Federal courts in the several States, but which such authority as a State may confer on her courts (*Kendall v. United States* (12 Pet. 524, 619, 9 L. ed. 1181)). Instances in which congressional enactments have been sustained which conferred powers and placed duties on the courts of the District of an exceptional and advisory character are found in *Butterworth v. United States ex rel. Hoe* (112 U.S. 50, 60, 5 S. Ct. 25, 28 L. ed. 656); *United States v. Duell* (172 U.S. 576, 19 S. Ct. 286, 43 L. ed. 559); and *Baldwin Co. v. Howard Co.* (256 U.S. 35, 41 S. Ct. 405, 65 L. Ed. 816). Subject to the guarantees of personal liberty in the amendments and in the original Constitution, Congress has as much power to vest courts of the District with a variety of jurisdiction and powers as a State legislature has in conferring jurisdiction on its courts" (at 545).

B. Limitations of plenary power: By virtue of the plenary power vested in Congress by article I, section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution, Congress may legislate over the District of Columbia in all cases whatsoever, provided that in exercising its power Congress does not authorize a denial to the inhabitants of the District of Columbia of any constitutional guarantee "not plainly inapplicable" (*O'Donoghue v. United States*, *supra* (at 539)).

Nothing in the Constitution, its history, or the original amendments can justify the assertion that citizens of the District may be deprived of the benefit of any of the constitutional grants of life, liberty, property, or the privilege of a jury trial in criminal cases (*Callan v. Wilson*, 127 U.S. 540, 550, 8 S. Ct. 1301 (1888)). To the contrary, everything in the Constitution, its history, and its amendments justifies the assertion that citizens of the District are to be accorded every right and every privilege accorded by the Constitution to citizens of the several States. Thus, in *Downes v. Bidwell* (182 U.S. 244, 260-261, 21 S. Ct. 770 (1901)), Mr. Justice Brown said:

"This District had been a part of the States of Maryland and Virginia. It had been subject to the Constitution, and was a part of the United States. The Constitution had attached to it irrevocably. There are steps which can never be taken backward. The tie that bound the States of Maryland and Virginia to the Constitution could not be dissolved, without at least the consent of the Federal and State governments to a formal separa-



tion. The mere cession of the District of Columbia to the Federal Government relinquished the authority of the States, but it did not take it out of the United States or from under the aegis of the Constitution. Neither party had ever consented to that construction of the cession. If, before the District was set off, Congress had passed an unconstitutional act affecting the inhabitants, it would have been void. If done after the District was created, it would have been equally void; in other words, Congress could not do indirectly, by carving out the District, what it could not do directly. The District still remained a part of the United States, protected by the Constitution. Indeed, it would have been a fanciful construction to hold that territory which had been once a part of the United States ceased to be such by being ceded directly to the Federal Government."

To the same effect, see *O'Donoghue v. United States* (at 540) wherein Mr. Justice Sutherland stated:

"It is important to bear constantly in mind that the District was made up of portions of two of the original States of the Union, and was not taken out of the Union by the cession. Prior thereto its inhabitants were entitled to all the rights, guaranties, and immunities of the Constitution, among which was the right to have their cases arising under the Constitution heard and determined by Federal courts created under, and vested with the judicial power conferred by, article III. We think it is not reasonable to assume that the cession stripped them of these rights, and that it was intended that at the very seat of the National Government the people should be less fortified by the guaranty of an independent judiciary than in other parts of the Union."

The nature of plenary power of Congress to legislate for the District of Columbia was fully recognized by the Supreme Court in *National Mutual Insurance Co. v. Tidewater Transfer Co.*, *supra*. In that case, as pointed out hereinabove, Congress extended the jurisdiction of Federal courts in the several States to actions between citizens of the District of Columbia and citizens of the several States. While two of the Justices sustained the validity of the legislation, on the ground that the District of Columbia was a State (thus bringing the legislation within the purview of article III), three Justices, Jackson, Black and Burton, concluded that the legislation was constitutional, and authorized by virtue of the plenary power of Congress to legislate for the District of Columbia. Mr. Justice Jackson, writing an opinion in which Justices Black and Burton joined, stated:

"It is elementary that the exclusive responsibility of Congress for the welfare of the District includes both power and duty to provide its inhabitants and citizens with courts adequate to adjudge not only controversies among themselves but also their claims against, as well as suits brought by, citizens of the various States. It long has been held that Congress may clothe District of Columbia courts not only with the jurisdiction and powers of Federal authority as a State may confer on her courts (*Kendall v. United States ex rel. Stokes* (12 Pet. 524, 619, 9 L. ed. 1181); *Capital Traction Co. v. Hof* (174 U.S. 1, 19 S. Ct. 580, 43 L. ed. 873); *O'Donoghue v. United States* (289 U.S. 516, 63 S. Ct. 740, 77 L. ed. 1356)). The defendant here does not challenge the power of Congress to assure justice to the citizens of the District by means of Federal instrumentalities, or to empower a Federal court within the District to run its process to summon defendants here from any part of the country. And no reason has been advanced why a special statutory court for cases of District citizens could not be authorized to proceed elsewhere in the United States to

sit, where necessary or proper, to discharge the duties of Congress toward District citizens.

"Unless we are to deny to Congress the same choice of means through which to govern the District of Columbia that we have held it to have in exercising other legislative powers enumerated in the same article, we cannot hold that Congress lacked the power it sought to exercise in the act before us.

"We conclude that where Congress in the exercise of its powers under article I finds it necessary to provide those on whom its power is exerted with access to some kind of court or tribunal for determination of controversies that are within the traditional concept of the justiciable, it may open the regular Federal courts to them regardless of lack of diversity of citizenship. The basis of the holdings we have discussed is that when Congress deems that for such purposes it owes a forum to claimants and trustees, it may execute its power in this manner. The Congress, with equal justification apparently considers that it also owes such a forum to the residents of the District of Columbia in execution of its power and duty under the same article. We do not see how the one could be sustained and the other denied.

"We therefore hold that Congress may exert its power to govern the District of Columbia by imposing the judicial function of adjudicating justiciable controversies on the regular Federal courts which under the Constitution it has the power to ordain and establish and which it may invest with jurisdiction and from which it may withhold jurisdiction 'in the exact degrees and character which to Congress may seem proper for the public good.' (*Lockerty v. Phillips* (319 U.S. 182, 187, 63 S. Ct. 1019, 1022, 87 L. ed. 1339))."

Framed in its broad perspective, the significance of the Supreme Court's decision, in *National Mutual Insurance Co. v. Tidewater Transfer Co.*, *supra*, lies in the fact that the Supreme Court, in that case, gave complete recognition to the full breadth of the plenary power of Congress to legislate for the District of Columbia in all cases whatsoever. In sustaining the constitutionality of the act of Congress, which vested jurisdiction over suits between citizens of the District of Columbia and citizens of States in Federal courts sitting outside the District of Columbia, the court gave explicit cognizance to the concept that citizens of the District of Columbia were entitled to all those rights, privileges, and immunities which the Constitution secured for the citizens of the several States and to the further concept that mere cession of territory by the States of Virginia and Maryland could not, and did not, strip citizens of the United States (who had been citizens of Maryland and Virginia) of these same rights. To do this, the Supreme Court found, that Congress, under article I, section 8, clause 17, not only had the right to carry the effects of its legislation for the District of Columbia outside the boundaries of the District of Columbia, but also that Congress under this article could add to the jurisdiction of Federal courts outside the District of Columbia and in effect extend jurisdiction of those courts which was otherwise limited by article III of the Constitution.

#### CONCLUSION

Under its plenary power to legislate for the District of Columbia, Congress possesses powers which belong to it in respect of territory within a State, and also the powers of a State. In the exercise of its absolute sovereignty, Congress treats the District of Columbia just as the legislatures of the several States treat the territory which is subject to their jurisdiction. This was intended and recognized by the framers of the Constitu-

tion. See, for example, Federalist No. 43, wherein Mr. Madison stated:

"The indispensable necessity of complete authority at the seat of government carries its own evidence with it. It is a power exercised by every legislature of the Union, I might say of the world, by virtue of its general supremacy."

Under its plenary power to legislate for the District of Columbia, Congress has the power to enact all legislation necessary to secure for citizens of the District of Columbia those rights which they would otherwise enjoy, had the territory of the District of Columbia remained a part of a State. See *National Mutual Insurance Co. v. Tidewater Transfer Co.*, *supra*. This includes the power to legislate, to grant citizens of the District of Columbia rights which they had enjoyed prior to the cession of the territory which became the District of Columbia, i.e., the right to vote in national elections and to have representation in Congress. The bare bones of an ancient precedent, which has been subject to much criticism and very little critical analysis, obscures this conclusion, but by the application of both logic and reasoned law, as set forth in decisions subsequent to *Heppburn* (said decisions being cited herein), the conclusion is inescapable that Congress, by legislation under its plenary power, may grant suffrage to citizens of the District of Columbia and that constitutional amendment is not necessary.

I am sure, based upon the authority I have cited, no court would disturb legislation passed to grant the rights I propose. In fact, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the courts have suggested we act.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in its final form the Civil Rights Act of 1960 is a disappointment. It is based on a narrow conception of the problem, seriously restricts the opportunities for creative executive leadership, and underrates the force and majesty of the law.

This legislation rests on a questionable magic-wand theory that the exercise of voting rights will prove to be the "open sesame" of all other civil rights. The truth of the matter, however, is that our human relations problems touch most facets of our national life and if one accepts the premise that our country cannot afford a double standard in its human relations it follows that our laws should be addressed to the total issue and be designed to encourage action toward moderate solutions of all the main problems.

The issues and solutions in our human relations crisis are closely interrelated and it is plain that action—and success—in any area affects and influences the struggle to enlarge human rights in other areas. For instance, who would deny that the example set in professional and amateur sports during the last decade has not had immeasurable influence on the course of events in housing, education and the use of public facilities?

If in truth our laws not only compel obedience to certain standards but change the hearts and minds of men as well, we have surely erred in narrowing the scope of this legislation. It is plain, I think, that the one unanswerable argument available to the southern moderate is his contention that respect for the law must override all other considerations.

Consequently, although this act will have some moral force, its impact will

be limited by the final, narrow dimensions of the bill. It is also easy to predict from our experience with the 1957 act that the voting rights provisions of this legislation will in some States serve only as an invitation to lawsuits and further State legislation designed to make voting more difficult.

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

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Senate has made some minor amendments to the so-called civil rights bill of 1960 does not remove from this legislation the dangers it threatens to American freedoms.

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

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

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

I am opposed to any and all civil rights legislation this year or any other time. We simply do not need it, watered up, watered down, or otherwise.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, earlier during the course of debate there was a colloquy among the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] concerning the effect of the Dirksen amendment to the provisional voting section. That amendment appears on page 20 of the Senate bill and is numbered "23."

Obviously, the colloquy was planned in advance as an effort to establish so-called legislative intent to guide the courts in the interpretation of the provisional voting section. I take vigorous exception to the intent as expressed in that colloquy, and I respectfully submit that the Senate debate, which is the best evidence of the intent of the Senate amendment, clearly demonstrates a contrary intent. In response to a question propounded by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] in substance replied that, in order to vote provisionally, it was not necessary that the applicant had previously attempted to register and had been denied registration. He based his answer on the theory that, inasmuch as the court had already found that a practice or pattern of racial discrimination existed, it would have been futile for him to make application for registration before the State registrar, and since a court of equity does not deny relief because the petitioner failed to perform a futile act, the court could grant him a provisional vote order even though he had never made timely application before the registrar.

Not only is such reasoning consonant with the legislative intent reflected in the debate in the other body, it is manifestly in conflict with the substantive language and procedural provisions of title VI. Beginning on line 9 page 16 of the bill, I read in pertinent part as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, passage of this bill today marks an important step on the path of assuring equality for all our citizens in step with the Constitution. The subject has taken many hours and has preoccupied some of the most distinguished Members of this body because it represents a social change of great magnitude to those who believe that we should hold the clock still. I do not believe we can afford to do so, and I welcome an advance.

We all realize, however, that the true contest for civil rights for all our citizens, regardless of race, color, or creed, is not being conducted in a parliamentary setting. It is, rather, within ourselves. It is within the hearts and minds of men that the greatest obstacles lie, and this is true regardless of geography. Our aim has been to secure the equal protection of the laws for all our citizens, but the greater achievement will be to banish prejudice and bias wherever it exists.

This Nation has made progress through patience and the broadening of our laws to guarantee equal rights where force and custom was being applied against such progress. In this sense, the Civil Rights Act of 1960 is a heartening thing, again advising the world that watches us so closely that we mean what we say, and that we are determined to see that in fact, as well as in theory, we enforce constitutional rights for all our citizens.

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

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill, even with the Senate amendments. I can add nothing to what I said when this matter was before this House earlier this year. I ask only that my remarks then made be considered here. There is no occasion, no need, no demand for legislation of this character. It is destructive of constitutional principles and personal liberty.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the civil rights battle in Congress has ended for the present. To those of us who will not rest until every vestige of discrimination has been wiped out, the bill as passed is a grave disappointment, and we feel many regrets over the lost provisions of the bill. At best, we have passed only moderate legislation, it is merely a short step forward, and a great dis-

tance still lies ahead toward our goal of complete equality for all.

Some satisfaction can be felt in our victory for equality in one of the fundamentals of our democracy—the voting booth. The voting referee system withstood every major assault, and if properly enforced, it promises to give the Negro free access to the polls for the first time since the days of the Reconstruction.

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

Powerful opposition prevented enactment of many provisions which would have been extremely helpful to those now subjected to discriminatory practices; one of these provisions included FEPC principles relating to Government contracts.

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

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

Giving credit to the bill in the most favorable light, this is only moderate legislation. We still have a long way to go in guaranteeing civil rights to all Americans, regardless of race, color, or creed. I have given earnest consideration to the bill. This seems to be the best bill which can be obtained at this time and under these circumstances. This is an advance over the Civil Rights Act of 1957. This is the second step in the onward march of civil rights for all of our people. It has taken us almost a century to come this far. However, we have in the past 8 years made much greater progress than in the previous 75 years.

If we can take the experience of the Attorney General with reference to the 1957 civil rights bill, it does seem that we will have better means of enforcement of constitutionally guaranteed rights. In many ways this legislation will be a challenge to the Attorney General to enforce these rights in accordance with the legislation.

I have voted for this bill as a means of helping to achieve a better climate in which civil rights may be enforced and guaranteed. It is true that the Senate made substantial changes when it came to that body. In title I, the Senate deleted the word "corruptly" and struck out the portion under which the criminal penalty imposed would not run

concurrently. From the same title was stricken language which would have made it a crime to interfere or obstruct a court order by a threatening letter or communication.

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

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

In title VI, the Senate put in a section requiring that hearings before any voting referee shall be held under the direction of the U.S. district court.

It appears to me that this bill is neither one to the right or the left, but is essentially a middle-of-the-road bill. However, if properly enforced, I believe that it could result in substantial gains in the next few years for those who have been denied their civil voting rights for almost a century.

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 288, nays 95, answered "present" 2, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—288

Adair	Blatnik	Celler
Addonizio	Boland	Chamberlain
Albert	Bolling	Chelf
Allen	Bolton	Chenoweth
Anfuso	Bosch	Chipperfield
Arends	Bow	Church
Ashley	Bowles	Clark
Avery	Brademas	Coad
Ayres	Bray	Coffin
Bailey	Breeding	Cohelan
Baker	Brewster	Collier
Baldwin	Broomfield	Conte
Baring	Brown, Mo.	Cook
Barr	Brown, Ohio	Corbett
Barrett	Buckley	Cunningham
Barry	Burdick	Curtin
Bass, N.H.	Burke, Ky.	Curtis, Mass.
Bates	Burke, Mass.	Curtis, Mo.
Baumhart	Byrne, Pa.	Daddario
Becker	Byrnes, Wis.	Dague
Belcher	Cahill	Daniels
Bennett, Mich.	Carnfield	Dawson
Bentley	Cannon	Delaney
Berry	Carnahan	Denton
Betts	Cederberg	Derwinski

Devine	Kilgore	Rabaut
Dingell	King, Calif.	Randall
Dixon	Kirwan	Ray
Donohue	Kluczynski	Reece, Tenn.
Dooley	Knox	Rees, Kans.
Dorn, N.Y.	Kowalski	Reuss
Doyle	Kyl	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dulski	Laird	Rhodes, Pa.
Dwyer	Lane	Riehlman
Edmondson	Langen	Rivers, Alaska
Fallon	Lankford	Robison
Farbstein	Latta	Rodino
Fascell	Lesinski	Rogers, Colo.
Feighan	Levering	Rogers, Mass.
Fino	Libonati	Roosevelt
Flood	Lindsay	Rostenkowski
Flynn	McCulloch	Roush
Fogarty	McDonough	Rutherford
Foley	McDowell	Santangelo
Forand	McFall	Saund
Ford	McGinley	Saylor
Frelinghuysen	Macdonald	Schenck
Friedel	Machrowicz	Scherer
Fulton	Madden	Schwenkel
Gallagher	Magnuson	Schweley
Garmatz	Maillard	Sheppard
George	Marshall	Shipley
Gialmo	Martin	Short
Gilbert	May	Siler
Glenn	Merrrow	Simpson, Ill.
Goodell	Metcalfe	Slack
Granahan	Meyer	Smith, Calif.
Gray	Michel	Smith, Iowa
Green, Oreg.	Miller, Clem	Springer
Green, Pa.	Miller,	Staggers
Griffin	George P.	Steed
Griffiths	Miller, N.Y.	Stratton
Gross	Milliken	Stubblefield
Gubser	Minshall	Sullivan
Hagen	Moeller	Teague, Calif.
Halleck	Monagan	Teller
Halpern	Moore	Thomas
Healey	Moorhead	Thompson, N.J.
Hechler	Morgan	Thomson, Wyo.
Henderson	Morris, Okla.	Thornberry
Hess	Moss	Toll
Hiestand	Multer	Tollefson
Hoeven	Mumma	Udall
Hoffman, Ill.	Murphy	Ullman
Hoffman, Mich.	Natcher	Vanik
Hogan	Neisen	Van Pelt
Hollifield	Nix	Van Zandt
Holt	O'Brien, Ill.	Wainwright
Holtzman	O'Brien N.Y.	Wallhauser
Hosmer	O'Hara, Ill.	Walter
Hull	O'Hara, Mich.	Wampler
Inouye	O'Konski	Watts
Irwin	O'Neill	Weaver
Jarman	Osmers	Weis
Johnson, Calif.	Ostertag	Westland
Johnson, Colo.	Pelly	Wharton
Johnson, Md.	Perkins	Widnall
Johnson, Wis.	Pfost	Wier
Judd	Philbin	Wilson
Karsten	Pillion	Wolf
Karsh	Pirnie	Wright
Kastenmeier	Porter	Yates
Kearns	Price	Younger
Kee	Prokop	Zablocki
Keith	Pucinski	Zelenko
Kelly	Quie	
Kilday	Quigley	

NAYS—95

Abbitt	Fountain	Norrell
Abernethy	Frazier	Passman
Alexander	Gary	Patman
Alford	Gathings	Pilcher
Alger	Haley	Poage
Andrews	Hardy	Poff
Ashmore	Harmon	Preston
Bass, Tenn.	Harris	Rains
Beckworth	Harrison	Riley
Bennett, Fla.	Hébert	Rivers, S.C.
Blitch	Hemphill	Roberts
Boggs	Herlong	Rogers, Fla.
Bonner	Huddleston	Scott
Boynik	Ikard	Selden
Brooks, La.	Jennings	Slikes
Brooks, Tex.	Jensen	Smith, Kans.
Brown, Ga.	Jonas	Smith, Miss.
Broyhill	Jones, Ala.	Smith, Va.
Budge	Jones, Mo.	Spence
Casey	Kilburn	Taber
Colmer	Kitchen	Thompson, La.
Cramer	Landrum	Thompson, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	Lennon	Trimble
Dorn, S.C.	Loser	Tuck
Dowdy	McMillan	Utt
Downing	McSween	Vinson
Durham	Mahon	Whitener
Elliott	Mason	Whitten
Everett	Mathews	Williams
Evins	Mills	Wills
Flynt	Morrison	Winstead
Forrester	Murray	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Aspinall Johansen

## NOT VOTING—45

Andersen, Minn.	Grant	Mitchell
Anderson, Mont.	Hargis	Montoya
Auchincloss	Hays	Morris, N. Mex.
Barden	Holland	Moulder
Brock	Horan	Norblad
Burleson	Jackson	Oliver
Cooley	Kasem	Powell
Davis, Tenn.	Keogh	Rogers, Tex.
Dent	King, Utah	Rooney
Derounian	Lafore	St. George
Diggs	Lipscomb	Sisk
Fenton	McCormack	Taylor
Fisher	McGovern	Teague, Tex.
Gavin	McIntire	Withrow
	Mack	Young
	Meader	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.

Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Johansen against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Burleson against.

Mr. Brock for, with Mr. Young against.

Mr. Moulder for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. King of Utah for, with Mr. Grant against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Cooley against.

Mr. McCormack for, with Mr. Meader against.

Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Barden against.

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Mitchell against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Montoya with Mr. Norblad.

Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. McIntire.

Mr. Oliver with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Anderson of Montana with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Mack with Mr. Derounian.

Mr. McGovern with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Anderson of Minnesota.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Lafore.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Lipscomb.

Mr. Hargis with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Kasem with Mr. Withrow.

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

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE]. If present she would have voted "yea." I wish to change my vote from "no" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

computed on the rates of basic pay provided by the Act of May 20, 1958. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## RIVERTON FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolutions (S.J. Res. 150) permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water lands in the Third Division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That pending completion of a repayment contract the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to continue to deliver water to the lands in the Third Division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming, during the calendar years 1960 and 1961, as under the provisions of section 9, subsection (d) (1), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1195, 43 U.S.C. 485h(d)) but without regard to the time limitation therein specified.*

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of this resolution would take care of an emergency situation that has developed on the Riverton Federal reclamation project in Wyoming. The legislation is necessary to permit the Secretary of the Interior to deliver water to lands of the third division of the project during the 1960 irrigation season. Information from the farmers on the project and from the Department indicates the water deliveries are needed immediately. The Secretary cannot deliver water to a portion of the project lands because the 10-year development period provided under reclamation law has expired and the repayment contract between the irrigation district and the Department has not been executed.

The third division of the Riverton project is a relatively small public lands project comprising approximately 8,000 acres. The lands were opened to entry in 1949 and 1950. At that time a 10-year development period was established to provide for organization of a district and the negotiation and execution of a repayment contract. Petition for organization of the district was finally filed in May of 1957 but litigation followed and there was a year and a half delay before the formation of the district was

affirmed on October 17, 1958. Since that time, negotiations have been carried on between the Bureau of Reclamation and the district but it has not been possible to conclude all the required steps leading to the execution of the repayment contract. We have been advised by the Department of the Interior that all necessary contract arrangements are expected to be completed in the near future. However, since several steps remain to be taken and approval by the Congress of final repayment arrangements will be necessary, the resolution provides for water deliveries both this year and 1961.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

## MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

## RECOMPUTING OF RETIRED PAY

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I present the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 506) for printing in the RECORD:

*Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11318) to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the Act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay re-*

leadership of their President, Santa Ana. They had, so they thought, trapped on a little rise of ground 910 Texans under the leadership of Sam Houston. They were waiting for the Texans to surrender, but the Texans had burned in their hearts and their minds the memories of the slaughter of Goliad and the slaughter of those brave defenders of the Alamo. The Texans did not wait for Santa Ana and his well-plumed and well-armed 1,600 to make their attack; the 910 charged the Mexican Army. This was one of the most decisive battles in history. In a matter of less than 20 minutes Sam Houston's men had conquered completely the army of Santa Ana. Six hundred and thirty Mexicans lay dead, 230 wounded, and over 700 captured. The Texans lost 9 men killed, and 30 wounded.

There were many Latin Americans in the fray, but we now enjoy a tremendous good neighbor relationship with our Mexican neighbors. Their culture has enriched ours. But on this day we revere, San Jacinto Day. Those heroic deeds still live in our memory when the Texans fought to establish their rights. That is why Texans have always held the rights of the individual to freedom in such high regard, and that is why Texans wish the enslaved countries of the world to have their San Jacinto Day, and we hope it may be in the very near future.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, usually I do not speak on the authorization bill for mutual security, as it is my privilege to chair the subcommittee handling funds for the total mutual security program. However, I asked for this time in order to direct the attention of the Committee to the fact that whereas the Committee on Foreign Affairs—and it is a great committee—the Foreign Affairs Committee spent some 16 or 17 days conducting its hearings. The Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee may require from 7 to 9 weeks for its studies of the requests for funds.

We run into many things that are indeed shocking. There is one matter of that type which I should like to direct to the attention of the Committee of the Whole House at this time. The ICA formulated a special educational course, and went to Johns Hopkins University which told them that no such course was available there. But the ICA prevailed upon Johns Hopkins to formulate such a course, and it was put together.

I believe the Committee would like to investigate this unusual contract with Johns Hopkins. The class consists of 20 students. All of them had previously been indoctrinated thoroughly in ICA, before they were turned over to Johns Hopkins, where they take a 5-month course. The amount that we pay Johns Hopkins is \$80,000, which amounts to \$4,000 per student, for a 5-month training course.

Mr. Chairman, this procedure is spreading also to other universities, and it should be investigated. Our subcommittee will document this situation with many pages of factual information.

Many of the arrangements are just about as unreasonable and wasteful as the one to which I have just referred.

This so-called mutual-security program has grown to a point that there are more than 43,000 employees, many of them now in the top echelon. Every year new jobs are being created, many of them never before heard of in government. But the witnesses frequently cannot even tell us what these people are going to do. It is one of the most miserable conditions with which our subcommittee has had to contend.

Some time ago I addressed myself to the membership and stated that foreign aid is now costing the American taxpayers \$10 billion annually. I want to amend that figure and say that if the interest on what we are borrowing to pay for foreign aid is included, it will result in a total annual cost of nearly \$11 billion.

When we bring the appropriation bill to the floor, we will thoroughly document evidence of waste and mishandling and poor planning, and so forth; and you will know, as I do, that this is the most wastefully expensive and most inefficiently controlled program ever conceived by the mind of man.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman mentioned that for the 20 in training now at Johns Hopkins the Government is paying \$80,000. They are asking for authority to train 43 at Johns Hopkins next year, which would cost \$4,000 apiece, \$840 a month for tuition, resulting in a figure of \$172,000 rather than the \$80,000 the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. GARY. For a similar number.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

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

There are seven of those technical aid programs, which branch off in different directions; but I can assure you that the subcommittee will certainly endeavor to bring them together. If you will read carefully the many hundreds of pages of testimony that our subcommittee will present to you on this subject you will more fully understand the puzzling situation with which we are confronted.

This implies no discredit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which held hearings on the authorization during 17 days. But, on the other hand, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee will hold from 7 to 9 weeks of hearings. We believe you will support the reduced amount which the committee will recommend for this undeniably wasteful worldwide program.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Is it my understanding that this course at Johns Hopkins and at the Boston University is designed to train people in the professional art of giving away the taxpayers' money?

Mr. PASSMAN. I think that that is very well stated. These people are already a part of ICA, and they bring them in and give them these additional courses, 166 subjects, in 5 months.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yesterday I listened to practically all the debate, and I was amused by the number of those who apologized for the waste and inefficiency in this program. In fact, I heard the greatest array of apologists for a bill that I heard in my 12 years around here. With a few exceptions—and I am talking now about the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs—the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PILCHER], the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], made no apology for their opposition to the bill. Practically everyone else on the committee who spoke were apologetic. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], in his printed supplemental views on this bill, time after time told of his disappointments because of the waste and inefficiency.

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

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

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

Mr. JUDD. I practiced surgery for 19 years.

Mr. GROSS. Just a moment.

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

Mr. GROSS. Just a moment.

Mr. JUDD. And I am going to continue to make that sort of constructive criticism and effort with respect to this program.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. That is your opinion, and it is not supported by a single fact.

Mr. JUDD. I think I am a better friend of the taxpayers than my colleague from Iowa.

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

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

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

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

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I repeat that Americans are getting some benefit from the farm program, and I do not accept the statement that 80 percent of the foreign hand-out program is spent in this country.

Mr. JUDD. I am sure that the gentleman, representing a farming district in Iowa, will not give up on efforts to get a better farm program just because we have been disappointed in the existing one.

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

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

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

Mrs. BOLTON. The gentleman was not here when we looked for him.

Mr. GROSS. I was here when the gentlewoman yielded back 21 minutes of time.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. COOK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

Why do you except \$100,000?

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

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

Mr. MORGAN. This is for preliminary engineering studies. You cannot start a project and submit a program unless you have some engineering studies.

Mr. GROSS. It says nothing about limiting it to \$100,000 for engineering studies.

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

Mr. GROSS. It does not say anything about limiting any project under the Development Loan Fund to \$100,000 for engineering services. This pertains to a project involving \$100,000; is that not correct?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; a project.

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

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] is the author of

this language and the author of the amount, \$100,000.

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

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

Mr. MORGAN. Four.

Mr. GROSS. Why?

Mr. MORGAN. The administration asked for eight. The committee cut it down to four. Last year, if the gentleman remembers, the committee wrote in the Inspector General-Comptroller. The committee felt that two of these supergrades should be for the new agency, the Comptroller-Inspector General. One was to go to the Office of the Coordinator and one to the ICA.

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

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

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

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

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

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

I pointed out at that time that they have, as I remember it, three \$16,000-a-year instructors for some 20 students.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad the gentleman from Louisiana called the attention of the House to some of the operations that are going on around here. I assume there is an authorization in this bill for the military assistance training school over in Arlington Towers where the American Research Institute is paying a retired general \$14,000 a year in addition to the \$6,000 a year he is drawing as retirement pay.

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

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

Mr. PILCHER. Talking about that \$100,000, there are some countries where the Development Loan Fund has earmarked millions of dollars and the project has not yet been devised. In other words, they have earmarked the money but they have not yet even decided on a project.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Here is some unclassified information I obtained from

the mutual security outfit a few days ago. If you get the classified information, I do not know whether you could carry it around or not, but this is a list of the Development Loan Fund loans. I recall a couple of years ago that I raised a question concerning \$5-million loan to Yugoslavia to purchase diesel locomotives. I asked at that time whether the locomotives would be bought in this country and I was assured they would be. Now I find in this record that they are being purchased abroad, \$5 million worth of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The motion was rejected..

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

Mr. Chairman, I was intensely interested in the debate that has been going on here particularly in the field of education and in the field of contracting educational programs abroad through the International Cooperation Administration.

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

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

University contracts are employed by ICA as one means of implementing the technical cooperation program. As of March 31, 1960, the total cumulative obligations for contracts specifically aimed at education amounted to \$26,644,208, involving 33 contracts with 27 universities operating in 19 countries. As early as 1951, the Economic Cooperation Administration negotiated an agricultural contract between Cornell University and the University of the Philippines. At the same time, the Institute of Inter-American Affairs negotiated a somewhat similar contract with the University of Arkansas for work in Panama, and the Technical Cooperation Administration negotiated a contract with the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College for work in Ethiopia.

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

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

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

I have here, and I am going to ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD, a list of all the countries in which they are carrying on this program together with a brief description of what the program is. I am doing this, Mr. Chairman, for the sole purpose of calling to your attention the fact that I am going to be

here pleading with you in the matter of a few days, I hope, to do something or other about the education of and creating educational facilities for American children. If we have the money to do this in a program of this kind, we ought not even have to go to the trouble of having a debate to furnish our American youth at least with an opportunity equal to what we are doing all over the world.

The matter referred to is as follows:

#### EXAMPLES OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

**Africa:** Ethiopia has developed the foundation for the first modern public school system in the nation's 5,000-year history as a consequence of stimulation and joint planning with the ICA education program. In 1953 there were fewer than 500 qualified teachers to cope with a school population of 72,000 crowded into 718 makeshift classrooms. The single teacher-training institution that year graduated a total of 18 teachers. Today, because of joint effort, there are 4,300 teachers and supervisors in the nation's 3,910 classrooms which house 210,000 children. Teacher-training institutions now number 4 and produce 500 teachers annually. As a result of ICA assistance about 75 percent of all teachers receive summer school training for professional upgrading. The establishment of 148 new self-help village schools has improved and expanded educational opportunities in rural areas. Operating in all provinces, 87 post-elementary, academic, and special schools graduate about 1,300 skilled workers yearly for employment in 23 critical manpower areas.

Through ICA assistance the training of semiskilled and skilled artisans in the building and mechanical trades has progressed. The building trade school in Addis Ababa commenced as a joint effort in 1956 as one means of producing much needed building tradesmen and trade instructors. Training is now offered in electricity, carpentry, masonry, plumbing, and related subject matter in applied mathematics, science, and mechanical drawing. Over 100 graduates annually are obtaining employment in these trades while others are being trained and entering the teaching field in vocational education.

The vocational trades school in Asmara, Eritrea, which began as a cooperative program in 1953, was phased over to the Ministry of Education during fiscal year 1959. U.S. advisers have been reduced from 13 to 9 since the nationals have been trained to take over various shops. It is estimated that in 5 years sufficient vocational teachers can be trained to operate Ethiopian vocational schools with a reduced U.S. advisory staff providing backstopping only.

**Libya:** The teacher education project in Libya, which was initiated in 1953, has as its objectives the training of additional teachers through preservice programs and upgrade others through inservice programs. The accomplishment of these objectives will eliminate the necessity for the Libyan Government to employ untrained teachers and non-Libyan teachers. Approximately 300 teachers have been graduated from the teachers colleges in Tripolitania and Cyrenaica in each of the years 1958 and 1959. An additional 1,000 received training in a 10 weeks' summer program held at Tripoli and in special classes in Cyrenaica. Acceleration for the certification of elementary teachers is being carried on through evening inservice courses in six centers in Tripolitania.

**Liberia:** The vocational education program at the Booker T. Washington Institute in Liberia has shown rapid expansion since 1955, when ICA obtained under contract the services of Prairie View A. & M. College to assist in the training of vocational teachers and

skilled workers. Enrollment at BWI Vocational High School has increased from 195 in 1954 to 450 at the present time. A total of 206 students have been graduated since 1955. The last graduating class consisted of 63 students. During the period from April 1956 to May 1959, 10 buildings were constructed primarily by American technicians and BWI students. An academic building was completed by the Government of Liberia. The newly expanded Booker Washington Institute opened February 1958, with instructional programs in 16 vocational areas. Among the vocational trades included are agriculture, arts and crafts, automobile mechanics and machine shop, building trades, distributive education, heavy equipment mechanics, home economics, radio and communication, secretarial science, and tailoring. Under the Prairie View contract, ICA provided six advisers in 1955. A full complement of 23 advisers was reached in fiscal year 1958. As a result of training key people Liberian counterparts commenced working with American technicians in 1958. It is contemplated that by 1961, Liberian teachers will assume the major responsibility for operating the school.

#### LATIN AMERICA

**Brazil:** When ICA was requested to render technical assistance to Brazil in 1951, the State of Sao Paulo, one of the most active of industrial areas, lacked enough trained lower-level executives, foremen, and supervisors with which to promote industrial growth. At the request of the Ministry of Education, a training within industry program was instituted which involved (1) job instruction training, (2) job methods training, (3) job safety training, (4) conference leadership, and (5) human relations within industry. About 30,000 foremen and supervisors were trained in these courses. This particular program was phased out in 1958. As a followup on this training a newer program is now being organized in the same area for skilled and unskilled workers.

The Brazilian Air Corps had developed an aviation engineering college at Sao Jose de Campos. Brazil had no aviation industry and a study of the records of graduates indicated that they were absorbed in industries other than aviation. With the assistance of ICA this institution has been converted into a general engineering college with seven major fields in which students can specialize. This institution will now be able to supply Brazil with her much needed engineer corps.

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

**Guatemala:** Guatemala has a population reported to be about 60 percent illiterate. The compulsory military training law brings all 18-year-old men into service for a 2-year period. With ICA assistance about 40 army officers have been trained in the techniques of teaching adults and these officers are now conducting literacy classes for new recruits. About 1,000 men at a time are taken for this training. Through such a program illiteracy is being reduced considerably.

**Paraguay:** As in other developing countries, Paraguay, while agricultural, needs workers in service occupations. ICA assisted in the development of a vocational school in Asuncion which is now producing a trained corps of servicemen in a variety of occupations. The school solved a major problem during 1958 when the city of Asuncion installed a water system for the first time.

There were, however, no plumbers to connect homes to water mains. The vocational school established special courses and, by working day and night, trained the needed plumbers. As of June 1960 this school is being phased over to the Government of Paraguay, no longer in need of technical assistance for effective operation.

**Peru:** Peru is a country in which the mining, petroleum, fishing, and manufacturing industries are making great progress. In all of these industries, chemical and industrial engineering—as well as analytical chemistry—play an important role. Many of the industries have modern laboratories equipped with modern instruments to carry on the chemical analysis and tests necessary for the development and control of production, but in all of Peru there has been no educational institution with trained professors in the field of analytical chemistry and instrumentation for giving effective training in these areas. Recognizing that the offering of such training would be of tremendous importance in the industrial development of the country, the University of San Marcos in Lima requested ICA to assist in the modernizing and broadening of the department of chemistry. Three years ago ICA entered into a contract with the University of New Hampshire to carry out such a program of assistance at the University of San Marcos through the training of professors and the provision of a modest amount of equipment basic to the training program. This very successful program will be completed in June 1960.

#### NEAR EAST-SOUTH ASIA

**Turkey:** One of Turkey's major problems is the erasure of illiteracy. Since 50 percent of the conscripts for military service are unable to read and write the Turkish Ministry of National Defense and the U.S. military mission found themselves seriously handicapped in their efforts to develop modern military units. A project for literacy training in the armed forces was launched in the spring of 1959 under the joint effort of the Turkish Ministries of Education and Defense, the U.S. military mission and the ICA technicians were furnished from the USOM Education Staff and the Georgetown University contract team temporary housing by the U.S. military mission. Every 2 months 11,000 recruits enter the literacy training programs. Four such groups have completed the 2-month course. Materials have been developed and produced for use in literacy education. Results to date indicate that a high percentage of recruits emerge with an effective degree of reading and writing ability; some of these are being given advanced training in preparation for promotion to officer status. Many are selected to continue literacy education in their communities upon their discharge from the Army. Followup reading materials are now being prepared for use by the newly literate.

**Jordan:** Jordan, which had no organized teacher education program prior to ICA assistance in 1952, now has preservice training facilities for about 500 and has increased its in-service training and summer school programs for teachers from approximately 200 to 2,500 annually. This growth has been due primarily to the efforts of ICA and the Jordanians who have put into practice that which they have learned, under the auspices of ICA.

**Afghanistan:** Afghanistan is one of the border countries of the free world. While Soviet bloc economic assistance activity is present in Afghanistan, the U.S. program is the only bilateral effort which is presently permitted in the field of education which is of paramount importance in the battle for men's minds. It already affects (a) higher education through assistance which is being given to the college of agriculture and engineering, to the university administration, and to the affiliated institute of education—and through the quick acceptance of many

of the recommendations made late in 1959 by the University of Illinois team which carried out a comprehensive survey of Kabul University; (b) teacher education through the Institute of Education and in-service teacher training courses; (c) a large segment of elementary and secondary education; (d) vocational industrial education through the Afghan Institute of Technology; (e) vocational agriculture, through the vocational agriculture school developed under the program; and (f) a major project in the teaching of English as the "second language" of Afghanistan. Plans for an even more intensive program of action in education are presently under discussion with Afghan authorities.

**India:** India's effort to develop her economy to meet the needs of a rapidly expanding population of some 415 million, requires a major effort to expand agricultural and industrial production, public works, transportation, irrigation, conservation and reclamation facilities. To make possible increases in industrial output there must be a sharp increase in the supply of engineers, an improvement in their quality, and at the same time an adequate corps of technicians must be trained to back up the work of the engineers.

Much has already been accomplished through the ICA technical cooperation program. During an initial phase from fiscal year 1953 through fiscal year 1958 assistance was provided, through contracts with American universities, for developing and strengthening 11 existing engineering educational institutions. During that phase, which ended in fiscal year 1958, 45 U.S. engineering professors served a total of 67 man-years in India, and 60 Indian engineers were trained in the United States, primarily for staffing the engineering colleges.

A second and more intensive phase is now under way. In this program, technical cooperation is concentrated on developing a new program of graduate study and engineer teacher training in five leading engineering institutions. New contracts for this purpose, replacing old contract activities, were signed during fiscal year 1960 with the Universities of Wisconsin and Illinois, and a third university contract is scheduled to come into effect late this fiscal year. In another project, 170 Indian engineering educators have been brought to the United States with approximately 200 more to come by the end of fiscal year 1961. New plants (or enlargement of present plants) are being constructed for these five institutions and their curriculums are being revised. Thus, an impressive start has been made on measures to meet the present engineering teacher shortage which has been estimated at 1,500 teachers. Plans for the development of a major Institute of Technology at Kanpur are progressing rapidly, in addition to the projects mentioned above.

Meanwhile, the supply of technicians will have to come from schools providing vocational training. India has decided upon a far-reaching development of the "multipurpose higher secondary school," which can provide not only candidates for university training, but some training in vocational areas as well. The vocational phase of the existing multipurpose high schools, however, needs to be more adequately developed. A technical cooperation project is now concerned with providing assistance in this respect. Twenty-six multipurpose higher secondary schools, covering all of the states of India, have been selected as demonstration schools. Curriculums have been worked out and accepted; an Ohio State University contract team has participated in some 92 workshops, seminars, and conferences—many of which were directed especially toward vocational education; plans have been drawn for four regional vocational teacher-training colleges; and a program for participant

training in the United States, beginning in this fiscal year, has been adopted, involving key Indian personnel for the multipurpose higher secondary scheme.

#### FAR EAST

**Vietnam:** The development of Vietnam, especially its human and economic resources, is dependent in a large measure on the educational opportunities provided for its people. Since 1952, assistance has been given in providing adequate leadership and facilities for the training of teachers, professors, and administrators in academic, professional, and vocational fields. A total of 172 participants have been sent abroad for study in the fields of elementary and secondary education; teacher training (normal school, college, and university); leadership training; and technical vocational education. Approximately 34 inservice training workshops have been conducted with over 3,000 people in attendance. Between 1956 and 1958, 900 students completed beginning courses in the English language.

While there has been a severe shortage of trained and skilled personnel which accounts in part for a low and undiversified agricultural and industrial production the basic problem has been an acute shortage of schools and equipment. They are woefully inadequate at every level. It is estimated that there are from 750,000 to 1 million children of elementary school age not in school primarily because of a lack of facilities. As a means of attacking the problem, assistance has been given with the construction of badly needed buildings and classrooms. From 1952 to 1959, 2,156 elementary school classrooms and 192 secondary school classrooms have been constructed with U.S. assistance. Working drawings for 38 new science laboratories have been made and 16 of these facilities have been completed and equipped.

A new national normal school with a capacity of 1,000 students has been erected, and partially equipped, in Saigon, and another new normal school with a capacity for 50 students in a rural area. A new faculty of letters building with a capacity of 1,200 students has been erected and partially equipped. Plans have been made for the construction of (1) a new elementary demonstration school for the national normal school, (2) two new rural normal schools, and (3) a new faculty for pedagogy building with a secondary demonstration school. Facilities for the new Phu Tho Vocational School have been completed except for the installation of heavy-duty electric wiring in the school shops. The preparation of architectural plans and arranging for construction bids is well under way for the Hue Technical School and Nha Trang Apprentice School.

Without the necessary instructional materials teaching and learning are severely handicapped. To meet the urgent need for textbooks USOM assisted with the printing of approximately 1 million copies of such basic texts as arithmetic, physics, civics, history, etc., of which 80 percent have been already distributed to the schools.

**Korea:** Through higher education the economic development of a country may be greatly accelerated. In Korea, Seoul National University has been given assistance with 4 of its 12 colleges. Eighty-three of the 122 Seoul National University staff members who were sent to the United States for training have been returned to the university and are actively engaged in using improved teaching and research methods, development of curricula, and general administrative leadership.

**Cambodia:** The reduction of illiteracy through education is a major concern to many countries in the Far East, including Cambodia. To meet, in part, the pressing emergency of providing some training for new teachers, who are greatly in demand,



a series of summer schools has been offered. To date, approximately 6,000 teachers (fresh graduates from the sixth grade) have received their only training in these courses. As a means of providing more adequately prepared teachers, a national elementary teacher training center for approximately 500 students was built and equipped.

**Thailand:** The effort to improve education in Thailand has been an outstanding example of cooperation between United States and Thailand. Achievements to date include the training of 11,000 teachers in regional centers, 12 countrywide conferences with 1,800 educators participating and 60 workshops and seminars. Approximately 20,000 teachers received inservice training. A large number of these teachers had only a seventh grade education.

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

The regional English project aims to increase the numbers and standards of English-speaking persons in Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam. There are four phases in this project: (1) Analysis of the local language of each country, (2) preparation of teaching materials for teacher training, (3) establishing an improved training program, for teachers of English as a second language, and (4) training secondary schoolteachers in at least one major institution in each country.

Progress to date shows that No. 1 above has been completed and in step No. 2 the completed drafts of texts and manuals for teacher training in the three countries have been made and drafts started for the lower level of secondary schools in Thailand. Phase 3, the training of teachers to teach English as a second language, indicates the following accomplishments: (1) Curricula for teacher training programs completed; (2) 70 teachers of English trained in the regular course of instruction; (3) in-service training seminars held for 160 teachers in the rural areas; (4) instruction of 25 students in English at the Faculty of Letters in Saigon; and (5) four teachers have been sent to the University of Michigan for 2 years of advanced training.

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

**Mr. DOWDY.** Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

**Mr. DOWDY.** Mr. Chairman, as in former years, I am opposed to this foreign aid bill, and more so with the swollen amounts herein authorized.

I can neither justify nor rationalize giving away our resources, and putting this greater burden on American taxpayers, who are already suffering under an overwhelming tax burden. Furthermore, our national debt is so huge that

only wasters would think of making gifts of money that we do not have.

I fail to see how anyone could vote for these gifts to Communist alien dictators, and actual as well as potential enemies, when there are so many needs and needy people here in our own country. These huge sums of money would better serve us and our economy if kept here in America. I hope the majority will join me in bringing this fantastic scheme to an end.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have voted for this legislation in past years. I am going to vote for it today—and with no apology to anyone. I voted for it because I consider it to be in the national interest of my country. A little over 20 years ago there was a man by the name of Hitler in this world. There were Members then who said that Hitler was a man of peace. I can remember 3 months before Pearl Harbor, on a bill to extend the selective service act for 1 year, that bill passed this House by only one vote—by a vote of 203 to 202. Those of us who voted for the bill were called warmongers. Where would our country have been after Pearl Harbor—where would our country be today if those of us who voted for the bill which was passed by only one vote, had not done so.

Mr. Chairman, it is one thing to discuss the policy and theory of a program and it is another thing to criticize certain actions or to talk about instances of corruption in a program. I do not believe that I am justified in "cutting off my nose to spite my face." A little over 20 years ago, we saw Hitler take over the Ruhr. He was allowed to get away with it, hoping that he would be satisfied and stop. But, he was not satisfied and he did not stop. Then he went into Sudentenland. He was allowed to get away with that—again in the hope that he would be satisfied. But, of course, he was not. He then went on and took over Austria. They let him get away with that, hoping that he would be satisfied, but he was not. He went in and took over Czechoslovakia, and they let him get away with that, hoping that he would be satisfied, but he was not. Then came the pact of Munich. Chamberlain went back to England with his umbrella, parading as an apostle of peace. Then came the ravage of Poland and World War II.

What does it mean? You have lived it. I have lived it. Have we forgotten it? It means that uncertainty and weakness and lack of firmness is the road to war. We find symptoms around the world today of the same kind. If anyone here thinks Khrushchev is a good boy because of his wooing conversations, they had better wake up quickly from their dream world.

We pick up the paper this morning and find where the Soviet Union spurns the United States plea on disarmament. You heard Khrushchev several weeks ago talk about the ability of the Soviet to destroy the world with their nuclear power. The intent of world communism has not changed, to revolutionize and dominate the world. The techniques only have changed. There is no change

in what they intend to do. If anyone thinks there is a change, they are living in a dream world today.

Now, this legislation—I am talking about a program—certainly it stopped Greece from becoming communistic. It has stopped other nations from going communistic. Europe would have been communistic 12 years ago if we had not done what we did. We did it in our own national interest. It certainly would not be for the interest of the United States to have the world dominated by communism. Oh, my friends speak against this bill. Their motives are just as good as mine, but their judgment on the selective service bill was not as good as mine. I judge no man, but I have a judgment. This legislation is a part of our national defense. It is in the national interest of our country. Oh, they come down here and talk about some students. Then they create opposition against the whole program. What will happen if we do nothing? What would have happened 10 or 12 years ago if we had done nothing? Italy would have been communistic. France would have been communistic. Greece would have been communistic. It would have been a communistic-controlled world against America. So I am for this program in no apologetic way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

**Mr. O'HARA** of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before the confusion spreads, let me contribute a bit of light to the subject of a proposed educational program for tropical Africa, which was mentioned by my good friend from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and my other beloved friend, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The special program for Africa is included in the special assistance authorization, and our committee has been assured that \$20 million will be allotted to this program. In my opinion, it will prove one of the wisest investments we have ever made. The Secretary of State says that in the foreseeable future Africa may have as many as 30 or 40 seats in the United Nations. The wealth of Africa is tremendous. Its future is a challenge to imagination. If we lose Africa, the understanding friendship of her new governments, the hearts and minds of her people, we have lost the world.

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

From this program now under consideration of 90-day training courses for African civil servants will come men and women reasonably prepared to operate the governmental machinery in these emerging African nations. Is there anything foolish about that? Help, too, will

be given to existing colleges in tropical Africa and aid in the opening of new schools. Is there anything foolish about that?

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

We have almost missed the boat in tropical Africa. We have been so absorbed in the Far East that we almost forgot there was a continent of Africa. Now we are trying to do something, something sound and constructive which will reach into hearts and minds and create lasting friendship, and I do not like to see any of my colleagues come into this well and give the impression that this is a case of spending the good money of the American taxpayers for foolish purposes.

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

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

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

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

My last point—

Mr. Gates said—

concerns the return we receive on our investment.

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

Today we and our allies are in a far better posture. The armies receiving military assistance have increased from 3½ to 5 million men—

Adding my own comment, that 5 million men added to our own competent U.S. forces of approximately 2½ million men gives us 7½ million men in the free world to defend us. Reading further— allied navies have increased from 1,000 to 2,200 combat ships; allied air forces have increased from about 17,000 to over 25,000 aircraft, about half of which are jet. All allied forces are better trained, better equipped, and better able to perform their assigned missions in the framework of our total strategy. Their self-confidence is

strong. Their determination to resist has become steadily firmer. They know that the United States stands with them and, accordingly, when the going gets tough—as it can be made tough by the Communists even in time of peace—they do not falter or fall back.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. The gentleman said they would not love us, or trade with us. Is there not the great danger that they may become covetous and there is danger actually from that standpoint?

Mr. FULTON. Yes; that is a very good philosophic and religious comment. There is no doubt we will be one of the most hated groups in the world if we do not accept our world responsibility for mutual security and progress.

Let me show you what would happen. Shall we pull our troops back of the 38th parallel in Korea, and let the whole country cave in by withdrawing the support for South Korean forces jointly holding the line with us? Shall we pull our support from Formosa and let Red China endanger and breach our U.S. Western defenses based on the island chain in the western Pacific? Shall we withdraw our support of Greece and Turkey and Pakistan, and let the Middle East fall and head for its destruction? Should we withdraw our support of Israel in her good progress, even under great difficulties, when she is unjustly barred from use of the Suez Canal? Shall the U.S. people barricade everyone in his own house and in his own city and try to defend against all comers? Or shall we in the United States be good citizens of the world and take just a little less than 1 percent of our gross national product in 1 year to help our neighbors

and be a good Samaritan to help these fine people do the job necessary to be done for their security and progress?

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

When our people in the executive department choose and use Boston College as well as Johns Hopkins University, two excellent and responsible institutions for training purposes for top personnel to improve the management of this worldwide program, there can be no insinuation about the value we will receive from either of those high-standing institutions. We will receive full value and more.

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

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

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

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

I have in my hand this bill, chapter by chapter.

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

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

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

The distressed areas bill is nothing more and nothing less than a point 4 bill for the hungry and the jobless in the States of the United States of America. Yet the Committee on Rules says, "Six to six, no rule," and we will be forced to resort to the difficult Calendar Wednesday tactic to give this House an opportunity to vote on this measure, but we will overwhelmingly support this request of the President for foreign aid. And I will support it. Now, you bleeding hearts, who all day yesterday and today proclaimed to high heaven and to this membership, Mr. Chairman, and asked to help the distressed areas of the world, I come to you in these 5 minutes, and every one of you who votes for this bill—you are the ones to whom I speak—every one of you who votes for this bill

and does not appeal to the Committee on Rules to send the point 4 program for America here, I say, listen: We need one vote. We need one vote in the Committee on Rules. Six Democrats voted for that rule and no Republicans voted for it. Two Democrats did not vote for it. Four and two are six: six to six. Now, give me one vote. My friends, in 30 States we have 5 million unemployed, and if you do not know what a depressed area is, God forbid you ever find out. If you do not know, I hope you never will. So, on this day, Mr. Chairman, when you are going to help the underprivileged of the world and the distressed areas of the world, and when you and I vote for a point 4 program for the nations of the world, in God's name let us vote at least \$200 million out of this \$2 billion for a point 4 program for your brothers and sisters at home. I will vote for this.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATEMENT OF POLICY

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

"(f) It is the sense of the Congress that inasmuch as—

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

"(2) the purposes of this Act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under this Act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this Act, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways;

assistance under this Act and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be administered to give effect to these principles, and, in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this Act or arising under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, these principles shall be applied, as the President may determine, and he shall report on measures taken by the administration to insure their application."

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The continuing Egyptian action of preventing the passage of Israeli ships

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

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER I—MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Military assistance

SEC. 101. Section 105(b)(4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to conditions applicable to military assistance, is amended by striking out "1960" and inserting "1961" and striking out "1959" and inserting "1960".

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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

"ANNUAL AUTHORIZATION FOR MILITARY ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 101. Section 103(a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to authorizations of appropriations for military assistance, is amended by striking out "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal years 1961 and 1962" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1961."

And reletter the following section accordingly.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, last year when the House approved the mutual security legislation for 1959 the authorization for military assistance was retained on an annual basis. However, in conference with Members of the other body, the House conferees accepted a change in the language which in effect gave an open-end authorization for 3 years for military assistance. I would like to read to the members of the committee at this time the authorization language as it now stands in the legislation:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal years 1961 and 1962 such sums as may be necessary from time to time to carry out the purposes of this chapter, which sums shall remain available until expended.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, what we did in adopting the conference report last year was to give the Executive a blanket authorization for whatever sums might be appropriated for fiscal years 1961 and 1962. That is one of the main reasons why today we are dealing with an authorization bill of only \$1,318,400,000 while in the reasonably near future we will be considering an appropriation request of over \$4 billion subject, of course, to the action of the Committee on Appropriations.

My amendment, if adopted, would not reduce the program by a single dollar but

would terminate this open-end authorization for military assistance at the end of fiscal year 1961, and would require the executive branch to come up before our committee next year and offer a new request for a new authorization for military assistance, instead of being able to carry on with no authorization required, as they are at the present time. As I have said, that is one of the reasons that the authorization bill is so much less than the contemplated appropriation request this year.

The same thing was done with respect to the Development Loan Fund, but I understand that the authorization for the Development Loan Fund will expire at the end of fiscal year 1961.

I do feel very strongly, Mr. Chairman, that this program, whether one supports it or opposes it, should be subject to continuous review and continuous scrutiny by the appropriate committees of the House to the extent that although we do have hearings on the military assistance portion of this program there is no need for us and no need for the administration to ask us to authorize a single penny for military assistance. That is because of the language adopted in the conference report last year. This open end authorization which the House, when the bill was initially passed last year, did not adopt, was adopted subsequently in conference. That open end authorization should be terminated and we should insist that starting next year, when we have the fiscal year 1962 bill before us, we should have the administration go back to the customary practice of requesting annual authorizations.

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

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

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

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

This new procedure did not originate in the Foreign Affairs Committee or in the House. The mutual security bill passed by the Senate last year abandoned the practice of annual authorizations for military assistance and provided a continuing authorization of appropriations for this purpose. In conference a compromise was reached which included a specific authorization for fiscal

1960 and such sums as may be necessary for 1961 and 1962. This compromise was accepted by the House and is now contained in the law.

Mr. BENTLEY. If the gentleman will yield, it removes the 1962 date.

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

I still have an open mind as to whether this action of last year is a good idea. One reason for doing as we did was that the Executive wanted to include the military assistance appropriation in the regular military appropriation bill. They said that waiting for an annual authorization would make this impossible.

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

The gentleman from Michigan next year will have left this great legislative body for greener pastures. He has been an outstanding member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I value his work on the committee. He has worked very hard on this bill and has been one of the outstanding leaders in helping to eliminate waste and inefficiency in the program.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure it is understood that the fact that in these 2 fiscal years no ceiling on military assistance is established in the MSA authorization bill does not mean that the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the House of Representatives thereby lose control over this \$2 billion program. No ceiling is legislated annually on appropriations for our own Armed Forces, and that is a \$40-billion-a-year program. The Committee on Armed Services does not bring before the House every year an authorization bill saying that the Committee on Appropriations is authorized to appropriate for our Defense Department not to exceed X billions of dollars. Each year the Committee on Appropriations determines what it believes to be the proper amount and

brings it to the House for action. The waiver on military assistance authorizations adopted last year on the initiative of the other body was to try out for 2 years the same mechanism that we have consistently followed without any difficulty in providing for our own armed services. If you look through the hearings, you will find that our Committee on Foreign Affairs had extensive discussions this year on the military assistance program. You will find the record of detailed testimony by Secretary of Defense Gates and his staff. It begins on page 69. There was a long session with Admiral Felt who is in command of all our forces in the Pacific, beginning on page 535; and one with General Norstadt and his associates dealing with all aspects of our military assistance programs and the armed forces of our allies in the NATO or European-Mediterranean theater. It begins on page 673. Our committee and the House of Representatives can at any time take action, either in this bill or in a separate bill, to modify the military assistance policies and programs or to put any limitation we wish on the amount of money that can be appropriated for that purpose. In no sense do we lose control of the military assistance program by having this waiver in the bill.

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

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

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

Mr. JUDD. Yes; that was one reason. Another reason was the desire to make possible more long-range planning with regard to the foreign components of our national defense, as we do now for the domestic aspects of that defense.

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

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

The other body wanted to make this waiver of annual authorizations a permanent arrangement. In the conference we compromised on 2 years. That is enough to give us a fair trial. In 1962, automatically, this matter will come back to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and to the House of Representatives when it considers this legislation, to decide whether to extend the waiver for a further period or allow reversion to the previous practice of annual authorizations.

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

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

Mr. JUDD. No authorization will be required.

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

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

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

Renumber section 101 on page 2 as section 102.

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

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

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

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

This is recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 21, 1959.

I asked Chairman MORGAN of the Foreign Affairs Committee whether mutual security funds would be used for this purpose, when he discussed the Conference Committee Report. He said, "I do not think that is involved unless it is involved in military money for the NATO organization." This is recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 22, 1959.

When Congressman BENNETT of Florida offered an amendment to the Mutual Security Appropriation Act to prevent the use of funds for this purpose, subcommittee Chairman PASSMAN said:

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

This appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated July 28, 1959.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. MEYER. I would ask the gentleman to consider withdrawing his objection. I seek no special favors, but I do want to explain the issue as thoroughly as I can.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

It is possible to change my amendment, to modify it so that we would make it apply only against the actual transfer of the nuclear weapons warheads themselves. This would at least definitely prevent such a transfer which earlier was contemplated by the administration, and even suggested as possible without congressional authorization. However, the latest reports are that President Eisenhower, in a letter to Premier Khrushchev, said:

The United States has no present intention of sharing nuclear weapons with its allies.

I think an amendment of this type will reassure our own people and the rest of the world that we are going to try to prevent a nuclear war. I say in conclusion that this is not only a moral issue but it is also a practical issue, because there is no sense to having a nuclear war, because we cannot win it—no country can win it. The danger of spreading this weaponry to many countries is a risk we cannot afford to take.

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

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

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CHAPTER II—ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

##### Defense support

SEC. 201. Title I of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to defense support, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 131(b), which relates to general authority, strike out "1960" and "\$751,000,000" and substitute "1961" and "\$675,000,000", respectively.

(b) In section 141, which relates to conditions of eligibility for assistance, strike out "No such assistance" in the second sentence and substitute "No defense support or military equipment and materials".

(c) In section 142(a), which relates to agreements, strike out "No assistance" in the introductory clause and substitute "No defense support or military equipment and materials".

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADAIR: On page 3, line 8, strike out "\$675,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$625,000,000."

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is one which is easy to understand. It would reduce the defense support funds by \$50 million. Those Members of the House who feel that we are authorizing too much money in this bill can take a step in the direction of correcting that by supporting this amendment. It would reduce the defense support funds authorization from \$675 million to \$625 million.

By way of comparison, it is interesting to recall last year's figures on defense support. Last year the executive request was for \$835 million. The authorization as it came out of conference was for \$751 million. The appropriation was \$695 million. So, between the executive request and the final appropriation there was a reduction from \$835 million to \$695 million.

This year the executive request was for \$724 million and the authorization as proposed by the committee is for \$675 million, a reduction by the committee of \$49 million.

My amendment would reduce that by an additional \$50 million and would still leave available for defense support purposes \$625 million. It ought to be called to the attention of the House that this would constitute a modest reduction in view of the fact that we have a very large amount of money available for economic purposes through the Development Loan Fund.

As I pointed out yesterday, one of the arguments used in support of the Development Loan Fund was that it would make necessary a smaller amount of grant aid money for economic purposes. In spite of the fact that there has already been appropriated \$1.4 billion for the Development Loan Fund with a request for a further appropriation of \$700 million, this year, making a total of \$2.1 billion. I am asking for only a very modest reduction in this defense support authorization.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge that the Committee adopt this amendment which I am sure will not harm the program but will, on the contrary, improve it. Closer scrutiny of expenditures would be required and this would make a better program for a smaller amount of money.

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

Mr. Chairman, the committee has studied this section on defense support very carefully. I think we have cut the funds to a bare minimum. As the gentleman suggested, last year the authorization request was for \$835 million. The

committee cut it to \$750 million. Finally the appropriation was \$695 million. Now, this figure in the bill is \$49 million less than requested this year, \$20 million less than appropriated last year.

This defense support money goes to 12 countries; most of them are right up against the Soviet-Sino border. These are countries that are facing the Communists every day. They have over-extended their military forces. They have larger armed forces than their economies can maintain. This is strictly economic aid we give them to support their economies so that they can support armed forces of 3 million men. This is money that is actually needed to keep forces right on the Communist line. I think a cut of \$50 million would do serious damage to 12 of our best friends, and I oppose the amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Defense support does not go for military hardware, that is true, but defense support is used for the purpose of maintaining and sustaining the soldiers for which we contribute money for military assistance.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not true that the maintenance and support of the soldier falls within expenditures from military assistance funds and that

the defense support funds are used for the economic support of the recipient countries?

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we need to remember that while defense support is indeed economic assistance, it is economic assistance for a military purpose. There is more of our own national defense in this particular item than in anything else in the bill because this is the economic assistance that enables 12 exceedingly important countries to maintain the armed forces we believe to be necessary for their and our defense.

Our military planners first sit down with these countries that are strategically located and have the will to defend themselves to the extent of their abilities. Together we determine what they need and ought to have in the way of air force or army or navy. Having agreed with them upon the desired level of forces, we estimate how much they themselves can provide for the support of such forces. We furnish the difference, which is defense support.

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

If Members of the Committee will look at page 20 of the report, they will see what it costs to provide just the pay, allowance, subsistence and clothing of one American soldier. It is \$3,859 per year. At the other end of the scale is shown the cost of the same items for a soldier on Formosa. It is \$167 a year. It makes graphically clear how beneficial and essential defense support is for our national defense. It has already been cut as deeply as prudence will permit.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. If I may quote from the committee report at the bottom of page 22, in answering this question about the military users of this money, I will read the following:

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

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

Mr. JUDD. Let us take the case of Turkey as an illustration. Turkey is a country whose location and whose superb armed forces make it vital to the whole Middle East. The Turks were disciplining themselves to the utmost to maintain their armed forces. Unrest began to develop among the common people of Turkey because they could not make any headway or see any hope for improving their living standards. Obviously you cannot maintain good morale in a soldier at the front, no matter how many weapons he has, if he knows that the standards of living of his people at home are going down instead of rising. Furthermore, loss of confidence in his government develops. So more defense support had to be provided. Some is for specific projects, such as my friend from Indiana has read, and some of the aid is for nonproject support of the economy. Otherwise the country simply could not maintain the armed forces that we, ourselves, want them to have in our own national defense.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

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

Mr. JUDD. Some of these funds could be and probably are used to support the budget of the Republic of Korea; and some of that budget goes for support of its armed forces and police forces, just as some of it goes for education and for health and for highways and for agriculture. The recent events in Korea cannot be condoned. It is pretty hard to get full democracy in a country divided, still at war, and under constant threat. That is a painful fact. But an equally important fact is that without the 19 first-rate Korean divisions which defense support makes possible, with many of them guarding the demilitarized zone as they are today, we would have to send and support in Korea a good many more than the 2 American divisions we have there.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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

"(a) In the first sentence of section 131(a), which relates to the authority of the President to furnish defense support, insert, immediately before the period at the end thereof the following proviso: 'Provided, That all documents, papers, communications, audits, reviews, findings, recommendations, reports, and other material which relate to operations or activities under this title are furnished to the General Accounting Office and to any committee of the Congress, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, charged with considering legislation, appropriations, or expenditures under this title, upon request of the General Accounting Office or such committee or subcommittee as the case may be.'"

And reletter the following subsections accordingly.

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

Mr. MORGAN. If the gentleman will yield, I am not going to oppose this amendment. I recognize that it is of vital importance that the committees of the Congress should have access to detailed information about the operation of the mutual security program if they are to be able to discharge their function of legislative oversight.

There have been occasions in the past in which information has been kept from the Congress with the result that wasteful practices were allowed to persist. The most serious problem relating to the mutual security program today is the quality of its administration, and I am convinced that the best guarantee that the administration of the program will

be improved is that Congress do a better job of riding herd on it.

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

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

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

The problem of securing necessary information has been difficult for committees of Congress on both sides of the Hill. One of the major difficulties has been the President's frequent introduction of this so-called doctrine of executive privilege to which the gentleman has just referred. I do not fully agree with what the gentleman has said on this subject. However, I believe that any discussion of executive privilege at this time would be completely academic because it is not applicable to the amendment I have offered.

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

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

Mr. MONAGAN. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY]. I have been privileged to serve with the gentleman as a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and I have had a chance to see the difficulties which executive agencies have placed in the way of the committee in its job of following the foreign aid program. In many cases these agencies have thrown up roadblocks which have prevented our com-

mittee from following out the task set for it by the Congress.

I believe in the objectives of the foreign aid program, but only by constantly reexamining this program can these objectives be attained and only by constant vigilance on the part of Congress can the administrators of the program be kept to the course charted out by the Congress itself.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

SEC. 202. (a) Section 202 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to general powers of the Development Loan Fund, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) The Fund shall not allocate or commit funds aggregating in excess of \$100,000 for use in any country under this title unless (1) an application for such funds has been received for use in such country which is supported by sufficient engineering, financial, or other data to indicate reasonably (A) the manner in which it is proposed to use such funds, (B) the economic and technical soundness of such use, and (C) the practicability of such use, or (2) the President determines it to be in the national interest to use such funds pursuant to multilateral plans."

(b) Section 205(a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to management, powers and authorities, is amended by striking out "Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs" in the first sentence and substituting "Secretary of State".

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

Adoption of this amendment will make it much more clear that the Congress intends to inject better business management into this loan program, indicating a seriousness of purpose and intent. We will at least know the stated purpose of each project and will thereby have a logical basis for ultimate evaluation of that program.

Such business practices also should help generate some respect among nations which have reached the status of economic responsibility at the point where they seek to borrow rather than receive gifts.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there has been a foreign handout bill to come before the House in my memory that Adolf Hitler has not been conjured up as one of the reasons why it was necessary to continue lading out money all over the world. That goes for the Draft Act too. Hitler is dead—the Draft Act was passed some years ago; the old dictators remain and some new ones have been added. We have fought two wars since that Draft Act was passed, but still we hear about Hitler and the Draft Act. When the appropriation bill comes up to provide the money for this giveaway program, I have no doubt that we will hear more about Hitler and the Draft Act.

Reference was made to the distressed-areas bill. I say to you—continue this program—continue the development loan program, all the rest of the soft loans, plus this giveaway program, and you will have more, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], if he is on the floor—you will have more and more distressed areas in the United States. There will be more New England fishermen on the beach. There will be more coal miners unemployed. There will be more steelworkers unemployed. Just continue to put up loans—soft loans—loans that if they are ever repaid, will be in Yugoslavian dinars and Indian rupees and so on and so forth; currencies that cannot be taken out of the foreign country, to build more textile plants and more steel mills and more power-generating plants overseas. Yes; you are going to have more distressed areas in this country. There will be more of you around, hat in hand, seeking funds from Congress for the unemployed in your districts. Surely you are not unaware of the fact that in the last session of the Congress, the House passed a bill to provide Federal subsidies for the building of fishing trawlers for the New England fishing industry. Why? Because of foreign imports. The countries that are providing the frozen fish fillets are the beneficiaries in almost every instance in some form or other of the foreign handout program. I repeat, continue to vote for this kind of legislation and you are going to have more unemployed, and more of you will be around begging for more funds for distressed areas. Incidentally, how about some of those countries to which we are making gifts and uncollectible loans and which are buying U.S. securities? As I understand it, they now own some \$11 billion of our securities. How silly can we get—giving money to foreign countries and they, in turn, buying our securities?

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARDY as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. KYL: On page 3, line 23, strike out "\$100,000" and insert therefor "\$50,000".

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment for this reason. As the chairman of the committee has indicated, the language which this bill contains is a modification of an amendment which I sent to the committee for

its consideration. Now I suggested the figure of \$100,000, with the idea that there are occasions when some planning funds are needed, which ought not to be completely eliminated. It may be the figure of \$100,000 is excessive and I am perfectly agreeable to reducing it to \$50,000, but in spite of that fact, I want to keep this thing just as tight as I can and keep it on a businesslike basis, but I still think there is a need for a limited amount of authority excepted from the restrictions of this subsection.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARDY: On page 3, line 22, strike out "or commit" and insert in lieu thereof "reserve, earmark, commit, or otherwise set aside."

On page 3, line 24, strike out "(1)".

On page 4, line 4, strike out all that follows "use" the second time that word appears, down to the period in line 6 on page 4.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, the problem with which this amendment seeks to deal was discussed in considerable detail when members of my Government Operations Subcommittee recently had the privilege of visiting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I want to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Doctor MORGAN, for inviting us. I think the kind of cooperation which has been developed between our two committees is likely to produce improved legislation, based not only on an analysis of the needs which the mutual security program seeks to fill, but taking into account also the quality of performance. It is our desire to be helpful and I believe that the kind of results now being achieved are those which the Legislative Reorganization Act had hoped for.

I like to think of our visit with the Foreign Affairs Committee as a joint discussion of the problems with which we are mutually concerned. At that time I agreed to suggest amendatory language designed to put an end to the abusive practice of "earmarking." I was disappointed to observe the extent to which the committee had altered the language which I later suggested.

The amendment which I am offering now is essentially the same as my original recommendations to the committee, which included at the beginning the words "allocate, reserve, earmark, commit, or otherwise set aside".

There was and is a very good reason for including all of these terms. The

reason is simply that they have all on occasion been employed by the executive branch to circumvent technical requirements of the statute and to avoid restrictions which Congress had intended. The committee in its action eliminated several of these terms which I feel must be included in the legislation.

Another alteration of my amendment which this bill contains permits a broad waiving of the restrictions of this section virtually at Presidential discretion.

If the President delegates this authority, as he has delegated so many others under the Mutual Security Act, then the authority to waive the provisions may be in the hands of the same officials whose commitments and earmarking activities in the past have led to the need for this amendment.

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

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HARDY. I yield for that purpose.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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

On page 4, line 5, strike out all that follows "President" and insert "personally determines with respect to each such allocation, reservation, earmarking, commitment, or set aside that it is in the national interest to use such funds pursuant to multilateral plans."

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

The President personally determines with respect to each such allocation, reservation, earmarking, commitment, or set-aside that it is in the national interest to use such funds pursuant to multilateral plans.

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

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. I appreciate the genuine cooperation of the gentleman and the



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

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

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make three observations about the Hardy-Carnahan amendment we are about to vote on. First, the prohibition on advance allocations, reservations, earmarks, commitments, or set-asides by the Fund definitely applies to any formal action by the Fund's Board of Directors which would either bind the Fund or constitute a basis for representing to the Congress that a given sum cannot be used for other purposes. It does not mean that the Fund's staff cannot, or should not as prudent bankers, informally discuss priorities of various proposals with prospective borrowers, or internally prepare work programs and give special attention to applications from key countries. It should be noted here that just last year the Congress directed in section 202(b) of the act that the Fund "in its operations shall recognize that development loan assistance will be most effective in those countries which show a responsiveness to the vital long-term economic, political, and social concerns of their people, demonstrate a clear willingness to take effective self-help measures—" Obviously assistance to projects and programs in such countries are to be given priority.

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FEIGHAN: Page 3, immediately after line 16, insert the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

On another occasion Tito said:

I wish, comrades, that Poland and Yugoslavia—which are much criticized for practicing some national communism, which I consider nonsense—ought to show that they have no use for any national communism.

Some naive people believe that Tito is neutral. Tito in his own words refuted this idea.

In June 1956, Tito visited Stalingrad as a guest of the Russian leaders and

here is what he said in a public address made in response to the welcoming statement:

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

Assistance to Yugoslavia is a classic example of abuse in the use of foreign economic assistance and a prime reason why the assistance program is falling into discredit. We should stop assistance to Communist dictators. We should stop assistance to all dictators who deprive their people of the basic human freedoms. When people are deprived of the basic human freedoms, their nation cannot qualify as a free nation. It is the policy of Congress to assist free nations.

The record of Tito and the Yugoslav Government in the United Nations is one of almost complete support of the Soviet Union.

We are spending billions of dollars of U.S. taxpayers money in an effort to preserve freedom throughout the free world and to defeat communism, which is utterly opposed to our way of life, and which seeks to impose its base tenets and tentacles upon the United States and every other free country of the world. I cannot understand any logic that provides that the means to defeat communism is to support and to provide communism with U.S. taxpayers' money.

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

I urge adoption of my amendment.

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

First, it is quite well known that I am in opposition to totalitarian governments, and I certainly am not going to praise Tito or to defend him. I do want to make clear, however, that the money provided in this bill for Yugoslavia is not to promote Tito or communism. It is to assist the people of Yugoslavia. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to page 61 of the committee report. Section 143 states:

In furnishing assistance to Yugoslavia, the President shall continuously assure himself (1) that Yugoslavia continues to maintain its independence, (2) that Yugoslavia is not participating in any policy or program for the Communist conquest of the world, and (3) that the furnishing of such assistance is in the interest of the national security of the United States.

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

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

The gentleman's amendment would discontinue all aid to Yugoslavia upon the enactment of this legislation and would very likely drive Yugoslavia into

the Soviet. All Soviet bloc credits to Yugoslavia were canceled in 1958, and no new Soviet credits are at present anticipated. I wish to point out that there is no military assistance to Yugoslavia in the legislation before us.

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

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

It is very difficult for the United States to take any action which will improve the lot of or advance the liberation of the people in the European satellite countries.

The United States is not ready to go to war to liberate the satellites and it is not either to our or their interest to incite them to premature revolution. There are limits on the value of directing propaganda to them since they are already aware of the advantages of freedom and do not need to be reminded of them.

Assistance to Yugoslavia does contribute to the promotion of the independence of the satellite countries.

Each satellite is governed by Communist bureaucrats. These officials take orders from Moscow. It is in our interest if we can encourage these bureaucrats to think of themselves as having a national interest and a national identity rather than as being Russian stooges. If they occasionally regard themselves as Czechs, or Bulgarians, or Poles, and as having an obligation to their own countries rather than to the Soviet Union, it is worthwhile.

Tito serves as a constant reminder to the satellite countries that a nation may avoid becoming completely assimilated into the Soviet Union.

It must be conceded that Tito is a Communist, a dictator, and that he would very likely not be elected President by his own people in a free election.

It must be conceded also that he tries to remain on good terms with both the Soviet Union and the United States, and that he seeks assistance from both sides. If we discontinue the limited amount of assistance provided for in this bill to Yugoslavia, may cause Tito to seek all of his assistance from the Soviet Union. We close the door, bring down the Iron Curtain, and make it impossible for us to penetrate into that area. Therefore, in spite of these facts I submit, it is in the interest of the United States to continue to provide assistance to Yugoslavia. Under this bill authorization is planned only for a small amount of economic and technical assistance which is to the benefit of the people of Yugoslavia. No military aid is programed for Yugoslavia.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an excellent time and place to put in the Record some more information regarding Yugoslavia. The gentleman from Wisconsin says we are giving them only a little aid. Let us take a look at this unclassified list of what we are doing under the Development Loan Fund alone for Yugoslavia. Here is a \$5 million so-called loan for 20 diesel locomotives, \$5 million. Incidentally, as I said earlier today, those locomotives are being bought abroad, not manufactured in this country, using our workmen, our coal, our steel, and so on and so forth. There is fertilizer plant, \$22.5 million. A thermal powerplant, \$9 million, and a hydroelectric plant, \$15 million. Does the gentleman still say we are giving them a little aid? All of that is in addition to the military assistance and other handouts to Yugoslavia.

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

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Let me add this: Most of these so-called loans, soft loans, are being made for 20 to 25 years, at 3½ percent interest and they are to be repaid almost altogether in the currency of that country. If ever paid, it will be in the currency of Yugoslavia. What American taxpayers, who have put up the dollars, will do with the dinars I do not know. Oh, yes; there is more than a little aid going to Yugoslavia.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

which are required under section 143. When you talk about giving money or assistance to Yugoslavia to keep them from the camp of the Soviet Union, they are already in the camp of the Soviet Union; they are part and parcel. And, if there is any question of a showdown, it is patently clear that the Yugoslavs, according to the words of Tito, will go along with the Communist conspiracy headed by the Kremlin.

By giving aid to Tito, we are strengthening his tyrannical grip over the people of Yugoslavia. Aid to Tito does not contribute to the promotion of the independence of the satellite countries, instead it shows the Communist countries that they can still be Communists and still get assistance from the United States. Aid to a Communist regime appears to me to be a strange method of telling the enslaved people that the United States is against communism.

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

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

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

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

Mr. POFF. I recently had occasion to read an article on that subject, and I wonder if the gentleman would yield further so that I might direct that question to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Of course I yield for that purpose.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

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

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

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FEIGHAN) there were—ayes 36, noes 62.

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

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TECHNICAL COOPERATION

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

(a) In section 304, which relates to authorization, strike out "\$179,500,000" and "1960" and substitute "\$172,000,000" and "1961", respectively.

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

(1) In subsection (a), which relates to contributions to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and related fund, strike out "\$30,000,000" and "1960" and substitute "\$33,000,000" and "1961", respectively.

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

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

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

A report on the continuing study provided for in section 503(c) was recently submitted to the Congress by Under Secretary Dillon. This report contained some frank predictions as to what we could expect in the way of reductions and termination in gifts and grants. It is encouraging to me and I know to other Members of the House who want to see the overall program cut down to size, that termination of almost half of the 22 defense support and special assistance programs can be foreseen within the next 5 years.

This year, as the result of the detailed study provided for in section 503(c), we have seen a \$115 million reduction in the amount requested for these two categories of economic assistance for fiscal year 1961 below the amount requested for the same program last year. I am pleased to note that the committee has reduced these requests by an additional \$61.5 million. This reduction may seem slight when we think in terms of the

costs of the overall program but at least it represents a start in the right direction.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This year, assuming that the President's request for funds is approved, the almost \$6 billion in previously appropriated unspent sums will make a total of almost \$10 billion that can be spent during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960. Despite these tremendous expenditures, the foreign aid program is still beset by many of the haphazard operations that have characterized it since the beginning. While progress is being made toward cutting down the program in some areas, waste and inefficiency remain large scale in others. Administering agencies have built themselves into gigantic self-sustaining bureaucracies now numbering 43,000 permanent personnel with an additional 10,000 trainees.

Last fall, a study mission composed of members of our own Foreign Relations Committee completed a 40,000-mile world tour to study the effect of the foreign aid program in areas which have been receiving our aid. The report of this study group is replete with further examples of lavish, unnecessary spending. It concluded by calling for an immediate review and reappraisal of the foreign aid program because it is not "reaching the people." It also cited the pressing need for greater supervision of

its farflung activities. To these recommendations I can only add a sincere "amen."

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

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

In short, we no longer discipline ourselves by hard judgments on what we hope to accomplish or to whether there is a reasonable prospect of accomplishing it. This failure of discipline has given to the foreign aid program unattainable objectives, limitless cost, and accounts for practically all its trouble; the waste, the inefficiency, and the irritation of the recipients with their benefactors.

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

But first, we are going to have to abandon the notion that the U.S. Treasury is a perpetual fount, spouting forth tax dollars to every nation under the sun just because these nations are underdeveloped or in serious financial straits or happen to want some U.S. dollars. The long range objectives of promoting friendship for the United States among the lesser developed nations of the world has too often not been attained. Because I do not think that we have received benefits commensurate with the nearly \$80 billion we have poured into this program, I intend to oppose again this year any additional funds for this purpose especially with such large sums remaining unspent and I am hopeful that the Congress will again see fit to substantially reduce the amount requested for foreign aid.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 5, immediately after line 6, insert the following: "(c) Repeal section 308, which

relates to the International Development Advisory Board".

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the passage of this section without reduction of the amount requested in this section with regard to technical cooperation. This is an area which should be approached in light of our real national purpose. This is an area where we assist people, where we lend aid to the needy, where we stand ready to meet our obligations to the rest of mankind.

I have listened to the criticism of the opponents of this program on both sides of the aisle, who each year oppose the program. Some conscientiously oppose—others with a meat ax in their hand and lacking the slightest acquaintance with the real need or purpose of the Mutual Security Act try to ridicule it with isolated instances of inefficiency and waste.

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

The authorization request for fiscal year 1961 is \$172 million. The technical cooperation programs reach people more directly and more immediately than any other form of aid. Critics who argue that our aid does not reach down to people should support this program. This is an area where we should increase the program rather than decrease.

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

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

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

The amount programmed for Africa in fiscal year 1961 is \$24,300,000, an increase of \$3,350,000 over the current year. This increase understates the funds for Africa since at the time the budget was prepared it was not apparent that the Belgian Congo, the Mali Federation, Madagascar, and other former colonies would secure their independence.

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

I urge the passage of the whole amount. Nations that we have helped in the past have indicated a readiness to join us in aiding the underdeveloped nations. Their participation should be

encouraged. Our faith in the program is the best type of encouragement.

Let us act responsibly and maturely, with patience and understanding toward the old nations and the new; let us vote favorably in this program with no further cuts in these vital areas.

It is perhaps a great opportunity to demonstrate to all nations and all people that we are interested not only in containing communism but that we are interested in making life more worthwhile for those who, but for the United States, would be without hope.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

**SPECIAL ASSISTANCE AND OTHER PROGRAMS**

Sec. 204. Title IV of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to special assistance and other programs, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 400(a), which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and "\$247,500,000" and substitute "1961" and "\$256,000,000", respectively, and add at the end thereof the following: "It is the sense of the Congress that so long as it is the policy of the United States not to sell or furnish armaments to any one nation in the Near East, no part of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section should be used for the purchase of armaments by any other nation in the Near East."

(b) In section 401, which relates to the United Nations Emergency Force, strike out "1960" in the second sentence and substitute "1961".

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

(d) In section 403, which relates to responsibilities in Germany, strike out "1960" and "\$7,500,000" in the first sentence and substitute "1961" and "\$6,750,000", respectively.

(e) Insert after section 403 the following new section 404:

"Sec. 404. INDUS BASIN DEVELOPMENT.—The Congress of the United States welcomes the progress made through the good offices of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development toward the development of the Indus Basin through a program of cooperation among South Asian and other nations of the free world in order to promote economic growth and political stability in South Asia, and affirms the willingness of the United States, pursuant to authorities contained in this and other Acts, to participate in this significant undertaking. In the event that funds appropriated pursuant to this Act are made available to be used by or under the supervision of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in furtherance of the foregoing purposes, such funds may be used in accordance with requirements, standards, or procedures established by the Bank concerning completion of plans and cost estimates and determination of feasibility, rather than with requirements, standards, or procedures concerning such matters set forth in this or other Acts; and such funds may also be used without regard to the provisions of section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1241), whenever the President determines that such provisions cannot be fully satisfied without seriously impeding or preventing accomplishment of such purposes."

(f) Amend section 406, which relates to migrants, refugees, and escapees, as follows:

(1) In subsection (c), which relates to contributions to the program of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, strike out "1960" and "\$1,100,000" and substitute "1961" and "\$1,500,000", respectively.

(2) In subsection (d), which relates to the continuation of activities undertaken for selected escapees, strike out "1960" and "\$5,200,000" and substitute "1961" and "\$3,500,000", respectively.

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

(h) In section 407, which relates to Palestine refugees in the Near East, strike out "1960" and "\$25,000,000" in the first sentence and substitute "1961" and "\$18,500,000", respectively; and strike out the proviso in the first sentence.

(i) In section 409(c), which relates to ocean freight charges, strike out "1960" and "\$2,300,000" and substitute "1961" and "\$2,000,000", respectively.

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

(1) In subsection (b), which relates to certain expenses of administering nonmilitary assistance, strike out "1960" and "\$39,500,000" and substitute "1961" and "\$40,000,000", respectively.

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

(k) Section 412, which relates to the President's special education and training fund, is repealed.

(l) In section 419(a), which relates to atoms for peace, strike out "1960" and "\$6,500,000" and substitute "1961" and "\$3,400,000" respectively.

(m) Add the following new section after section 420:

"Sec. 421. LOANS TO SMALL FARMERS.—It is the policy of the United States and the purpose of this section to strengthen the economies of underdeveloped nations, and in nations where the economy is essentially rural or based on small villages, to provide assistance designed to improve agricultural methods and techniques, to stimulate and encourage the development of local programs of self-help and mutual cooperation, particularly through loans of foreign currencies to associations of operators of small farms, formed for the purpose of joint action designed to increase or diversify agricultural productivity. The maximum unpaid balance of loans made to any association under this section may not exceed \$25,000 at any one time; and the aggregate unpaid balance of all loans made under this section may not exceed \$10,000,000 at any one time."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENTLEY: On page 5, line 15, strike out all after "that" through the comma on line 16 and strike out "other" on line 18.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want at this time to express my personal appreciation to the chairman of our committee for the very kind remarks he made about my work on the committee earlier in the day, and to say as I have said in the past, that it is with very deep regret I say goodby to him and to my other colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Affairs at the close of the 1960 year.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is merely for the purposes of strengthening a very desirable portion of this bill.

which was written in by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It was the feeling of the committee that with respect to special assistance, which the committee understood was being used by certain countries in some cases for the purchase of armaments in the Near East, even though special assistance is basically economic assistance, that in view of the unsettled conditions in the Near East, and in view of the tensions that not only exist but can be aggravated by unrestricted sales or purchases of armaments in that area, it was felt, as I say, by the committee that special assistance should not be used by any country in the Near East for the purpose of purchasing armaments, but should be limited entirely to economic assistance as, of course, is the intent of the special assistance section. I did feel when this particular language on page 5 was adopted by the committee that some confusion might possibly arise owing to the fact that there are countries or one country at least in the Near East to whom, I believe, under no circumstances would we sell or furnish armaments at the present time. I, therefore, felt that language would be clarified and strengthened by the adoption of my amendment, which would make the language read as follows:

It is the sense of the Congress that no part of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section should be used for the purchase of armaments by any nation in the Near East.

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

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield.

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

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, this merely clarifies and makes certain that the intent of the committee is fully carried out with respect to the so-called fifty-fifty act. I have taken this up with the chairman and with Dr.

Judd, and they assure me there is no objection to the amendment.

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

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

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

Moreover, if the witness of the State Department before the Committee knew how his own Department was administering the Cargo Preference Act, it would have been crystal clear to him that the authority to waive cargo preference was absolutely unnecessary. Never has our shipping law been administered on the basis of each particular project within a broad aid program. It has always been administered overall to each geographic area. It would, therefore, have been entirely proper, should the situation have developed, for American ships not to carry any of the Indus River project cargoes, provided that other aid programs to that area were administered in such fashion as to give American ships 50 percent participation overall. This is so completely obvious that the Department, apparently seeking to save face, issued a release on April 19, 1960, in which it said, referring to the extent of American-flag participation in Indus River cargo, that—

Should this amount prove to be lower than that required under the cargo preference legislation, it was believed that compensating adjustments in other MSP-financed traffic patterns would obviate the need in the near future to request actual use of the waiver authority.

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

Now, for a moment as to the principle involved, completely apart from the specific law that is asked to be waived. I have been a consistent supporter of the foreign-aid program, and I am impressed with the monumental burden undertaken by our taxpayers in supporting these various programs. In part, this tax burden was compensated for by the stimulation of the American economy and job creation in the production of goods and services for shipment abroad. But recently, the emphasis has shifted to stretching the aid dollar by increasing procurement abroad. This may make our dollar go further, but it certainly does not bring anything back into the American economy. Now, we are faced, in section 404 of the present bill, with an entirely new proposition. This runs to the effect that because our money in tremendous proportions is being commingled with the small amounts of moneys of other countries and the total sum is to be administered by the International Bank, long-standing American laws shall be set aside. On page 236 of part 2 of the hearings, we are advised by its advocates that it is essential that the International Bank "have the authority to allow the use of our funds in accordance with the requirements, standards, or procedures of the International Bank." To date, they have chosen to set aside our maritime laws for at least 10 years in the future. When next are our health and safety laws to be set aside, and what then will the excuse be? When is our farm legislation to be set aside? When will progressive labor and social security legislation be set aside? And what sort of pretext will be advanced for that?

Without equivocation, and I doubt if there is a Member of this body who will disagree with me, I do not think my constituents would appreciate giving away a substantial portion of the United States and, in addition thereto, setting aside American legislation as a necessary prerequisite. For us to yield our money is one thing; to yield our principles and law, quite another.

I, therefore, am heartily in favor of specifically providing in the present legislation the amendatory language suggested so as to assure that our basic legislation is not eroded.

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

Mr. Chairman, section 404 of this bill provides for participation by the United States in the Indus Basin development project—a billion-dollar undertaking in which the United States would be putting up some \$515 million of a total of \$645 million being contributed by six countries including the United States. In addition, the World Bank, which will be administering this project, is putting up \$103 million, and the two countries in which the project would take place,

namely, India and Pakistan, will also be making some contribution in local currency.

Because the funds which will be appropriated for the Indus Basin under this bill will be administered by the World Bank the Department of State has anticipated the possibility of a problem in administering one of the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, namely, the matter of cargo preference in connection with the shipment of materials deriving from our mutual security assistance programs. To cover this point the final clause of section 404 provides for waiver of the provisions of section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, as amended, in connection with this project whenever the President determines that such provisions cannot be fully satisfied without seriously impeding or preventing the accomplishment of the purposes of the program.

This matter of waiver of our cargo preference statutes in connection with the Indus Basin Project is a matter of great concern to the entire steamship industry. The waiver provision goes so far beyond the requirements of the situation that one wonders whether there is not some purpose behind it other than that of which we and the Congress have been informed. The State Department, speaking for the administration, has advised that there is no immediate necessity for waiver but that authority for it has been requested in the event waiver should be found desirable in the future; and that in any event the shipping industry should not be concerned because any deficiencies resulting from this project can be compensated from within the regular mutual security program for the area. Under Secretary of State Dillon advised the ocean steamship industry to this effect in a letter to Ralph E. Casey, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, dated April 11, 1960, from which the following is quoted:

As we have explained to the Congress and to you and your associates, we do not foresee need to exercise this authority in the near future. If the present programs of assistance under the Mutual Security Act were to continue at approximately present levels over the period of time that will be required to complete the Indus Basin project, we could probably be reasonably confident that no necessity to waive the provisions of the cargo preference legislation would arise.

In this same letter Secretary Dillon advised the industry that "we anticipate ability to compensate within the regular mutual security program for the required proportion of the tonnage deriving from implementation from the Indus Basin project."

It is just this kind of logic which has caused our industry such concern. If section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act can be administered in the manner in which Secretary Dillon proposes—and we agree that it can—why, then, is a waiver needed? Would not the effect of such waiver authority be to relieve the Department from its obligation to compensate for these cargoes in the manner in which they say they are willing and plan to do? For this reason I urge that it be made clear in the language of the

bill itself that this waiver authority, if granted, will not be used as a mechanism for avoiding the promised compensation from other mutual security programs.

It has been suggested that an appropriate means of accomplishing the above would be to append a clause at the end of the present waiver provision to the effect that in the event of exercise of this waiver any deficiencies in section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, resulting from the exclusion of this program will be compensated for to the extent possible from other mutual security programs in the same area. Such an amendment is nothing more than putting into language of the waiver authority that which Secretary Dillon has advised the Congress and the industry he plans to do as a matter of administration.

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

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

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

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

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

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman.

I want to join the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], in expressing appreciation for the cooperation of the committee. We favor the Indus Basin

project. We do not want to do anything to hurt the project, but we want to protect our Cargo Preference Act.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Minnesota mentioned New Zealand. Well, we are getting tons of dressed lamb and other materials from New Zealand and Iceland. At the same time, we support wool at approximately 100 percent of parity. That is some more of the folly of this entire international program.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Some fantastic arguments have been used in support of the proposed waiver of the cargo preference law. It is asserted, for example, that the World Bank opposes it. As a matter of fact, the United States is putting up most of the money for the Indus Basin project.

If cargo preference statutes are to be waived in this kind of a case, it will set a very dangerous precedent. It will also strike a body blow to our merchant marine and maritime policy.

The State Department does not claim that a waiver is necessary, but vaguely suggests that the waiver might be desirable in the future.

Under Secretary Dillon went beyond this view and stated definitely that the Department did not foresee the need of this authority in the near future.

Furthermore, the Secretary stated that the Department expected to be able to compensate within the regular mutual security program for the required proportion of the tonnage derived from implementation of the Indus Basin project.

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

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

In view of these uncertainties and the threat to the merchant marine, I think that the language such as proposed by the gentleman should definitely be incorporated in this bill.

In fact, the best result from a legal, as well as an administrative, standpoint might be by striking out this unnecessary waiver authority.

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

I cannot see any objection to this amendment because it would merely write into the bill the requirement to do what the State Department has advised us it plans to do anyway.

Let us not put further penalties on our merchant marine. I think it is the overwhelming wish of this Congress to support, sustain, and protect the merchant marine and we should not hesitate to do it.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

The forces of international communism are fully aware of the opportunities presented to exploit the nationalistic movement in Africa for their own political ends. They have been doing so at an increasing rate, covertly through their usual methods, and overtly through rather massive economic and technical assistance in chosen areas. The record indicates that through and by the stability and good sense of the African people themselves, communism has not gained a significant foothold on the continent. There is convincing evidence that the Africans who have but recently freed themselves of foreign control will not, except by force, permit themselves to come under a new domination alien to them in every sense of the word. There

are many indications that the African peoples and leaders will be vigilant and uncompromising in rejection of all political subversion masquerading as friendship and assistance.

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

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

The total economic aid in this year's program for Africa will be \$115 million for special assistance, plus \$24.3 million for technical cooperation. We are hopeful that this amount will be increased in the future when the results in economic development are visible. Both African and outside observers agree that for a long time to come the principal assistance required by the emerging states is, first, education and training, and, second, development assistance, which includes private investment and public financing.

The United States has but lately become involved in providing a share of the educational, technical, and development assistance so urgently needed in Africa. In the cultural exchange field there are now more than 1,700 African students in the United States. Next year our Government hopes to finance 500 educational exchanges, 400 of them to bring Africans to this country, 100 for American teachers, professors, and specialists to work on the African Continent.

These are good beginnings, but they are not good enough. As the most materially favored nation in the free world, we must accept a larger responsibility in meeting this challenge. We are called upon to play a new and a more positive role in responding to the needs of these countries and in sharing with them our human and material resources. The peoples of the African Continent are looking to the United States to see how it will respond to their needs and prob-

lems. Our answer to their needs shall not be found wanting.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLF: On page 9, immediately below line 7, insert the following:

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

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

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

"(2) the United States will pay the costs of transportation of such commodities to ports of debarkation;

"(3) such commodities shall not replace in the countries of use the usual domestic production or imports of the same or similar commodities;

"(4) such commodities shall be used solely for domestic consumption in the country to which exported, and shall not be reexported nor shall such commodities be used to replace commercial exports from the United States;

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

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has great appeal and we understand and laud its objectives. Everyone wishes that it were possible to get more of our bountiful surpluses of food and fiber into the hands of people who need them, without disrupting world trade, and so on. But after a careful reading of the

amendment, it seems to me that it is outside the scope of this bill and outside the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WOLF. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. JUDD. I reserve the point of order.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I do not wish to yield until I have completed my statement. I feel my

position very strongly. But I would be happy to yield for any questions when finished.

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

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

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

There is no question that in many of the underdeveloped countries the rate of progress which our technical aid would make possible would be accelerated if the underfed peoples could be assured of adequate diets.

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

Now, what does this amendment do?

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

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

I would like to accentuate this matter of the schools.

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

Such commodities shall be used solely for domestic consumption in the country to which exported, and shall not be re-exported, nor shall such commodities be used to replace commercial exports from the United States; also such commodi-

ties shall not replace in the countries of use the usual domestic production or imports of the same or similar commodities.

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

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

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

I was pleased with the comments of the gentleman from Minnesota when he said he was in favor of multilateral organizations and in favor of working with multilateral organizations just now. He made a fine speech on behalf of my proposition and I thank the gentleman.

On March 25, 1960, I received a letter from Martin Hill, Deputy Under Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations, after I made several trips up there at my own expense to talk to their leaders and the heads of various departments of the United Nations. I quote the following from this letter:

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

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

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

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

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

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

The surplus-reduction program proposed in this amendment promises to alleviate one



of the most perplexing and distressing problems in the American economy, the problem of our vast and growing agricultural surpluses.

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

The latter makes the liberal's duty on this legislation very clear. The liberal measures legislative values invariably, though not exclusively, by social and human need. His senses of justice and morality are shocked by the very existence of food and fiber surpluses in a world which leaves a majority of its population inadequately clothed and poorly fed. And his same senses are shocked in the extreme by the knowledge that these surpluses rot in storage bins while many nations find economic and social progress impossible simply because their energies are wholly consumed in the quest for the food and fiber they must have to survive.

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

But I am equally certain the conservative, whose creed stresses fiscal solvency and whose political instincts seek the economic justification in every legislative measure, also sees the merit of the bill.

Our surpluses are now so vast that their storage is a heavy economic burden.

I would like to anticipate some of the questions that I expect will be asked.

What is the difference between this program and Public Law 480?

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

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

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

Secondly, I would like to point out, and perhaps the most important point brought out when I discussed this program with the gentlemen in the economic section of the U.N., they believe that by our leading, we can encourage other nations with surplus resources to begin to put food and other surplus resources together collectively through the U.N. to further increase the program. This is just another method by which we can shift the burden, at least in part, to

other countries with surpluses. I am thinking of countries like Australia—with wheat and meat surpluses—Argentina, France, and other northern European countries, and Canada, just to name a few.

Will not this create competition for our own industries?

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

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

It is costing us much more to hold these commodities here in storage bins, and they are doing no one any good. It is simply a question of cost analysis. Over a 10-year period we can save \$1,540 million in storage costs alone. Our transportation cost to the farthest point in the world would be only \$400 million. Second, we are making these commodities available to countries who want to help themselves. We have the vessels available. The recipient countries do not have vessels available. Neither do they have the money to pay for vessels or transportation. Neither does the U.N. have the money to pay the transportation. The only way these commodities will ever leave our shores is in this manner.

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

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

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

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

What is the administration doing about food for peace now?

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

Why were not hearings held on this amendment?

I would like to state that public hearings have been held on the floor of Congress at the time I introduced this amendment with 27 cosponsors. We had a general debate on this proposal.

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

The proposal was discussed at the World Food and Agriculture Organization where I went specifically to discuss ways to implement this program.

Last year the amendment was offered during the debate on the mutual security program, just as it is being offered to-

day, and at that time there was strong support and a clear understanding of what this amendment would do. Hardly a day passes without some prominent Government leader mentioning the desirability of such a program. The President himself every few days has something to say about the value of food for peace both at home and in his many travels abroad. I think adequate hearings have been held before the American people and before the Congress on the need of a food for peace program.

Mr. Chairman, the hungry of the world cry out to us in their need. They are aware, our enemies have seen to that, that we have these bulging warehouses full of food and our apparent reluctance to share fully our abundance. We must expand greatly and soon our program of food distribution. Christian charity and humanitarianism demand this of us. Let us demonstrate to the needy of the world our desire to raise them up by adopting this amendment.

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

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

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Iowa on the amendment. I support the amendment. There is no form of capital that we can more easily make available. There is no form of capital that would be more welcome abroad. There is no form of foreign aid that we can give that we can be more sure will actually help the peoples of the world. There is no form in which aid can be given that would be better than the 10-year program against the year-to-year program under which we have been operating. I think this is an excellent amendment; I hope it will be approved by the committee.

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

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

To me, this legislation makes good sense. I want to put our surplus agricultural commodities to work. And I can think of no better way to do this than by putting them to work in behalf of a lasting world peace.

It is difficult for us in the United States, where overproduction by farmers is a constant problem, to realize that in many areas of the world people are constantly faced with a shortage of food. Many nations are hard pressed to meet the day to day food requirements of their people. They do not have large reserve stocks to pick up the slack in the event of droughts, floods or other natural disasters which curtail production.

There should be an internationally created food reserve upon which nations which suffer temporary shortages could call for help.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that other nations of the world would join the United States in making food and fiber available to this food reserve.

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

Passage of legislation such as we have proposed today will demonstrate once more to the world the dedication of the United States to the ideal of peace. Once more, we will say to the world, "When you are in trouble, share in our abundance."

Millions of people throughout the world look to the United States for leadership today. Whether we like it or not, we cannot escape our role as leaders in the free world. Enlightened self-interest demands that we do all we can to help other nations become economically strong. People who are convinced that their economic self-interest will best be served under a democratic form of government will have little, if any, sympathy for Communist propaganda.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will give careful and sympathetic consideration to this legislation. By agreeing to make surplus commodities valued at \$250 million available annually to the United Nations over a 10-year period, we will not only be taking a step that will greatly strengthen our foreign policy, but will also be acting to solve the surplus commodity problem for this country.

There can be no doubt that until the present large surpluses are worked off, we cannot really get down to the task of writing a farm program that will be fair to the farmers and will operate at a minimum cost to the taxpayers.

But bear in mind that this is not primarily surplus disposal legislation. First of all, it would be a deliberate attempt on our part to use our surpluses to the greatest advantage, to bring help and relief to people anywhere who are in trouble. It would reinforce our present efforts to help peoples and nations help themselves.

This is sound legislation, Mr. Chairman, and I am proud to be among those sponsoring it on the floor today.

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

Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] insist on his point of order?

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I refer to volume 105, part 9, page 11298 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where the Chairman, Mr. MILLS, is quoted.

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

The Chair has had an opportunity to examine the amendment, also the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, particularly title IV thereof, which has to do with special assistance and other programs, and calls attention to the fact that in title IV there is specific mention of surplus agricultural commodities pursuant to the Agricultural Trade, Development, and Assistance Act of 1954.

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

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

Mr. JUDD. Yes, Mr. Chairman, just one further word. I realize that this point of order was overruled last year, but it is my understanding that the amendment this year is not in the same form as it was last year.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

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

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, did not the amendment last year say something about "in order to further implement the foreign policy of the United States as outlined in the Mutual Security Act," or something of that sort?

I have the wording of the amendment now and it began:

In keeping with the purpose and objective of the Mutual Security Act, to assist in stabilizing economies, to promote the use of the greatest asset of the United States, and to help eliminate famines and hunger in ways that will promote economic development—

And so forth. I thought that the difference made it subject to a point of order this year as contrasted with the decision made last year.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is germane because legally, if it is the same subject matter and the same framework of language, that carries the same obligation or the same authority,

then the mere statement of intent by the individual submitting the amendment has no effect. So it is germane.

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

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

The Chair has had an opportunity to examine the context and purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] points out, it is the opinion of the Chair that the overall objective and purpose of the amendment is the overall objective and purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman to the bill pending before the Committee last year. The gentleman from Iowa has referred to the language of the Chair at that time in concluding that the amendment then was germane to the legislation pending. The Chair feels that this language is germane to the bill that is pending before the Committee at this time and therefore overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WOLF. With all due respect to my distinguished chairman, I should like to point out that I received a letter from the Deputy Under Secretary stating that they have no restrictions on

this amendment and there are no problems dealing with this amendment. I am sure, with all due respect to my distinguished chairman, that they know their business well enough to inform me if this is not correct.

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

Mr. WOLF. With all due respect to the good doctor, at meetings that I attended at the United Nations the very top leaders were there, with the exception of Dag Hammarskjöld himself, on several occasions. While this man wrote in his own behalf, he wrote as the Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs. I think in his capacity he was entitled to know his position.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; I realize it is the Deputy Under Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs, but I think such a modest expression of approval does not constitute complete United Nations approval of this type of program. I favor this type of program if it is handled right, but I do not think the mutual security bill is the place for it.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment because I think "food for peace" can be added successfully to the mutual security program, the foreign aid program, if anything can. When food is here in storage and costing us money it is not doing the United States any good.

I also would like to say in connection with the deliberations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that last year I offered a similar amendment. At the time the discussion went briefly to the effect that we had not had time to consider this measure thoroughly. Therefore, I withdrew the amendment. I would have thought that in the intervening year there could have been time to consider it more thoroughly. Last year there were no objections raised to the amendment other than on the technical grounds that the committee had not had time to consider and think about it. I should think that in the passage of a year we could have had that time. This most constructive proposal should be considered seriously now. We can do a lot of good with it. I cannot see any harm that would come from utilizing its good features. Therefore, I wish to support this amendment strongly.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL to the amendment offered by Mr. WOLF: After the

period at the end add a new sentence as follows: "Provided further, That no food or fiber products shall be donated or shipped abroad under provisions of this section which are not available through domestic programs to assist needy persons within the United States, and unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall have so certified prior to such shipment or donation."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues in this body are well aware, for a number of years I have been very critical about the distribution of food-stuff surplus to our needs in this country under Public Law 480. The Secretary of Agriculture has shipped abroad, edible oils like butter, margarine and cottonseed oil. He has shipped fruits and vegetables and canned meats, hams, and hamburgers. He has shipped abroad fresh and frozen and dried vegetables—fruits, canned and frozen, juices of various kinds and any number of other substances which have been denied to our people at home. Each time I have made this complaint, very little has come of it except that there has come up to this Hill a denial from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, the function of this amendment is very simple. It is to assure that if there is another foreign give-away program established that at least we will remember the simple axiom that charity begins at home, and see to it that the fruits of the labor of our taxpayers and the surplus commodities of our farms are given away to our own people at home first, and then are given away as they should rightly and properly be given away abroad to our suffering fellow humans.

I point out again that on many occasions I have visited with high officers of the Department of Agriculture and I have engaged in lengthy correspondence with them, and urged them to make available the fruits and fiber and vegetables and produce of our soil and farms to our people at home first, and then to give them away under these foreign giveaway programs next.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to speak for a few minutes to point out a couple of facts with respect to the distribution of food throughout the world. I have in my hand copy of a hearing held on January 28, 1960, in which the Secretary of Agriculture or his deputy agreed with the Secretary of State on the rate of distribution of these products and their sales to foreign countries. They said they did not think wheat could be sold in any greater quantity than it is at the present time even though ample authority and laws to promote such sales does

exist. They agreed on this rate of distribution and sales. I point this out for this reason. It takes more than law—it takes a change of administration, if we are going to push this kind of program. I am for this increasing world consumption of food. But, I think the only way we can have a change of administration of world food distribution this year is by a program operated through the United Nations. I know we are not going to get it through this administration in Washington because the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of State are in agreement that the rate we are pushing wheat now is the greatest that we should push it despite the fact that Russia is constantly gaining in their percentage of the world wheat market.

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

Nobody likes to oppose something that is designed to help feed needy people. But that is not as simple or easy to do as it may sound. Near the end of World War II we adopted what was called UNRRA. That was for relief and rehabilitation and also under the U.N. We appropriated \$3¼ billion to provide food, clothing, and all sorts of aid for hungry and needy people around the world. At that time many of us raised this same question as to just how it was to be administered. If it was to be administered by the International Red Cross, as after World War I, in such a way that the aid would certainly get to the people who needed it, it was one thing; if it was to be given to and through existing governments, including Communist puppet regimes being established in Europe and Asia, then it could become a weapon to defeat the objectives we had in mind. The latter course was adopted, and UNRRA became such a scandal that there was a terrible revulsion against it.

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

I commend the purposes of the gentleman from Iowa, but in proposing to turn so vast a program over to an organization, the United Nations, which has no administrative machinery for handling such a complicated operation, we could be turning over our food to help tyrants in the world hold down the people under them by giving food only to those who are willing to bow down before them. It could help defeat their own efforts to weaken and pull down from within their present oppressors.

This proposal must be given much more careful study and consideration before we adopt it. From the very standpoint of seeking to accomplish the praiseworthy thing that the gentleman from Iowa and all of us have in mind, we should vote this amendment down and let the matter come up before the

Committee on Agriculture, where it can be studied fully and in consultations with the responsible top officials of the United Nations. Then we can vote for something based not only on good will, hope, and prayer, but on plans and arrangements that are solid and give greater chance of succeeding.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Wolf].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Wolf].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. Wolf) there were—ayes 46, noes 93.

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

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CHAPTER III—CONTINGENCY FUND

SEC. 301. Section 451(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to the President's special authority and contingency fund, is amended by striking out "1960" and "\$155,000,000" in the first sentence and substituting "1961" and "\$100,000,000", respectively.

#### CHAPTER IV—GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

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

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

(b) In section 505(a), which relates to loan assistance and sales, insert after the first sentence the following new sentence: "Commodities, equipment, and materials transferred to the United States as repayment may be used for assistance authorized by this Act, other than title II of chapter II, in accordance with the provisions of this Act applicable to the furnishing of such assistance."

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

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

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

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

"(b) All nonmilitary flood control, reclamation and other water and related land resource programs or projects proposed for construction under title I, II, or III (except section 306) of chapter II, under section 400, or under section 451 of this Act, shall be examined by qualified engineers, financed under this Act, in accordance with the general procedures prescribed in circular A-47 of the Bureau of the Budget, dated December 31, 1952, for flood control, reclamation and other water and related land resource programs and projects proposed for construction within the continental limits of the United States of America. In all cases the benefits and costs shall be determined, and a copy of the determination shall be submitted to the Speaker of the House of Rep-

resentatives and the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. No such program or project shall be undertaken on which the benefits do not exceed the costs and which does not otherwise meet the standards and criteria used in determining the feasibility of flood control, reclamation, and other water and related land resource programs and projects proposed for construction within the continental limits of the United States of America as per circular A-47 of the Bureau of the Budget, dated December 31, 1952."

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

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

(2) In subsection (c), which relates to employment of personnel outside the United States, strike out "Director" in the introductory clause and substitute "President"; and insert before the period at the end of paragraph (2) the following new proviso: "Provided further, That Foreign Service Reserve Officers appointed or assigned pursuant to this paragraph shall receive in-class promotions in accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe".

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

(f) Section 531, which relates to security clearance, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 531. SECURITY CLEARANCE.—The standards and procedures set forth in Executive Order Numbered 10450, as amended or supplemented, shall apply to the employment under this Act by any agency administering nonmilitary assistance of any citizen or resident of the United States."

(g) In subsection (c) of section 533A, relating to the Inspector General and Comptroller, strike out paragraph (9) and renumber paragraphs (10) and (11) as paragraphs (9) and (10), respectively.

(h) In section 534(a), which relates to reports, strike out "six months" in the first sentence and substitute "fiscal year".

(i) In section 537(a), which relates to provisions on uses of funds, amend paragraph (3) to read as follows: "(3) contracting with individuals for personal services abroad: *Provided*, That such individuals shall not be regarded as employees of the United States for the purpose of any law administered by the Civil Service Commission;"

(j) In section 537(c), which relates to construction or acquisition of facilities abroad, strike out "\$2,750,000" and substitute "\$4,250,000".

(k) Add the following new section immediately after section 551:

"SEC. 552. ASSISTANCE TO CUBA.—No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to Cuba after the date of enactment of the Mutual Security Act of 1960 unless the President determines that such assistance is in the national and hemispheric interest of the United States."

#### PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF WEEK AND FOR WEEK OF APRIL 25

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the majority leader if at this time he can advise us of the program for the balance of this week and for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. If this bill is disposed of today, there is no further business for the remainder of the week.

As to the program for next week:

Monday there will be a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress to receive the distinguished and outstanding President of France, General De Gaulle.

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

Tuesday: At the present time Tuesday is undetermined. Of course, there are two primaries on Tuesday, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. I see nothing for either Monday or Tuesday now.

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

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

Friday and Saturday are undetermined.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because of a conflict in jurisdiction of this committee and the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which I am a member. The subparagraph on page 11, beginning with line 11 and ending with line 16, provides for adding eight positions. Four of these positions are above the classified positions of our Civil Service Act. Four of them are supergrades which come within the Classification Act. My amendment would eliminate these four supergrade positions which properly belong under the jurisdiction of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Prior to 1949 the grades in the classified civil service ran from 1 to 15. In 1949 the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported a bill creating 400 supergrade positions; that is, positions in grades 16, 17, and 18.

These positions were created because the agencies called on Congress to provide some supergrade positions in which to place employees of the intelligence necessary to properly supervise the activities of the agencies.

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

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

I want to say that we cannot control this matter of holding down the number of these positions unless the other committees of the House leave it in our hands and let us hold hearings and let these agencies come before us and justify these positions. If they do that, we

give these positions to them. The fact that the number has been increased to 2,075 from 400 demonstrates that we have done just that.

In addition to that, the Congress has also created 275 positions under Public Law 313 of a scientific nature which also are above the old level of grade 15. These scientific and professional positions have a salary limit of \$19,000 a year. The number is 275. Our committee also has jurisdiction over the creation of those positions.

I am offering this amendment because we cannot hold this thing down if other committees are going to reach out and grant these supergrade positions every time some agency asks for them. I realize, as you do, that the floor of the House is not the place to write legislation; but I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and I knew nothing of this until the bill and committee report came out. So at the first opportunity I am calling it to the attention of the House and I am urging as strongly as I can that these supergrade positions ought to be deleted from this bill. Let the agency come before the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and justify them.

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

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

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

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

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee will be unable to properly evaluate the need for the establishment of various positions unless every agency is required to present its case to that committee. Other committees should, in my opinion, recognize the great care that is shown by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to hear every request made by the various agencies. One committee should have the jurisdiction in this important matter. I hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that this section provides for four, not eight, additional supergrades and that the ICA and the Coordinator cannot draw from the Federal pool of supergrades. They are limited to the authority of the Mutual Security Act. Congress has been urging more effective control and coordination and better administration of the mutual security program. If we desire to be consistent, if we desire to see a more effective mutual security program, if we desire to have adminis-

tration and coordination of the program, it is necessary that we authorize at least four additional supergrades. This section provides four additional supergrades. The Department has identified 16 positions that require supergrade employees. Two in the Inspector General and Comptroller's office; two in the Office of the Coordinator; five in the office of DLF; two in the Department of Defense, and six in ICA. They suggested that they could use 16 and agreed upon 8. The committee allowed four. I think that in the light of these facts, it is in the interest of proper operation of the program that the amendment suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia does not prevail.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Why does not this outfit come to the proper legislative committee of the House for these supergrades?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Because, as I pointed out, they cannot draw from the Federal pool. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which the gentleman from Georgia is a very valuable and distinguished member, does not deal with the personnel for ICA or for the Coordinator or for the Development Loan Fund. The ICA and Coordinator may use Foreign Service officers. But few are available. Most of them do not have the experience in aid programs or do not have the technical requirements needed. Therefore it is necessary that four additional supergrades are authorized.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to say to the gentleman that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has jurisdiction over supergrades for all agencies, and if we establish a precedent of letting agencies come in a bill like this and ask for supergrade positions and get them, our control over supergrade positions is gone and we cannot hope to hold that prerogative.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Does the gentleman from Georgia maintain that his committee acted upon the 74 supergrade positions that have been authorized for the mutual security program in the past?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. No. I contend that we should act upon them and to bypass the committee in this way will destroy the control which that committee has over supergrade personnel.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Oh, yes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I respectfully suggest to the gentleman that we are not.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. You referred in your debate here and you also referred in the committee report to supergrade positions, and the act which creates supergrade positions is an act which places that jurisdiction in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and that is the committee which has jurisdiction over supergrade positions.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is not my understanding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. TABER. I do not know whether the gentleman has noticed it or not, but there have been many bills coming into this Congress carrying an increase in the number of supergrades. A great many of them have gotten by without the question being raised. If you are going to take away the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I wonder if the gentleman does not think that is very bad legislative procedure?

Mr. GROSS. Why, of course; that is why I have taken this time. The amendment ought to be adopted and this agency ought to come to the proper legislative committee and justify the necessity for these supergrade employees.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

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

I think the amendment ought to be approved.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is the view we have always taken.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the Chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not true that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has not been consulted about these additional supergrades?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. MURRAY. That comes under our jurisdiction and certainly we should be consulted about it.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman completely.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASEY: On page 13 add a new section immediately after section 552 between lines 9 and 10 as follows:

"SEC. 553. QUALIFICATION FOR ASSISTANCE.—No assistance shall be furnished under this act to any country or nation after the date of enactment of the Mutual Security Act of 1960 unless such country or nation levies and collects from its individual citizens, business associations and corporations taxes in proportion to and on a commensurate basis with the taxes levied by the U.S. Government on its individual citizens, business associations and corporations."

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, we are operating on borrowed money here today. We are talking about giving it and lending it to someone else, but we owe almost \$300 billion and I want to make sure that these countries that we do assist are doing all they can, at least equal to what we are doing, for themselves.

I pondered in writing this amendment how I could fix the yardstick. That is the only criticism. But we have some very good economists who are coming out in the papers every month telling us how much the cost of living has gone up, how much it is costing me more to maintain myself, my wife, and my children. They tell me each month that it has gone up one-tenth of 1 percent, or something like that. If they can figure that out that well, I think they can easily figure out whether or not a recipient country, under this act, is bearing its fair share with reference to taxing its own citizens.

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

I notice in the report that we have given aid to Japan in the way of technical assistance to help them step up their production and know-how. That is coming home to roost, too. I got a letter from a constituent the other day. He sent me these two hinges. He is in

the hardware business. Look at them. One of them is 25 cents a pair and the other one 17 cents a pair. They are exactly alike. One is made in Japan and the other made in the United States. I know there is a difference in labor costs. There is also, I will bet you, a difference in tax costs. We can tax our citizens and keep giving know-how and assistance to other countries, but if you do you will not have any corporations left over here to tax, because they will move overseas to manufacture these products.

I see nothing wrong with my amendment. I think it is a reasonable request, and I trust that you will see fit to adopt it.

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

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I just want to say that an amendment similar to this was offered last year. An amendment of this kind would destroy the program. Vote for this amendment and you vote against the program.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is exactly right. It is impossible for these undeveloped nations to tax their people at a rate equal to ours at this stage of their development. It would require financial sophistication of a level which is impossible because of their underdeveloped stage of development. It would also require enforcing facilities equal to the Internal Revenue agency that we ourselves have. Furthermore, as to the \$600 exemption that we have in our own laws, the per capita income of the people in most of these countries who need aid is far below the \$600 level.

I therefore urge that because of the impossibility of enforcing it and the possibility of this amendment's being applied to the underdeveloped nations we oppose this amendment.

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

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

Mr. CASEY. I do not see anything in that amendment with reference to a \$600 exemption or any dollar sign at all. It says in proportion to and commensurate with. I daresay that they would determine it in the case of each individual recipient on the basis of their cost of living, the average income, and what would be commensurate and proportionate. I do not think it would destroy the program at all. It would just make sure they would pay their own way.

Mr. GALLAGHER. We certainly would like them to pay their own way. The point is, it would take many years for them to develop to the point we have, and by that time the need for the program might have disappeared.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASEY), there were—ayes 36, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROUSH: On page 12, line 15, insert "(1)" immediately after "(h)", and on page 12, immediately below line 17, insert the following:

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

"(c) The annual presentation to the Congress of assistance proposed to be furnished under titles II, III, and IV of chapter II of this Act shall not be classified as "Secret", or bear any other similar security classification. All information concerning assistance heretofore or hereafter furnished under such titles II, III, and IV shall be freely available to the public. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require that military information be made public."

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, on the tables behind which sit members of the committee are seven volumes of presentation books containing information relating to the mutual security program. Each of these seven volumes bears the classification "secret."

The amendment which I am presenting at this time will take the secret label off those presentation books—except wherein the information deals with the military.

Why should such an amendment be adopted? It certainly is not proposed so as to weaken the program. If we are to have such a program as mutual security then I would insist that the program be as strong as we can make it. When that program does not have the benefit of public scrutiny and public criticism then I am convinced that it will not have that strength required. When that program does not have the benefit of publicity provided by our press, TV, and radio but rather finds itself hidden behind a veil of secrecy then the right to know is being seriously thwarted. When the detailed aspects of that program cannot be discussed, debated and deliberated here on the floor of this Congress as we sit in open session, then the democratic processes by which we through legislative action determine our country's course is being seriously thwarted.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, and colleagues, those volumes and the detailed information they contain are not open to the public's scrutiny, those volumes and the information they possess are not open to members of the press, TV, and radio in order that they in turn transmit knowledge and understanding to their vast audience of readers, viewers, and listeners. And, although I can go through these volumes and you can go through them and we can inform ourselves, this information which bears the classification "secret" cannot be discussed with our constituency, I cannot discuss it with members of my staff, I cannot have the benefit of research done by outside agencies such as the Library of Congress, because I cannot outline my request. I cannot stand here in the well of this House and debate and discuss these specific areas with my colleagues. The members of the committee cannot thoroughly inform us here on the floor. The committee cannot answer certain specific questions projected by the membership because of that "secret" label.

As I have listened to the debate I find that even the staunchest advocates of

this bill are critical of many things which are happening. I wonder if much of this is not the result of the fact that the information surrounding various phases of this program is not open to public scrutiny and discussion. We are a democracy. We are proud of the fact that the power of governing lies with our electorate. How can we, however, govern, how can we legislate if we are deprived of knowledge? James Madison once said:

A people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives. A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prologue to a farce or tragedy, or, perhaps both.

Could it be then, if this is true, that our lack of power and strength in this mutual security program lies in the fact that those who govern—the people—lack the knowledge from which power is derived.

Although I recognize the need for classification of information in certain military matters, even there it is overdone and I am convinced that the national welfare could best be served by greater disclosure of information. And, although I am aware of the arguments favoring this veil of secrecy in the mutual security program, I am convinced that they are heavily outweighed by the right of the people to know and through that right to know, cause strength to be generated within the program.

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

Mr. ROUSH. I yield.

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

Mr. ROUSH. Yes, they would.

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

Mr. ROUSH. If the gentleman will permit, I read in your report where there is a desperate attempt—or at least an attempt—to declassify information in order that we might have more information. I think if the declassification takes place the American people would benefit and this program would benefit. It would be a stronger program because of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH] has expired.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that it would be the happiest moment for the Communists if we would adopt this amendment. As the gentleman admitted, the material is available to responsible people. Any Member of Congress has access to the information in the classified presentation books. If we declassify them, by his own admission, such an action would give to the Communist agents information on the platter. Would this be in our national interest? I want to assure the distinguished gentleman from Indiana that this committee and this House is pressuring the executive to declassify information to the greatest ex-

tent possible; I repeat it would be a mistake to vote for this amendment. I hope it will be defeated.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. MORGAN. Is it not a fact that every year the committee goes through these books and insists that the executive branch declassify everything possible that is not vital to the security of this country?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is a fact.

Mr. MORGAN. Would not the opinions of our Ambassadors and generals of the effectiveness of the armed forces of other countries and of the competence of foreign officials which are contained in these books cause us embarrassment in dealing with other governments?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It would ruin our diplomatic relations with other countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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

"All nonmilitary flood control, reclamation and other water and related land resource program or project proposed for construction under titles I, II, or III (except section 306) of chapter II under section 400, or under section 451 of this act, shall be specifically authorized by the Congress when the aggregate cost is estimated at \$1 million or more."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I shall not consume 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the intent of the amendment is clear to the membership. I am sure my colleagues understand the Mutual Assistance Act better than I.

This amendment concerns only bilateral arrangements and nonmilitary arrangements. The Congress in its wisdom has for a long time exercised much greater control than this over projects in the United States.

It is not difficult to envision what might happen if we were to establish a new agency in the United States to consider our domestic rivers and harbors problems and take this function away from the Congress.

This amendment is simply an attempt to make the improvements which the majority of the Members seem to have deemed prudent in the last 2 days of discussion.

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

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

If the gentleman from Iowa will read the committee report he will see that there are not many \$1 million projects in the program any more. The number of projects of this type which would come under the provisions of the gentleman's

amendment is small. There are only 31 projects of any kind which amount to over \$1 million planned this year. If we as Members of Congress take this job of passing on individual projects in foreign countries we would be there until doomsday.

I think the amendment should be defeated.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROUSH: On page 13, after line 2, insert the following:

"(k) Amend section 537 by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(g) During the annual presentation to the Congress of requests for authorizations and appropriations under this Act for fiscal years ending after June 30, 1961, and within ninety days after the date of enactment of the Act making appropriations to carry out this Act in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, there shall be submitted to the Congress a detailed budget, on a country-by-country basis, showing with respect to military assistance, defense support, technical cooperation, and special assistance, the specific programs and projects to be carried out in each foreign country, the commodities, equipment, services, and materials to be furnished to such country, and the purposes in detail, for which funds requested, and funds otherwise available, will be obligated during the fiscal year for which the requests are made. Except where the President determines that the national interest requires that funds available for programs and projects detailed in any budget submitted pursuant to this subsection be transferred in accordance with section 501 of this Act to other programs and projects, funds appropriated, and funds otherwise available, for any fiscal year shall be available only for the programs and projects proposed, and commodities, equipment, services, and materials proposed to be furnished, as stated in the budget submitted for that fiscal year."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has just been read by the Clerk is the same amendment I proposed last year during a discussion of this bill. I might say in this connection that this particular amendment has a great deal of appeal to the people of the Fifth District of Indiana. In response to a questionnaire which I distributed throughout my district, over 92 percent of those responding favored such a program as stated in this amendment.

This amendment is not designed as a crippling amendment.

Its whole purpose and design is to give greater control over the mutual security program by this Congress. It is an amendment which both advocates and opponents to the foreign aid program can in good conscience support.

Very simply stated the amendment does just this:

First. Requires the submission of a firm, detailed budget by the administrators of the program.

Second. Makes adherence to that budget mandatory.

Third. Places the budget presentation and adherence on the same basis as our domestic budget.

When we think of the very strict requirements imposed upon the agencies and departments dealing with the domestic problems, I feel we are compelled to wonder at the latitude and freedom given to the ICA in administering the mutual security program and its funds.

We have sat here during these past couple of days and heard of poor programming, improper use of funds, poor administration, and lack of planning. The amendment would give this Congress a greater say in how these funds—which we appropriate—will be spent. It should lead to a more definite programming. It will lead to long-range planning.

The amendment supplements and strengthens the requirements placed in the act last year which requires the furnishing of greater detailed information by requiring the submission of a budget and adherence to that budget.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that it is my desire that the program be terminated. I believe that is the feeling of a great majority in this Congress. Yet, unless we claim our right to control and direct the program through our legislative prerogative and control of funds it will be a self-perpetuating program which will continue to grow and grow. It is my hope that by reason of what we are doing the world will be free. That the people and nations of the world in using their present freedom might become economically self-efficient. This hope and this desire mean that I am opposed to any program of foreign aid which is everlasting and never-ending. I feel keenly that it is the responsibility of this Congress to make this program work to give it emphasis and efficiency by assuming the leadership in causing it to achieve its goal and then preventing it from becoming a permanent part of the world's economy—a never-ending drain on our economy.

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

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Did not the gentleman hear that we do not have time to scrutinize this multi-million-dollar spending program?

Mr. ROUSH. Yes, I heard that, but I believe we do have time to look after the taxpayers' money.

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

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Does that include military aid?

Mr. ROUSH. Yes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Does the gentleman think it would be wise to let all of the countries throughout southeast Asia know how much money is given by this

country to one country as against the other, Vietnam, Burma, Laos and the others?

Does the gentleman suppose also that in the Near East if one country were to know what the other country got, both for military aid and economic aid, that would make for friendship with this country?

Mr. ROUSH. This body rejected an amendment which would open up all of that information. This could be put under the classification of "secret," I imagine.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana offered this amendment last year. The amendment, of course, would add nothing of importance to what is already in the bill.

In the Mutual Security Appropriation Act for 1960 two new sections—sections 111 (a) and (b), are incorporated. Both of those sections in the mutual security appropriation bill, and 537 (f) in the Mutual Security Act, in my opinion, take care of the problem adequately, and I therefore ask that the amendment be defeated.

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

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

Mr. ROUSH. Does the gentleman say this amendment is already in the bill? This amendment is not in the bill. There is nothing in the bill or act which requires strict adherence to a budget that has been presented, is that not correct?

Mr. MORGAN. As I said, there is in the mutual security appropriation bill, plus 537 (f), sufficient authority in my opinion to accomplish what the gentleman wants to do.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill be considered as read, and open to amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The balance of the bill follows:

CHAPTER V—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS REFLECTING NEW LIMITS OF UNITED STATES

SEC. 501. The Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 205(c), strike out "continental" in the twelfth clause of the first sentence.

(b) In section 411(d), strike out "the continental limits of".

(c) In section 527(c), strike out "the continental limits of" in the introductory clause.

(d) In section 527(d), strike out "the continental limits of".

(e) In section 530(a), strike out "the continental limits of".

(f) In section 537(a), strike out "continental" in the last proviso of paragraph (5) and in paragraphs (13) and (17); and strike out "the continental limits of" in paragraph (10).

CHAPTER VI—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

Sec. 601. Title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1721 and the following), which relates to famine relief and other assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 202, strike out "The" at the beginning thereof and substitute the following: "In order to facilitate the utilization of surplus agricultural commodities in meeting the requirements of needy peoples, and in order to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas in addition to that which can be accomplished under title I of this Act, the".

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

Sec. 602. Section 501(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 256), which relates to international cooperation in health, is repealed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. CHURCH: On page 14, after line 23, insert the following:

"CHAPTER VII—JOINT COMMITTEE ON MUTUAL SECURITY

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

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

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

"(d) In carrying out its duties, the committee is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within or outside the United States, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

"(e) The committee is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and staff employees as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.



"(f) Expenses of the committee shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, on vouchers signed by the chairman of the committee."

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for reserving the point of order.

If this amendment is not germane, Mr. Chairman, it is nonetheless certainly needed. The arguments and the statements made during the last 2 days must have convinced anyone in the House that there is probably more question about this program than about any other operation of our Government—more doubt about its effectiveness, more criticism of its operations, more question on the part of some, indeed, as to whether the program justifies itself; and certainly on the part even of those who support it, honest soul-searching as to what can be done, at least, to improve it.

Mr. Chairman, we have been promised in good faith—and I know the promise will be kept—by the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs that next year the committee will bring to this body a new bill, what we call a "clean bill." I am not sure that the House appreciates just how the bills have been prepared since 1954. It was in 1954, and not since then, that the House was presented with a new bill. Since that time, every year the administration has sent to the committee a draft form on which the committee, with deliberation—and I would say conscientiously—has worked its will. But here we have had, Mr. Chairman, in 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1960 what might be colloquially, even if inelegantly, called a "rehash" of the bill of 1954.

Next year this House and the other body are due to receive new legislation. I think, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the moment is ripe for taking a new look at the policy, the pattern, and the operation of the mutual security program. I think that the Congress would welcome such a look. I think that the committee would welcome such a look, based on a new perspective, based on evidence, based on the viewpoint of those who may be less inclined to look back and produce only a continuation of what we have done year after year after year. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the country would welcome such a look. And, I would say to those who criticize the program, an honest evaluation, report, and recommendations as suggested would help us bring to this body proper answers and proper actions—or at least proposals to terminate unjustified activities. It would certainly bring to those who support the program, if continuation be proven merited, arguments on which better to urge continuation. Above all, it would make us intelligent about what we are doing, and it might even lead the executive branch to take a fresh look, too, at our problems in this troubled world and at the way that those problems might be freshly approached.

Mr. Chairman, someone might say: Is not the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate prepared to do just this?

First of all, sometimes a committee that has not in its entirety dealt so long and intimately with problems, actually profits from disassociation with previous trials and errors. The proposed committee will have not only perspective but fresh inspiration. It may find a new pattern on which to build our own safety and the peace of the world. But in addition, and very practically, Mr. Chairman, I realize that this present bill is not going to pass both bodies immediately, that the appropriation bill will be on our minds at least for a month or two and that we are going to adjourn as a body, hopefully we say, in July. The Committee on Foreign Affairs will not be meeting between that time and January. I therefore feel that the time has come when it is appropriate for the sake of new investigation to have a Joint Committee on Mutual Security, comparable to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, after which this proposal which I have outlined is patterned. I would certainly regret to have the committee raise a point of order against an amendment offered by one of its members in very good faith, but I would like to say that if the committee, perhaps because it does not realize the significance and helpfulness of the amendment which I have offered, does press that point of order, I shall certainly later introduce this amendment as a resolution and ask that it be sent to the Committee on Rules where I hope that it will receive prompt action.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I must reluctantly insist on the point of order.

I have the greatest admiration and respect for the legislative ability and skill of the gentlewoman from Illinois. Her amendment may have great merit, and I know that it is offered with the best of intentions. It provides, however, for the creation of a Joint Committee on Mutual Security and such a proposal, under the rules of this House, should receive appropriate consideration by the Committee on Rules. Our Committee on Foreign Affairs does not ever want knowingly to transgress the jurisdiction of any other committee of the House. Therefore, although I appreciate the spirit in which this amendment is offered, I trust my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois, will understand my position and my insistence upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from Illinois desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. CHURCH. Regretfully, Mr. Chairman, and with the additional statement that I think the decision to press the point of order results in a loss of valuable time for investigation of a policy and a program that needs investigation—regretfully, I repeat, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The point of order is sustained.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 14, line 15, strike the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "Provided, That not less than 25 percent of the funds expended during the next fiscal year under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, shall be used to purchase and make available to needy peoples surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply provides that 25 percent of the funds to be expended during the next fiscal year under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, shall be used to purchase and make available to needy peoples surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States.

I would point out to you that in the 5-year period 1946 to 1950 we exported \$3,468 million worth of agricultural commodities. In that same period we imported \$3,378 million worth of various commodities. In the decade following 1950 our exports dropped to about 20 percent. My amendment would put these exports back up and make available more food for the needy people in foreign countries.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. GROSS. My amendment provides for not less than 25 percent of the funds expended during the next fiscal year under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended.

Mr. PASSMAN. Expenditures and not appropriations?

Mr. GROSS. Expenditures under the 1954 act, as amended.

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

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

Mr. WIER. Does the gentleman make any provision that this food, and certainly we have plenty of it, gets into the hands of the people and not the administrations of the governments?

Mr. GROSS. No; I make no provision for that in the bill. The language in the bill preceding my amendment is this:

In order to facilitate the utilization of surplus agricultural commodities in meeting the requirements of needy peoples, and in order to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas in addition to that which can be accomplished—

And so forth.

Mr. WIER. I think our experience has been in the past that where we made contributions of surplus foodstuffs they went to the governments, and the governments sold them to the people, who had no money to buy them.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Would the gentleman be kind enough to clarify his amendment so as to let me know if he is talking about the needy people abroad or the needy people at home?

Mr. GROSS. As far as my amendment is concerned, it could be used to take care of needy people at home as well as abroad.

Mr. BAILEY. I would say amen to that.

Mr. GROSS. I did not say anything about foreign governments.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I would be glad to see some of the food paid for out of these foreign giveaway funds go to hungry people in West Virginia. That would suit me fine.

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

Mr. Chairman this amendment would damage the bill.

From June 1946 through June 1949 the agricultural exports of the United States amounted to \$49.1 billion. Of this amount those exports made under specific Government-financed programs amounted to \$20.8 billion or 42 percent of the total. Of the \$20.8 billion, \$10.2 was exported under programs administered by ICA and its predecessor agencies; \$7.2 billion of the \$10 billion was financed by foreign aid programs. I think we have done very well with the surplus food in this country under the foreign aid programs.

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

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

Mr. JUDD. In 1953 I offered an amendment, which was adopted, to require that up to \$250 million of the aid provided under this bill should be in the form of surplus agricultural com-

modities. One year, I believe that ICA used up to \$375 million.

Section 402 of the existing law requires not less than \$175 million of the funds appropriated in this bill be used for agricultural surpluses. But, the fact is that we cannot now use more than that because production in most of the countries that needed food and fiber in the beginning is fairly well restored—they have recovered from the devastation of war. Many of the countries to which we are giving most of the help now are self-sufficient in food. What they need from us most is machinery and various kinds of equipment and materials to develop their economies. The testimony is that \$175 million is about all that can be spent for or sent in the form of agricultural commodities, that is now being done and to adopt this amendment would just seriously cripple the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS), there were—ayes 60, noes 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is no evidence that Communist aggression and intent, as well as worldwide domination ambitions, have changed to the slightest extent. This is evident as we view what is happening throughout the entire world.

We need strong allies and friends to constitute a collective defense system necessary for peace and for our own national interest.

Throughout the world we have strong allies and friends such as Turkey, Pakistan, Iran, and other countries. There are other countries who are following the policy of neutralism. While in our own national interests we must adjust ourselves in a proper way to those countries that are following the policy of neutralism, above all we should not forget our friends and our allies, and by our policies for them feel that they are subordinated in our mind to those countries that are following the policy of neutralism.

There are some people in pivotal and powerful positions in America, and I do not say that they are necessarily in the administration, who believe that nations should be encouraged to adopt the policy of neutralism. I cannot agree with such persons. Certainly, when a country that is our ally and our friend turns to neutralism, that change is not for our best interest.

We must not permit the impression to be created in the minds of those countries that are our friends and allies, and with whom we have agreements, that, first, we encourage neutralism, and second, that we will emphasize our aid and assistance to those countries that follow the pathway of neutralism, as against those countries who are our affirmative friends and allies.

We must avoid the impressions that neutral countries are wooed, and that friendly nations are to be taken for granted. As I read the press and draw

my inferences, I have the impression that in the mind of some, if not all, of the leaders of nations that are our allies and friends, that such an impression exists and is growing. We should never permit policies to be established to convey a message to our friends and allies that they are taken for granted.

In those countries that are our friends and allies, they recognize that the Soviet Union is a Trojan horse. The Soviet Union is trying to weaken them in their friendships and alliances with us. They are offering all kinds of direct and indirect inducements and even threats. The nations that I have mentioned, and other nations such as Thailand, the Philippines, and others, have been loyal in their friendship to the United States. The friendship that we have with our allies should be cemented strongly and not weakened by glorifying neutralism as against friendship. Those administering this act in carrying out its provisions should recognize that real friendship between our country and other countries should be strengthened and not weakened.

Mr. Chairman, there appears to be a tendency in certain sections in this country that military alliances in Asia should be played down and that neutralist policies pursued by a number of Asian countries should be encouraged. Expression of views like this ignores the fact that the military expansionism of the Communist bloc faces hard and determined resistance—fully backed by the United States—both in its eastern and western borders, i.e. in Europe and Far East.

The soft underbelly of the Communist bloc on its southern border alone is the main area where such a determined and effective posture has been weak. It is therefore not without significance that recent Communist probings have increasingly centered on this area. Note Communist infiltration into Iraq and nearby areas, their increasing influence in Afghanistan, the unsuccessful military move into northern Laos, suppression of Tibetan rebellion and Chinese incursions into Indian borders and Ladakh area of Kashmir.

Apart from this danger, the currency of such views, encouraging neutralism, creates an adverse public opinion in the allied countries in Asia who have a feeling that they are being taken for granted. It also fosters a thought that it pays to turn neutral. This attitude naturally weakens the public support behind the policy of allied governments at the perimeter of the Communist bloc, who are, therefore, so to say under the gun of the Communist bloc. It is vitally important for the free world that such a mistaken impression is repelled by responsible leaders of opinion in this country.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if he would outline the effects of section 601 under chapter VI.

Mr. MORGAN. This takes care of surplus bread grains and other food-stuffs to be donated to underprivileged countries under title 2 of Public Law 480.

Donated surpluses will be used as part payment to workers employed on public works type projects such as soil conservation and reclamation, tree planting and reforestation, and the construction of earth dams, firebreaks, and so forth.

In some cases the donated surpluses will be sold by revenue short countries and the proceeds used for public programs, such as in the field of education.

An estimated \$50 million in surpluses can be used in these programs.

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

We have heard time and again throughout this debate conscientious and experienced colleagues who have criticized the administration of the program in the past and in the present, and heard them express their fears of a continuation of waste and extravagance in the future. Many have prefaced their remarks by saying they are for mutual security and foreign aid and then they proceed at great lengths to say why they are opposed to the passage of the mutual security legislation now before us. Not one have I heard offer any alternative plan which would take the place of the mutual security program to check the spread of communism. They attack the economic grants of aid in the program as

a giveaway and yet these critics are even more vociferous in their denunciation of the Development Loan Fund.

It is one thing to offer constructive criticism in the hope that such criticism can improve the administration of such a Government program, and I have joined my colleagues as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and as a member of the Special Study Mission to Asia, Western Pacific, the Middle East, Southern Europe and North Africa in offering such constructive criticism. But too many of the bitter critics do so because they are now and have always been violently opposed to any foreign-aid program, and the record will show this to be true.

There is nothing wrong with the mutual security program that better administration cannot correct. The Foreign Affairs Committee, under the able leadership of its chairman, Dr. MORGAN, without partisan consideration, has written into this bill, H.R. 11510, amendments adopted by the committee which should be ample safeguards. However, the responsibility for the administration of economic assistance under the mutual security program is vested in the International Cooperation Administration. This executive agency must accept full responsibility for the recurring charges of maladministration. In spite of repeated evidence of such maladministration over the last several years, there is no indication of administrative corrections. Because of this situation, the mutual security program is carrying an unnecessary burden of criticism which has affected its acceptance by the American people.

I plead with my colleagues to put the blame where it belongs—squarely on the shoulders of the executive department. The many examples of waste and extravagance in the mutual security program which have been revealed to the Congress and the American public over the past 8 years have never been given one line of public recognition by the President or any of his executive administrators.

Whether we like it or not, world opinion is watching the Congress as it works its will on the passage of the mutual security bill. And again, whether we like it or not, the billions of people in the uncommitted nations throughout the world and where the mutual security program has been in operation, will be affected by the action of the Congress of the United States.

Our foreign aid programs are in direct competition with the Soviet Union foreign aid programs in most of these countries. Are we afraid to meet this competition? Can we in all good conscience fail now to meet our responsibility to ourselves and to these people?

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my commendations to the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for the fine work they have done on H.R. 11510 and its accompanying House Report 1464. The bill is not all that I hoped it would be, but it does contain several significant, forward-looking provisions. These will strengthen the mutual security program and redound to the benefit of the entire free world.

These provisions reflect an awareness of the need for new techniques and programs for meeting challenges which we have come to realize play an integral part of the exceedingly complex economic problems of young, underdeveloped nations struggling to create a stable economic base.

I refer specifically to section 204(e) which endorses the Indus River Basin project. Rapid progress in the development of this great granary will prove of immense benefit to both India and Pakistan, and to the free world as well. It is fitting that Congress should, in this bill, acclaim the cooperative spirit which has carried the negotiations on this project to such a fruitful climax and that we should make known our determination to provide material assistance toward the implementation of the agreed goals.

Section 204(m) which provides for a program of loans to encourage the development of farm cooperatives, is another commendable addition. Agricultural land reform programs are often among the early measures adopted by underdeveloped nations in their drive toward modernization. Quite often the sudden increase in small, relatively inefficient farms results in a temporary decline in food production.

In other nations the condition has long existed of agricultural areas broken up into miniscule parcels as a consequence of age-old inheritance practices or lack of capital funds.

In either case, a possible solution to the problem of creating more efficient agricultural units is the formation of farm cooperatives. To the extent that the application of section 204(m) will aid in this aspect of modernization, its inclusion in H.R. 11510 is highly welcome.

Section 601(a) is closely relevant to section 204(m). This provision for a broadening of the famine relief program of Public Law 480 can prove of enduring benefit to the underdeveloped nations. The use of agricultural surpluses to relieve temporary decreases in agricultural production, to fill gaps left when farm workers swing to industrial and urban occupations or into education, and to fight ravaging inflation when farm stocks fall and hunger causes food prices to soar, fills a vital role in the overall mutual security program. Its beneficial consequences can be many, and I hope that it will be used to the greatest extent possible without infringing upon legitimate agricultural export programs.

The committee is also to be highly commended for the increase in the special assistance program from \$247 million to \$256 million. This grant aid to 22 nations is utilized for many important functions from the maintenance of political and economic stability to the carrying out of special programs. Its recipients include such countries as Brazil, Israel, Haiti, and West Berlin, among others, all significant members of the free world.

The committee likewise should receive our plaudits for section 2 which declares it to be the sense of Congress that the United States favors freedom of navigation in the international waterways,

and economic cooperation between nations, and that the purposes of the mutual security program are negated and the peace of the world endangered when nations receiving economic assistance under the act, wage economic warfare against other nations receiving such assistance, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways.

This addition superbly reflects the general policy of Congress as defined in section 2(a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, that—

Peace in the world increasingly depends on wider recognition, both in principle and practice, of the dignity and interdependence of men.

Efforts thus far to promote a conciliatory attitude in the UAR as regards its economic boycott of Israel and the closing of the Suez Canal have met with nothing but failure. Surely, if two countries ever possessed mutually interdependent interests, it is these two; yet, the UAR almost pathologically insists upon maintaining a state of belligerency and on defying international law and denying its own commitments.

The continuation of the Middle East crisis condemns the area to be in constant ferment and affords Russia an open invitation to intervene. A detente would not only enable the entire region to concentrate on domestic needs, but would greatly augment U.S. foreign policy by removing a sore which has been highly susceptible to Russian agitation.

I urge the Congress to support this provision overwhelmingly and thus strengthen the President's hand in its administration. Its adoption will constitute notice to the world of our determination to uphold the principles of justice and equity among nations.

There are other aspects in the committee report which should be mentioned. One is the discussion of the need for increasing the authority of our Ambassadors over the content, coordination and direction of our aid programs. This objective has been supported by numerous study groups and is a reflection of our growing awareness that U.S. Foreign policy can no longer be concerned solely with the external relations of States; the evolution of their domestic life has become a direct and legitimate concern.

Relationships between the United States and the underdeveloped nations today must rest on a shared interest in furthering a process of modernization which will enable transitional societies to develop their own versions of responsible government and to play a useful cooperative role in the international community. Mutual efforts will require our Ambassadors to become involved in activities directed toward the effectuation of this objective.

I hope that the policy outlined in the committee report will be applied as rapidly as possible in the implementation of U.S. foreign policy.

I also wish to commend the committee for its striking description of the pipeline problem and the need to maintain unexpended balances as an as-

urance of the continuity of our programs. Leadtime is a necessary factor in the administration of the program; the very core of the program depends upon continued adequacy of material shipments.

Continuity in the pipeline can be analogized to maintaining a balance in a checking account. Unless deposits sufficiently offset withdrawals, the balance will decline and the usefulness of the account will be destroyed. If we fail to keep the pipeline filled, or if we permit it to be broken, young, free nations will wither past any hope of revivification by emergency treatment.

These, in my opinion, are some of the outstanding provisions in the bill and in its accompanying report. I hope that the measure will be adopted in its present form or, perhaps, its authorizations increased where necessary to bring them into line with the recommendations of the President.

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

I deeply regret that the authorization for the Development Loan Fund, both in amount and time, was not substantially increased so that needs might be met, particularly in those nations which are poised just at the economic "takeoff" point, and require significant overseas assistance if they are to breakthrough into modernity.

Mr. Chairman, these are the years that we can never call back. The consequences of opportunities that are missed now can plague us in the future as we find that insufficient effort on our part might well be responsible for the failure of our expectations to fully materialize.

Once these years have passed, we cannot correct what might have been done.

I commend the committee for the fine advances it has made in the mutual security program through the provisions of H.R. 11510. I only regret that greater provision was not made to set the program on an adequate, long-term basis. I sincerely hope that this will be remedied and that free peoples everywhere will be enabled to fulfill their aspirations for growth and development as member nations in the free world.

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

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

So without reflection upon my friend, Dr. MORGAN, or any member of this committee I want to again call for the defeat of this misnamed, much-abused act of charity called the mutual security bill.

While we talk security, we preach, and sometimes I wonder if we also pray, for war and crisis after crisis. One wonders if all this hue and cry over war and threats of war, that is, the Berlin crisis, communistic aggression, and other pet slogans are not manufactured for the purpose of justifying the \$4.5 billion we

spend on defense for this country and our friends.

Certainly we all desire security at home and for our friends abroad, but we also have to admit that you cannot really buy either one of these much-desired goals. You can talk yourself into trouble a darn sight easier than shoot your way out of trouble.

I read this very morning the following editorial in the *Financial Post* from Toronto, Canada. It ought to show just what outsiders who are not Members of Congress, seeking election, nor are they Senators or statesmen running for President, think about our so-called peace offensive.

I quote the editorial dated April 16, 1960:

#### ARMS RACE REACHES INSANITY PEAK

Preparations for war by the two leading powers, the United States and Russia, have now reached a pitch of mania and horror that should alarm every responsible citizen.

Latest development in the United States (reported on p. 13) is a concerted effort to make germ warfare and nerve gases respectable and much more efficient.

For years the United States has been accumulating stocks of a lethal gas that can kill millions swiftly. Another specialty being developed involves mosquitoes, flies, and ticks infected with typhoid, cholera, and other terrible diseases.

This part of the military program has been kept hush-hush because the great public is supposed to have a moral or esthetic objection to this kind of defense.

But now the U.S. Army Chemical Corps, backed by top military brass and civilian experts, is out to make these ghastly weapons popular. They can kill far more people faster than nuclear bombs.

The cost of this kind of mass killing is only a few cents per corpse which is very much cheaper than the new bombs.

And so Congress is to be asked to speed up, and support with a greatly increased money vote, the making, testing, and storing of bacteriological and chemical killers. And some of the militarists seem eager, ferociously eager, not merely to test these monstrous discoveries but to commit the United States to using them first when, as they evidently expect, war comes.

Talk of disarmament is a shameful mockery when proposals of this kind are seriously made.

Indeed the bumbling leaders who have brought us to this desperate pass by their obsessive concentration on world war III mock and insult those who died in World War II.

The one possible basis for security, the necessary prerequisite to any cut in armaments, is a political settlement of disputed issues.

But it is obtainable now, as always, only by patient diplomacy, an art that's unfortunately out of fashion and even despised in the U.S. American foreign policy during the 7 years Mr. Eisenhower has specialized in repeated threats of force, not in the search of conciliation.

Next month's summit conference offers an opportunity for the diplomatic, peacemaking approach. If the chance isn't seized, if the U.S. Army Chemical Corps and other ambitious generals are to determine the course of American policy, the human outlook is frightening indeed.

The latest news from Korea shows that the guns and ammunition we supplied the Korean Government is working perfectly in the street riots against the government forces of Korea which we are supporting.

We can assume that much of our mutual aid cash was used for payment of guns and equipment being used in South Africa.

We also wonder and that is all we can do is wonder about the disturbances in South America, Central America, Cuba, Santo Domingo, and all over the Caribbean area and how much of the equipment, guns, and propaganda was and is being paid for out of the pockets of American taxpayers from so-called mutual aid funds.

Another situation seems to be getting out of hand in our mad race to beat our plowshares into swords and that is the proposal by the Eisenhower administration to give away to "friendly" nations our nuclear war equipment.

A few years ago this administration pushed through a bill allowing the President to give away nuclear secrets for peaceful purposes.

Since that time France has developed the A-bomb and China is on the threshold of this accomplishment. What happens when we give away the war secrets and equipment? Suppose we give these materials to another friendly nation like Cuba was and a Castro decides to take over. Do we then get hit with our own shells or do we beg them to be nice and not fight "Poppa."

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

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

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

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

If people need food and economic security, how can they have both when they use the major part of their income for guns and powder? Peace cannot be achieved by doubletalk, and the United States is tied up by treaty and tradition to such an extent that in any future war we will have to defend our neighbors whether they have standing armies or not.

Now for the developed countries—France, Germany, Japan, and so forth—they have long ago passed the berserk mark set up as a basis for aid. They

are far beyond their prewar economy level. This was our original goal in foreign aid. We seem to have lost sight of both the goal and the players and appear to be sitting in the bleachers while the game is going overtime with the opposition running up a score while our team is in the showers.

Let us cut out the nonsense and pure doubletalk. If we want to give military supplies, and so forth, to our friends, let us admit to this fact; but does anyone believe there is any difference in the British hiring the Hessians to fight the Revolutionary War and our plan to pay nations to fight our battles for us? We will survive so long as we are strong.

If I thought this act before us would prevent wars, I would vote for it time and time again, and so would all Americans.

However, unless we reevaluate the whole situation of trade, aid, loans, gold reserves, domestic requirements for our people, and move forward in a coordinated effort to better our way of life, and then give a helping hand to our friends, I cannot at this time support this so-called aid bill.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, as I listen to this annual debate on our mutual security program, the thought comes to my mind of the reaction of millions upon millions of people to President Eisenhower's visits in the Near East and South Asia and in Latin America. I believe this reaction—one of warmth, enthusiasm, and obvious friendliness—proves how wrong are some of the allegations heard about our foreign aid program.

Take, for example, the charges that our aid has made enemies instead of friends. This charge just doesn't hold up. If it were true, we should have made an awful lot of enemies by now, because we have been in this aid business for a long time and have spent billions of dollars at it. But if the charge were true, then why did so many people crowd the streets of so many nations to welcome our President with such an outpouring of affection? We have only to look at what happened during the President's visits to Pakistan and India. The crowds were by far the greatest ever to greet a foreign guest and pressed in upon the official cars so that they could hardly move. This reaction, in my opinion, is not unrelated to the fact that we have shown through our aid programs that we are concerned with what happens to the people of South Asia—with their welfare and their aspirations for progress. It is not unrelated to the knowledge on their part that we have provided enormous quantities of food, to help ward off famines, to relieve victims of disaster, to add to stocks available and help to keep the prices at reasonable levels.

Our aid in both Pakistan and India has reached down to the villagers, in Pakistan, through the village aid program, in India through our help with the community development program. Here we have helped stimulate local self-help projects, such as access roads, drainage ditches, pure water supplies, schools, and other enterprises of direct and immediate benefit. We have worked with

these Governments, as with other governments, to make it possible for the average citizen to improve his own condition and that of his family and of his home.

Another familiar charge against the aid program is that the benefits go only to the rich and the common man does not get anything, does not know anything about the aid program, or, if he does know, he resents it. People do know about programs and they know how they have benefited them. For example, who gets more benefit from a cooperative health program—the rich who can already afford a doctor, or the poor who learn how to prevent disease? Who gets more out of educational programs—the rich who already send their children to school, or the poor who are helped to build schools, to get teachers, to learn to read and write? Who gets more out of agricultural programs, or out of community development and out of self-help housing?

I have in my hand the latest issue of a newspaper called Economic World. On the front page is a picture of President Eisenhower examining a self-help housing project in Chile. This project is the result of advice and assistance given through the aid program and 23,000 houses have been or will soon be built in 26 towns in Chile through similar self-help activities. What can be a better defense against communism than a home of one's own—particularly a home that a man has built for his family with his own hands and help of his neighbors?

I cannot believe that the warm, the overwhelming reception given our President by the people of Chile was unrelated to their knowledge that over the years U.S. technical cooperation experts have worked side by side with Chilean Government officials and ordinary people to help them improve their nation—its agriculture, sanitation, education, and social institutions.

The people of Brazil were equally warm in their reception. Not even a terrible air tragedy could extinguish their happiness with our President. We have had years of cooperation with Brazil and, as a matter of fact, it was in this country that the earliest predecessor of the point 4 program was born. The most outstanding success is the Public Health Service in Brazil. It is called SESP—Cervico Especial de Saúde Pública. SESP started life much more North American than Brazilian—over 90 percent staffed and financed by the United States. Today it is a mature public health agency, larger in fact than the U.N. World Health Organization, and its more than 400 projects throughout Brazil are 97 percent financed and staffed by Brazilians. This is an example of the kind of institutional evolution which we encourage through point 4. It is the kind of institution which helps the Brazilian people directly and which many of them know about and appreciate our helping hand.

We have all heard opponents of this program say that our aid is not wanted—yet most nations ask for more.

We have heard these opponents—and even some self-styled friends say—that

U.S. personnel are inept and stupid, clumsy in their relations with sensitive citizens of other nations—and yet, our friends ask for more of our technicians and our help.

They ask for more because they like what they get; they know it is good for them. They ask for more cooperation because they think it is to their interest to work with us just as we think it is to our interest to work with them.

Let me refer to one other nation—Greece—where the cordiality of the reception given our President exceeded all we could even wish for. The thought of Greece should remind us that many countries literally would not exist at all had it not been for economic and military aid from us. Greece is one such country. Only 13 years ago Greece had been almost entirely taken over by Communist guerrillas. The Red-supported troops occupied 75 percent of the land area and held everything except a few of the larger cities. If there had been no aid from the United States, Greece would have gone down the drain.

But there was aid—both military and economic—and that country is today a valued ally in our NATO defenses and a strong partner for peace. The people of Greece appreciate our aid and in one area they even erected a statue in honor of a U.S. technician who helped them drain and desalt some marshes and then plant them to rice.

Now, of course, the purpose of aid is not to extract expressions of gratitude, but to help our partners to become better partners, stronger partners; to help them, when need be, to carry the economic load of defense, to help them to keep their economies from being crushed by this burden. Another purpose is to provide that vital margin of resources which can make the difference between success or failure of plans and programs for economic development. Our aid, in most instances, is only a fraction, and often a tiny fraction, of the total efforts at economic development. But it is an essential fraction. Without it the world situation would be entirely different. With it we are able to help create the opportunities for progress, opportunities to negotiate for peace.

Many more examples of the success of the aid program could be given, not only in the countries visited by the President, but in many others also. However, I think no more need be said to prove that the aid is appreciated, is known, and is needed.

I urge approval of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I should like to place in the RECORD an article by Joseph Harrison, published in the Christian Science Monitor, April 1, 1960.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY REAPS GAINS  
(By Joseph G. Harrison)

The foreign policy of the United States, according to a great deal of available evidence, has entered the crucial decade of the sixties in a considerably stronger position than many of its critics would have thought possible a year or so ago.

Indeed, an impartial observer might well argue that America's position in the world, despite certain obvious weaknesses and failures, contradicts those who claim that this position has continued to deteriorate.

It can, in fact, be maintained that the very opposite of what these critics expected has happened, and that for several years American foreign policy has been increasingly successful along most lines and at most points.

This does not mean that many grave problems do not lie ahead. The unresolved crisis over Berlin, Washington's presently unhappy relationship with Cuba and Panama, the continuing threat to Formosa on the part of Communist China, these and certain other unsettled questions indicate how difficult remains the road ahead.

Yet a broad survey of world conditions, as they affect the United States and are affected by it, indicates that in many areas of the globe Washington's policies have both strengthened this country's international relationships and improved the picture held of this country.

#### TRACED TO 1958

Some students trace the beginning of this improvement, surprisingly enough, to the summer of 1958, when, in the face of civil strife in Lebanon, an extremely tense situation in Jordan, and the overthrow of the pro-Western Iraqi Government, Washington sent a powerful contingent of U.S. Marines into Lebanon. This helped end the strife, and allowed an opportunity for peaceful compromise between the warring factions.

But, equally important, the Marines were, to the happy surprise of nationalist elements in the Middle East, quietly withdrawn after a few months. Important segments of Asian-Africa opinion, which had earlier condemned the dispatch of the Marines, even though the Lebanese Government had requested it, were gratified at the speed with which this withdrawal was made.

This and other wise steps taken since eventually resulted in a lessening of Arab hostility toward the United States, despite the fact that Moslem resentment over America's role in the establishment of the State of Israel continues, and will continue for the foreseeable future, to raise many problems for Washington.

At present American relations with the Arab-speaking nations of the Middle East and North Africa seem, on the whole, to be moving toward a steadily better relationship. This is particularly true of Washington's relations with the United Arab Republic, the most influential of the Middle Eastern nations.

#### SYRIAN AID RESUMED

Within the past few months, the Syrian region of the United Arab Republic accepted American aid for the first time since the end of World War II. Similarly, American aid to the Egyptian region of the United Arab Republic is rising steadily and negotiations regarding such aid are being held in an increasingly friendly atmosphere. At the same time, the United Arab Republic has quietly but effectively begun withdrawing a considerable number of students which it had earlier sent to the Communist countries of Eastern Europe and rerouting them to American and British universities.

It is undeniable that the relationship between the United States and the revolutionary regime of Premier Karim Kassem in Iraq is far from satisfactory, with the United States being frequently lumped with other leading Western Powers as "imperialist." However, the United States has moved in such a way as to attract a minimum of unfavorable attention in Iraq, with the result that Baghdad has been finding fewer reasons for attacking this country. One proof of this is seen in the fact that Iraq has made no serious attempt to link the United States with the series of upheavals which last year kept that country in confusion and which resulted in a succession of sensational treason trials.

In fact, the Iraqi-American situation has improved so greatly of late that the Iraq

Government recently asked the U.S. Embassy to help it fill 230 teaching posts at Baghdad University so that it might avoid hiring further Soviet personnel.

In general, it is not easy to see how the United States could within the present context of political realities appreciably improve its present foreign policy in regard to the Middle East. Washington has already demonstrated a heightened awareness of Arab sensibilities. It apparently seeks to do as little as possible to rub these sensibilities the wrong way, and it is endeavoring through a number of reportedly effective means to convince the Arabs that the United States not only has no designs against their independence but is sincerely interested in the preservation of peace and the advancement of well-being in the area. This is an effective beginning, given the bitter relationship which began with the partition of Palestine in 1947.

#### NORTH AFRICANS PLACATED

In still another Arabic-speaking area the United States has also managed to steer with considerable skill through excessively difficult diplomatic waters. This area is North Africa, where interest and emotion are largely focused on the effort of the Moslem underground in Algeria to win local self-determination.

Through the personal visit of President Eisenhower to the heads of state in both Morocco and Tunisia, through American willingness to negotiate over U.S. Air Force bases in the former, and through the offer of economic aid without strings, Washington has succeeded to a considerable extent in creating a not unfavorable image of the United States in those two countries.

Similarly, its shrewd voting during crucial tests in the United Nations on the Algerian issue, while not wholly satisfying either the French or their Moslem opponents, has enabled Washington to avoid offending either side too deeply.

But it is in south and southeast Asia that one of the most noticeable improvements in American foreign relations has taken place. While communism has been having its difficulties, due largely to Chinese Communist aggression along its Himalayan frontier and its actions in Tibet, the United States has, through a number of careful steps, managed to reduce Asian belief that the United States, if not exactly imperialistic itself, nonetheless was a fellow traveler of European imperialism. Through generous economic aid, but above all by the restraint which it has shown at a number of critical junctures during the past year and a half to 2 years, America has been able to remodel to a considerable extent the image of this country held by many influential Burmese, Ceylonese, Indians, Indonesians, and other Asians.

#### EISENHOWER GAINS NOTED

It goes without saying that the triumphal tour through this area taken late last fall by President Eisenhower only served to confirm and forward what was already a noticeable trend toward warmer relations with America on the part of the majority of non-Communist countries of south, southeast, and east Asia. Indeed, this tour seems to have had a favorable effect even in those Asian countries not included therein.

One has only to think back to the tense situation which existed 2 years ago between the United States and the Republic of Indonesia on the occasion of the Sumatran revolt, to recognize how great the improvement has been in this important corner of southeast Asia. At that time the United States was being openly accused of aiding the rebellion.

But by patient insistence upon its innocence, by carefully refraining from actions which might lend further color to these accusations, by the extension of post-revolt

aid, and above all by the skillful and friendly diplomacy exercised by American Ambassador Howard P. Jones, Washington has converted its relationship with Djakarta into one of friendship and a considerable degree of mutual trust.

An equally welcome improvement has been effected in American relations with Burma. Some 8 months ago, Burma began reaccepting American aid, which it had terminated in 1953 on the grounds that it had military implications. This renewal of close American-Burman relations is the result of patient effort on Washington's part plus the generally better picture which the United States has cut in southeast Asia during the past several years.

#### LATIN AMERICA IMPROVED

Taken as a whole the U.S. relations with Latin America also seem to be in a period of upswing. The Eisenhower visit during late February, American restraint over Cuba, the courage shown by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON during his South American swing, the promise of greater economic aid, the establishment of the Inter-American Development Bank—each of these has helped repair Latin American complaints of neglect on Washington's part and improve the average Latin American's image of the United States.

On the other hand, it is obvious that in certain areas of Latin America, the United States faces difficult days. No statesman would dare forecast the direction in which American-Cuban relations may move. Similarly, Washington's relations with Panama give every evidence of being headed toward some sort of crisis over the latter's demand for greater rights in the Canal Zone.

These will obviously both test Washington's diplomatic skill and have a bearing upon the continued improvement in this country's relationship to the rest of Latin America. But if Washington's course so far is any yardstick, the United States is prepared to handle these situations in such a way as not to jeopardize its new gains with Cuba's and Panama's sister republics.

Although some doubts have been expressed as to its diplomatic wisdom, Washington's move in sending a protest to the Union of South Africa deploring the loss of life in racial riots there is seen as part of America's new vigor in foreign affairs. Whatever else its effect may be, the move is almost certain to enhance American prestige among the new nonwhite nations now coming forth in Africa.

#### ATMOSPHERE BETTERED

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

Yet it is undeniable that the present atmosphere of conversation is an improvement over the situation which previously prevailed. In like manner, the exchange of visits between President Eisenhower and Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev cannot be dismissed as merely worthless window dressing. The continued edging toward some kind of agreement on the control of atomic tests and armaments is a helpful and hopeful sign, even if it would be dangerous naivete to pin too great hopes thereon at the present time.

While this somewhat easier situation between the United States and the Soviet Union is undoubtedly traceable in large part to Moscow's belief that it best serves Soviet purposes at the moment, it should not be overlooked that the greater flexibility in world affairs which Washington has shown during the past 18 months or so has contributed substantially to this improvement.

At present criticism of the White House and State Department emphasizes the three following points which pertain, in part at least, to foreign policy. One is that the United States is not exercising adequate world leadership. A second is that foreign aid is not what it should be. The third is that America's defense position has deteriorated in comparison with that of the Soviet Union during the past few years.

The charge that the United States is not exercising adequate world leadership is an interesting one from several points of view. It is undeniable that today, 15 years after the end of World War II, Washington does not have the commanding voice in world affairs which it had, say, 5 or 10 years ago.

There are those who ask, however, whether this decline (1) was not inevitable and (2) was not actually desirable. They point out, in fact, that the entire purpose of American foreign policy during the past decade and a half has been directed toward enabling other countries to stand upon their own feet, make their own decisions, and thereby lessen, rather than increase, their dependency upon the United States.

From this point of view, may not the decline in American leadership actually represent a victory for American foreign policy? It is obvious that this line of argument cannot be carried to the point of advocating the abrogation of all American leadership. Nor does it mean that America can afford to stop thinking in global terms. This would be as dangerous as it would be foolish. But one cannot dismiss out of hand the argument that the increasing independence which many nations, which once felt obliged to follow American policy willy-nilly, are now showing may well constitute one of the greatest triumphs of American foreign policy.

In regard to the adequacy of foreign aid, if there has been any shortcoming here, it is attributable to the country as a whole, rather than to any one man, agency, or political party. Observers in Washington generally agree that Eisenhower has fought more vigorously for foreign aid than for almost any other cause. In this he has been seconded by administration officials. If he has been frustrated in obtaining the level of aid desired, the fault lies as much with one political party as with the other.

Of the varying charges made against the present administration in Washington, whether sincerely or for political purposes, the one which has produced the widest repercussions is that of having neglected this country's defenses. Specifically, the charge is made that the United States has now fallen behind the Soviet Union in both conventional and space weaponry.

#### INFLUENCE SMALL

Such a charge belongs in a discussion of a nation's foreign policy only so far as it can be shown that the former affects the latter. So far, and this frequently comes as a surprise to Americans, there is little evidence that the influence of the United States has declined as a result of any change in this country's military strength vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. The general feeling in the rest of the world seems to be that, regardless of any alteration in the American-Soviet military balance, both nations possess such tremendous military might that such alterations no longer are significant. How sound this view is remains to be seen. But to date there is little or no evidence that the United States has been seriously handicapped or set back in the conduct of foreign affairs through an alleged neglect of its armaments.

No serious observer would or could attempt to deny that many grave problems lie ahead of the United States in the field of foreign affairs. Equally, none would deny that this country has behind it many missed or but half-seized opportunities. On the other hand, there is citable evidence that,

during the past several years, American foreign policy has had a number of quiet, yet effective triumphs and that, contrary to the predictions of critics, the United States is markedly better off in its foreign relations than these critics had forecast.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives has devoted a large share of its time to consideration of committee reports on the authorization bill to provide funds for foreign aid. It is otherwise known as the mutual security authorization bill, H.R. 11510.

Following World War II, the expenditure of American dollars to help our European allies rebuild their countries and to bolster them in their fight against communism was, in effect, helping the United States. There are certain areas in the world today where the expenditure of American dollars is essential to safeguard and protect otherwise defenseless people from Communist aggression of either a political or economic kind. I refer to the support of troops at the 38th parallel, to the defense of Chinese troops on Formosa, to the retarding of aggression in Vietnam, in Laos, and in other trouble spots in the Near East. I recognize also that our mutual security program has saved such nations as Greece, Turkey, Italy, West Germany, and possibly France from communism and certainly this has justified much of the foreign aid expenditures of American taxpayers since 1946.

During these past 16 years, however, great changes have taken place of a social, political, and economic nature throughout the world. Many of the nations we have aided have rebuilt their economy on a sounder basis than our own. Many of these nations enjoy a higher degree of prosperity than the taxpayers of this country enjoy. These countries should now bear their full share of the cost of aiding weaker nations and newer nations to protect themselves against the political and economic onslaught of Communist aggression.

The foreign aid program should be under review on a daily basis, not on an annual basis. The State Department and ICA—the International Cooperation Administration—have built vast bureaucratic organizations administering the foreign aid program. The program has become so complex, so diversified, and so inefficient as to require a complete renovation. Those administering the program no longer look for ways of making the program more economical for the American taxpayers, but rather seek ways of spending the foreign aid funds which they feel a docile Congress will provide, on a bipartisan basis, at the request of the President of the United States. Congress is denied much information as to the method and manner of spending foreign aid funds, as to what area it is spent in, and on what projects it is spent. Congress is expected to write a blank check for billions of dollars annually and is expected to permit agencies to plan the spending and to spend the same, even though Congress has no control over these agencies.

We witness, in the present bill, \$80,000 being spent to send 20 students to school

for 5 months at Johns Hopkins University and Boston University. We see many millions of dollars being spent to build high schools and colleges in Ethiopia and in other African nations. We see millions being spent to economically develop Africa and we see many, many other millions being spent to lend both military and economic aid to other nations throughout the world—all this at the expense of the American taxpayer, under a program where their Representatives in Congress have no voice in the spending but have delegated absolute power to the State Department, to ICA, and others. We see the farmers of so-called underdeveloped nations receiving substantial benefits to the tune of many millions of American taxpayers' dollars from these foreign aid funds. We hear rumors of hospitals being built in foreign countries, of railroads being built in Italy and we hear tell of foreign aid funds being used at the rate of \$1 million per mile to build a 300-foot-wide highway with underpasses, overpasses, and cloverleaf approaches—the Saigon-Bien Hoa Highway in Vietnam—and we understand that this uncompleted road will be continued with foreign aid funds anticipated in the bill presently before Congress and those to be presented in future years.

While all this takes place and while a majority of Democrats on a bipartisan approach to foreign policy support President Eisenhower in his request for passage of the bill to authorize funds for foreign aid and the items above set forth, plus many others, President Eisenhower has, nevertheless, asked Congress, and particularly the Republican Members thereof, to vote against almost every bill which provides any funds or program to aid or assist the American people. The farmers will witness this session of Congress attempt to deny further agricultural funds to carry on the soil bank program which is due to terminate at the end of 1960. The numerous areas throughout the country that are underdeveloped will find it impossible to secure the passage of the bill to aid the underdeveloped areas through a study and a joint plan of cooperation between the community and the Government to make economic taxpaying units out of areas that have long been uneconomic and underdeveloped.

FHA mortgage insurance which is due to terminate will have a difficult time securing approval in this session of Congress. The VA loan program will be permitted to die and the direct VA loan program has been virtually inoperative for the past 2 years. The 30-year mortgage guaranteed by FHA is virtually a thing of the past. High interest rates prevail for businessmen who seek loans to carry on legitimate business activities. If the Government does nothing to assist the people or our economy through a program that would compel lower interest rates, the whole industry suffers drastically for failure of the Government to act. Small businesses go bankrupt because of our own insecure economic position, and the Government does nothing to aid the small business-

We now see our Government actively engaged in a program to encourage and induce American industry to expand and develop in foreign countries. This takes jobs away from Americans and takes taxes away from the United States, as well as from the individual States and local units of government. The Government permits foreign imported products to enter this country in continually expanding amounts to sell in competition with American-made products. This brings down the wage scale of American working men and women and eventually results in a substantially lower standard of living for the American working people. The Government actually encourages this under the guise of helping redevelop the underdeveloped nations of Europe and is heard to say that this program is, in effect, a foreign-aid program.

The gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman PASSMAN, chairman of the subcommittee hearing the foreign aid bill, has documented the statement that our present foreign aid program is costing the American taxpayers in excess of \$11 billion a year. When you add to this American business which is being encouraged to develop in Europe, you can see that the cost of foreign aid to the American people, both in out-of-pocket dollars and in lost revenue, wages and taxes is staggering. This country still has 5 million unemployed men and women. It has long suffered and continues to suffer from a major farm depression. Small business faces its most severe economic test of this generation and a large percentage of them are being forced to quit or go bankrupt. American industry and big business is feeling the economic pinch of trying to compete in wages and costs against the substandard wages and living costs of foreign countries.

In spite of all of this, we are asked to authorize more billions of American taxpayers dollars to aid foreign countries while every American aid program that is mentioned is sacrificed and denied on the theory that we cannot afford it and we cannot unbalance the budget.

I have always favored foreign aid and mutual security in the past. I, at this time, would vote for a reasonable expenditure for foreign aid and mutual security in those areas where such aid is essential to build an ally strong enough to enable them to resist Communist aggression of either a direct physical or economic kind. I am not permitted to vote for such a sane and sensible bill. I must make the choice of voting for a bill that continues to enable those administering the program to boondoggle American tax dollars on public works programs throughout the world and on foreign aid programs which have little if any relationship to the rebuilding of those nations as strong units to resist communism.

The rules of the House of Representatives do not permit me to vote in favor of needed funds but rather requires me to vote for the entire wasteful program or to vote against the entire wasteful program. Under those circumstances, the

only hope that a Member of Congress has to remedy the situation is to voice his protest by voting against the entire wasteful program in the hope that the authorization bill will be defeated and that the ICA and State Department will be forced to submit to Congress, through our Foreign Affairs Committees, a program which will be reduced to provide only the necessities and to eliminate the grossly mismanaged and unnecessary expenditures that have been made in the past and that are provided for in the present foreign aid authorization bill. I, therefore, am forced to make the decision in the best interests of the American taxpayers, American citizens, and the country as a whole that I must vote against the foreign aid authorization bill. In doing so, I promise to fight to secure such funds as are needed to carry on a reasonable mutual security program. This, of course, will only be possible if enough votes are secured to defeat the pending measure.

I may summarize this by saying that I do not oppose mutual security but I do oppose the mismanagement and gross waste which has characterized the program, and I must point out that if we can afford billions to assist the economic recovery of foreign nations, we can afford a reasonable amount of money to assist the building industry, the farmers, to provide slum clearance and urban renewal, to fight unemployment, and to aid the business climate of the United States and to help big business, through protecting the American markets for products which they manufacture.

I, therefore, will vote "no" on the foreign aid authorization bill for 1960.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, one of the great tragedies of our time is the waste of American surplus food in a world in which one-half of the people go to bed hungry every night of the year.

That tragedy is compounded by the strange fact that we pay out more than a billion dollars a year for storage and related costs of handing this surplus food.

It is literally true that we could give away much greater portions of this food surplus, to the hungry people both inside our own country and abroad, and save money in the process.

In recent years we have made progress toward a more intelligent disposal of this great food surplus, which is one of the richest blessings our country enjoys. Millions of American children, and additional millions of people all over the world, have benefited through our surplus food disposal programs.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa is an attempt to take a further step toward intelligent and effective use of this great weapon for peace—America's food surplus.

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

I hope the amendment will be adopted, and commend its author for the fight he has consistently waged to use America's surplus food in the cause of peace.



The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 502, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments. The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. CHURCH. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. CHURCH moves to recommit the bill H.R. 11510 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS—243

Addonizio	Buckley	Donohue
Albert	Burdick	Dooley
Anfuso	Burke, Ky.	Dorn, N.Y.
Arends	Burke, Mass.	Downing
Ashley	Byrne, Pa.	Doyle
Aspinall	Byrnes, Wis.	Durham
Avery	Cahill	Dwyer
Ayres	Canfield	Edmondson
Baker	Carnahan	Elliott
Baldwin	Celler	Fallon
Barrett	Chamberlain	Farbstein
Barry	Chelf	Fascell
Bates	Chenoweth	Feighan
Baumhart	Chiperfield	Fino
Beckworth	Clark	Flood
Bennett, Fla.	Coad	Fogarty
Bentley	Cohelein	Foley
Blatnik	Conte	Forand
Boggs	Corbett	Ford
Boland	Cramer	Frazier
Bolling	Curtin	Frelinghuysen
Bolton	Curtis, Mass.	Friedel
Bowles	Curtis, Mo.	Fulton
Boykin	Daddario	Gallagher
Brademas	Dague	Garmatz
Breeding	Daniels	Gary
Brewster	Dawson	George
Brooks, Tex.	Delaney	Glaimo
Broomfield	Dingell	Gilbert
Broyhill	Dixon	Glenn

Goodell	McDowell	Riehlman	Evins	Lipscomb	Rains
Granahan	McFall	Rivers, Alaska	Fenton	McGovern	Roberts
Green, Oreg.	Maconald	Robison	Fisher	McIntire	Rogers, Tex.
Green, Pa.	Machrowicz	Rodino	Gavin	Mack	Rooney
Griffin	Madden	Rogers, Colo.	Grant	Mason	St. George
Griffiths	Magnuson	Rogers, Mass.	Hays	Meader	Saund
Gubser	Mahon	Roosevelt	Hébert	Mitchell	Sisk
Hagen	Maillard	Rostenkowski	Holland	Monagan	Taylor
Halleck	Marshall	Santangelo	Horan	Montoya	Teague, Tex.
Halpern	Martin	Schenck	Jackson	Morris, N. Mex.	Thompson, La.
Hardy	Matthews	Schwengel	Johnson, Colo.	Moulder	Withrow
Healey	May	Selden	Keogh	Norblad	Young
Herlong	Merrrow	Shelley	King, Utah	Oliver	
Hess	Metcalf	Sheppard	Lafore	Powell	
Hoeven	Miller, Clem	Slack			
Hollifield	Miller	Smith, Iowa			
Holtzman	George P.	Smith, Miss.			
Hosmer	Miller, N.Y.	Spence			
Huddleston	Milliken	Springer			
Ikard	Mills	Staggers			
Inouye	Moorhead	Stubblefield			
Irwin	Morgan	Sullivan			
Jarman	Moss	Taber			
Johnson, Calif.	Multer	Teague, Calif.			
Johnson, Md.	Mumma	Teller			
Johnson, Wis.	Murphy	Thompson, N.J.			
Jones, Ala.	Natcher	Thornberry			
Jones, Mo.	Nelsen	Toll			
Judd	Nix	Tollefson			
Karsten	O'Brien, Ill.	Trimble			
Karth	O'Brien, N.Y.	Udall			
Kasem	O'Hara, Ill.	Ullman			
Kastenmeter	O'Hara, Mich.	Vanik			
Kearns	O'Neill	Van Zandt			
Kee	Osmers	Vinson			
Keith	Ostertag	Wainwright			
Kelly	Pelly	Wallhauser			
Kilburn	Perkins	Walter			
Kilday	Phillbin	Watts			
King, Calif.	Pillion	Weis			
Kirwan	Pirnie	Westland			
Kirwan	Porter	Widnall			
Kluczynski	Price	Wier			
Kowalski	Prokop	Wilson			
Kyl	Pucinski	Wolf			
Lane	Quie	Wright			
Langen	Quigley	Yates			
Lankford	Rabaut	Younger			
Lesinski	Randall	Zablocki			
Libonati	Ray	Zelenko			
Lindsay	Reuss				
Loser	Rhodes, Pa.				
McCormack					

NAYS—131

Abbutt	Fountain	O'Konski
Abernethy	Gathings	Passman
Adair	Gray	Patman
Alexander	Gross	Pfost
Alford	Haley	Pilcher
Allen	Hargis	Poage
Andrews	Harmon	Poff
Ashmore	Harris	Preston
Bailey	Harrison	Reese, Tenn.
Baring	Hechler	Rees, Kans.
Barr	Hemphill	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bass, Tenn.	Henderson	Riley
Becker	Hestand	Rivers, S.C.
Belcher	Hoffman, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.	Hoffman, Mich.	Roush
Berry	Hogan	Rutherford
Betts	Holt	Saylor
Blitch	Hull	Scherer
Bosch	Jennings	Scott
Bow	Jensen	Shibley
Bray	Johansen	Short
Brooks, La.	Jonas	Sikes
Brown, Ga.	Kilgore	Siler
Brown, Mo.	Kitchin	Simpson, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Knox	Smith, Calif.
Budge	Laird	Smith, Kans.
Cannon	Landrum	Smith, Va.
Casey	Latta	Steed
Cederberg	Lennon	Stratton
Church	Levering	Thomas
Collier	McCulloch	Thompson, Tex.
Colmer	McDonough	Thompson, Wyo.
Cook	McGinley	Tuck
Cunningham	McMillan	Utt
Davis, Ga.	McSween	Van Pelt
Denton	Meyer	Wampler
Derwinski	Michel	Weaver
Devine	Minshall	Wharton
Dorn, S.C.	Moeller	Whitener
Dulski	Moore	Whitten
Everett	Morris, Okla.	Williams
Flynn	Morrison	Willis
Flynt	Murray	Winstead
Forrester	Norrell	

NOT VOTING—57

Alger	Barden	Cooley
Andersen, Minn.	Bass, N.H.	Davis, Tenn.
Anderson, Mont.	Bonner	Dent
Auchincloss	Brock	Derounian
	Burleson	Diggs
	Coffin	Dowdy

So the bill was passed. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Brock against.  
 Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Fisher against.  
 Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Dent against.  
 Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Barden against.  
 Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Withrow against.  
 Mr. Fenton for, with Mr. Lipscomb against.  
 Mr. Bass of New Hampshire for, with Mr. Alger against.  
 Mr. Derounian for, with Mr. McIntire against.  
 Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Gavin against.  
 Mr. Mitchell for, with Mr. Moulder against.  
 Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Bonner against.  
 Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Dowdy against.  
 Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota against.  
 Mr. Evins for, with Mr. Mason against.  
 Mr. Montoya for, with Mr. Young against.  
 Mr. Morris of New Mexico for, with Mr. Burleson against.  
 Mr. McGovern for, with Mr. Grant against.  
 Mr. Holland for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.  
 Mr. Monagan for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Oliver with Mr. Lafore.  
 Mr. Powell with Mr. Jackson.  
 Mr. Diggs with Mr. Norblad.  
 Mr. Saund with Mr. St. George.  
 Mr. King of Utah with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. COOK, Mr. BAILEY, and Mr. BECKER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DEALERS' RESERVES

Mr. MILLS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R.

8684) to provide transitional provisions for the income tax treatment of dealer reserve income.

#### PROCEDURE FOR ASSESSING CERTAIN ADDITIONS TO TAX

Mr. MILLS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 9660) to amend section 6659(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax.

#### DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER ON CALENDAR WEDNESDAY OF NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS

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

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems, created by House Concurrent Resolution 172, agreed to August 29, 1957, is hereby authorized to hold public hearings on the bills S. 3193 and H.R. 11135, and to furnish transcripts of such hearings, and make such recommendations as it sees fit, to the Committees on the District of Columbia of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively.*

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

There was no objection.

#### FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON LONG-DISTANCE TELEPHONE CALLS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Federal excise tax on long-distance telephone calls is a continuing, discriminatory and deceitful penalty imposed upon business enterprise and individual convenience.

When this tax was levied by Congress during World War II, it was understood that it was an emergency measure for the purpose of increasing revenues and conserving materials that were needed for the war effort. Everyone agreed that this tax was necessary as long as the war should last. By the same token, it was expected that this levy would be discontinued as soon as possible, once the war was over.

For 15 years, however, this temporary tax has continued, thereby restricting the development of a communications system that is essential to service the expanding needs of our people and our economy.

In the United States, the telephone is a business and social necessity. A second telephone is being used in the kitchens of many American homes for the handy use of the busy housewife. Outdoor telephone booths are becoming a familiar sight on city streets and country highways to serve the general public at any hour of the day or night.

As Members of Congress, we would be unable to service the needs of our constituents without the availability of an efficient telephone service. Fortunately, we are provided with an allowance for this purpose. But if we had to pay for these toll calls out of our own pockets, we would immediately feel the financial hurt of the excise tax and would repeal it forthwith. It mystifies me why this tax is still in effect when there is no justification for it.

The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. paid Federal, State, and local taxes on its operations during 1959, totaling \$1,690,289,000. These taxes averaged \$3.39 per telephone per month.

In addition, telephone users paid directly some \$600 million in Federal excise taxes. This is double taxation with a vengeance, and not counting the triple taxation on a stockholder-user.

With the surplus of \$4 billion that is anticipated by the U.S. Bureau of the Budget, it is clear that the wartime telephone excise tax is now a matter of habit and not necessity. Its repeal will mean that the Federal Government will still enjoy a substantial surplus of revenues over expenditures.

We must caution the States that the Congress does not intend to remove this tax so that State legislatures may reimpose it for their own purposes. Businessmen and individuals alike must have relief from the punitive excise tax on local and long-distance service.

I have introduced a bill to remove the Federal excise tax on all telephone service, effective July 1, 1960.

I believe that the lifting of this burden will be of direct benefit to every business enterprise and to most individuals.

#### MY FRIEND DICK NEUBERGER

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances in the body of

the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, my friend and coworker from Oregon, Senator Richard L. Neuberger, died March 9, 1960. It is not easy for me to realize that he is in fact gone from this earth. So many of our mutual projects continue to come to my attention. I miss his wise counsel and friendly cooperation.

Dick's great public services are fully discussed in the editorials and articles which follow these remarks. I am going to record here a few personal facts about my friendship with him.

Long before I met Dick I had heard about him. I was a student in Woodrow Wilson Junior High School in Eugene when he was a student under WAYNE MORSE, among other professors, at the University of Oregon. I knew of him as a fearless, brilliant editor of the Oregon Daily Emerald, the student newspaper.

Later when I came home from college in the east I would talk about Dick Neuberger's latest exploits with Bill Tugman, longtime editor of the Eugene Register-Guard and more recently editor-publisher of the Port Umpqua, Reedsport, Oreg., Courier.

"Dick ought to get married," Bill often told me. This was his solution, in part anyway, for Dick's many and in his opinion somewhat outrageous crusades. Later Dick met and married a school-teacher by the name of Maurine Brown. Then two crusaders fought together for what they believed right.

Like millions of Americans, I read Dick's articles in many of the leading national magazines. We bought some of his books for our oldest boy, Don. He found them fascinating.

Late in 1951 my work with the American Bar Association's Survey of the Legal Profession, with headquarters in Boston, came to a close. Malcolm Bauer, a friend from the days when he was a reporter on the Eugene Register-Guard, was in Cambridge as a Nieman fellow. He told me that Dick Neuberger and Monroe Sweetland were the leading Democratic politicians in Oregon.

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

In 1952, during the Presidential campaign, my law partner in Eugene was forced, by angry Republican clients of his, to sever his connections with me because of an incident involving my public protest about the Vice Presidential Republican candidate and his private fund. This action made Dick Neuberger indignant. He offered his personal assistance as a member of the State legislature.

In 1953, as I was beginning to establish my law practice, Dick decided he would run for the U.S. Senate. It was a

gamble, despite the support of his many friends and admirers. The incumbent, Senator Guy Cordon, was no pushover.

That spring my wife, Priscilla, and I were driving back from Portland one day. The discussion turned to how I could help Dick. I had been planning to run for Congress ever since the eighth grade. That was the year the mortgage was foreclosed on my folk's home and the year I read Lincoln Steffens' autobiography.

Priscilla and I concluded that I could best help Dick by filing for the Fourth District seat, although this was 2 or 4 years ahead of my personal timetable.

Dick and I did a lot of campaigning together. I never stopped admiring his tremendous learning, his quick mind, and his real humility. It was a wonderful apprenticeship for me as a politician.

I lost by 15,000 votes in 1954 but came closer than any Democrat had done in previous contests. Dick won, after 2 days of anxious tallying, by around 2,000 votes, about one vote for every Oregon precinct. Great was the rejoicing. He was the first Democratic Senator from Oregon in 40 years.

When I ran again in 1956 Dick stumped my district and helped me in many ways. This time I won by 4,500 votes, the first Democratic Congressman from southwestern Oregon in 75 years. The help given to me by Dick, by WAYNE MORSE, and by many others made the difference.

No man ever gave more of himself to his friends than did Dick Neuberger. When I came to Washington, D.C., in December of 1956, Dick gave me and my staff working space in his office for 2 weeks prior to the swearing in of the new Congress. It was a typical unselfish gesture for him.

During the rest of the time I was to work with Dick in the Congress for Oregon and the Nation, I came to appreciate his friendship even more.

We kept in close touch by telephone. Sometimes I walked over to the Senate to talk with him or to have lunch. It was a collaboration I enjoyed, greatly valued and will always cherish in my memory.

Three days before Dick was stricken he called me from Portland. We talked for about 20 minutes. He told me he planned to remain in Oregon until after the Easter recess. With real concern, I told him, "Take care of yourself." He said he would and not to worry and added, as he always did, "Give our love to Priscilla and the children."

Four days after that conversation Dick was dead. He left us a rich heritage of a superb mind and a warm heart. He never thought of himself as a "big shot." He was always willing to grant, "I may be wrong." Service in public office to Dick was a privilege, a duty and a challenge.

The Lord gave me, and many others, a good friend in Dick Neuberger. The example of his life, so well attested in the following articles, serves as a standard and an inspiration to all of us who seek to carry on his enlightened devotion to our great Nation and its system of self-government.

Mr. Speaker, if I have been overly personal in these remarks about my friend Dick Neuberger, it is because his death was a very personal loss to me. Some people come to Washington to grow, others to swell, according to a well-known adage. Dick grew. His friends were many. I thank God that I was one of them.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1960]

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

When the tall young man from Oregon took his seat for the first time in the U.S. Senate on January 3, 1955, he was far better known throughout the country as a writer and crusading conservationist than as a political personality. When untimely death took him yesterday at the age of 47 his extraordinary qualities of mind and heart and spirit had achieved for him in those 5 short years a secure eminence of stature as a Senator.

It is difficult to write of Richard L. Neuberger in the past tense. His enthusiasm and sincerity, his undeviating conscience and his high sense of public service combined to make him not only one of the most respected Members of the Senate but also one of the most useful and most vital. His powerful pen and his persuasive voice gave life and point to many issues—notably improvement of the legislative process and preservation of this country's dwindling natural and scenic resources—that brought him into conflict with interests that a lesser politician would have been afraid to offend.

One of his current projects dearest to Senator Neuberger's heart was enactment of legislation to establish as a national seashore preserve, a magnificent stretch of Pacific beachland in his native State, known as the Oregon Dunes. No more fitting tribute could be paid him by the Congress and the people of the United States than to adopt the Neuberger bill that would set aside forever this area in memory of a fine legislator and great outdoorsman who was determined that future generations should share in the great natural heritage of this country that he knew so well and loved.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 10, 1960]

#### SENATOR NEUBERGER'S UNTIMELY DEATH

The death of Richard Neuberger is particularly poignant. A man in his vigorous and youthful prime, the junior Senator from Oregon had recently recovered from an operation for cancer. The malignancy had been arrested, and he was preparing to run for reelection in the fall. Moreover, he had been for many years a tireless advocate of greater Federal spending on medical research both on the floor of the Senate and in the press.

Senator Neuberger was a man steeped in the tradition of Western liberalism, a tradition which can boast many famous names in American political history. But his style was entirely his own—freewheeling, outspoken, dedicated, sometimes even brash, although the brashness gave way to a reflective maturity in the last few years. And the fact that he was Oregon's first Democrat elected to the Senate in 40 years speaks loudly for his personal magnetism and for the reality of his representation. His is a most regretted loss to the Northwest and to American public life in general.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 10, 1960]

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

The Senate has lost an extraordinarily useful, constructive, and independent-minded Member in the death of Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon. There is extra pathos to Senator Neuberger's death in that he had apparently withstood a long siege with

cancer little more than a year ago and had sought renomination in the Democratic primary, only to fall victim of a cerebral hemorrhage.

Always a liberal by conviction, Dick Neuberger was a provocative and controversial figure when in 1954 he became the first Democratic Senator elected from Oregon in 40 years. He had been a prolific author on political science subjects as well as about his beloved Northwest, and he had constituted a team with his attractive wife, Maurine, in the Oregon Legislature. If he wore his principles on his sleeve and tended a bit toward prudishness when he came to Washington, he soon rejected the doctrinaire approach. He was as ready to oppose what he regarded as the preconceived notions of his liberal friends as to strike at entrenched reaction.

The result was that he was regarded with respect and affection even by those he opposed, and his analytical quality sometimes provided a catalyst in the Senate. Particularly after his cancer operation he developed a rare humanitarian gentleness, manifested in his personal relationships as well as in his interest in health legislation. One of his great regrets was the feud prosecuted by his Oregon colleague, Senator MORSE. Withal he was a man of much courage, not hesitating to criticize ethical standards in Congress and to stand up virtually alone when he thought he was right.

Dick Neuberger contributed significantly to the popularizing of conservation and enlightened resources development, to intelligent discussion of political structure and to such specific measures as the bill to save disappearing shorelines and the billboard ban on interstate highways. He served his State and country with integrity and devotion which were appreciated in Oregon as well as in Washington. His wife, who shared his views and worked closely with him, would make an admirable successor in the Senate.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch]

SENATOR NEUBERGER

The untimely death of Senator Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon, deprives not only his State but the Nation of a valuable public servant. At 41 the journalist and student of politics made political history himself by becoming Oregon's first Democratic Senator in years; and it was his election that switched the Senate majority from Republican to Democratic after 2 brief years of the Eisenhower administration. He quickly proved himself a stalwart liberal though not a doctrinaire Democrat; he consistently supported the administration on foreign policy issues, fiscal, and monetary policy. Then, a little over a year ago, cancer struck him down. He recovered sufficiently to return to Washington for a time, devoting himself appropriately to the fight for funds for medical research. Yet now at 47 a cerebral hemorrhage has ended a promising career. The best measure of his quality is that after winning election in 1954 by the narrowest of margins he was entering this year's campaign with virtually no opposition to his reelection. The Nation will miss him.

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

DEATH'S SECOND CALL

The face of death was no stranger to Senator Richard L. Neuberger. He had gazed into it in 1958, when he was informed he had cancer and that the cancer had spread.

"In those first hours," the Senator reported later in Harper's magazine, "I never thought of my seat in the Senate, of my bank account, or of the destiny of the free world. I worried over my cat, Muffet. Who would take care of him? What would happen to my wife when I was gone. And how would it feel to die?"

He never knew; he never emerged from the coma that followed a cerebral hemorrhage that struck him on Tuesday afternoon. But he had meanwhile learned something else; how to conquer fear, how to fight back against grim odds, how to accept the sudden, devastating proof of mortality and go on from there. Not even death could take that away from Dick Neuberger.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Mar. 11, 1960]  
SENATOR NEUBERGER

Sometimes one might think it was a rule of the universe that the average man may accomplish only so much in a lifetime. Most of us struggle along to our 3 score and 10 without more than a small fraction of the achievements of U.S. Senator Richard Lewis Neuberger, Oregon Democrat, at his untimely death this week at 47.

As a member of the Oregon Legislature at 29, a prolific writer, lecturer, historian, world traveler, dedicated proponent of conservation, his flame burned brightly while it lasted.

His service in the U.S. Senate, beginning in 1954, was complicated by the rancorous attacks of his senior colleague, WAYNE L. MORSE. In this, as in other matters, he conducted himself with dignity and competence. He will be remembered as a superior man.

[From the Northern Virginia Sun, Mar. 10, 1960]

A SYMBOL OF YOUNG COURAGE, INTELLECT:  
SENATOR RICHARD NEUBERGER

The sudden, tragic death of Oregon's young Senator, Richard Neuberger, will be mourned far beyond the borders of his native State. For the things that Dick Neuberger fought for hold a special value and a higher meaning for mankind everywhere: human rights and the betterment of the lot of his fellow men.

A successful writer, Democrat Neuberger was attracted to politics by his admiration for the late George W. Norris, Nebraska's Republican liberal Senator. Together with his wife, Maurine, he served in the Oregon Legislature as the lone Democrat in a Republican State senate. He was the first Oregon Democrat to be elected to the U.S. Senate since 1914. But Dick Neuberger was a Democrat in the broader sense and so well did he serve his State that he was facing no serious opposition in his forthcoming reelection.

It was only a few months ago that he was assured he had conquered the cancer for which he had been operated on in 1958. His personal struggle against this dread disease won him respect and admiration throughout the Nation and he used his own experience and his position as Senator to campaign successfully for vastly increased medical research.

Following his cancer operation, he wrote: "A brush with cancer tends to place many things in true perspective . . . old antagonisms fade away. I can no longer transform political disagreements into any feelings of personal malice. When one is grateful to be alive, it is difficult to dislike a fellow human being."

For many Americans, Senator Neuberger symbolized young courage and intellect and a dedication to his convictions that were in the highest traditions of political democracy. He was also a vigorous advocate for conserving the Nation's natural resources and Senator MIKE MANSFIELD's announcement of a bill to name the proposed Oregon Dunes National Park for Senator Neuberger would seem a fitting tribute to the memory of a courageous heart who, in the words of Mr. MANSFIELD, was "a star whose light remains."

[From the Northwest Ruralite, April 1960]

#### NEUBERGER

By the time you read this, the shock, the memorials and the outcry over the passing of Oregon's Senator Richard L. Neuberger will be, in considerable measure, things of the past.

But the sense of loss will remain for some time, partly because Mr. Neuberger, like F. D. Roosevelt, had a gift for making himself known to thousands on a deeply personal basis.

In the next few weeks, the loss will be felt in a number of practical, everyday ways. He was the principal Senate champion of the regional power corporation bill, the destiny of which he was carefully guiding through the Congress. From his key position on important Senate committees, he was uniquely fitted to find the difficult answers to issues between power and fisheries, between the patient and downriver interests.

The patient statesmanship required to save the public interest in matters of resource development is an exercise taxing of the greatest energies. Many will remember how Senator Neuberger took the time out to barnstorm his State in a series of debates over a proposed partnership sellout of the John Day Dam, and how he won.

The skills and abilities to do these things are rare.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, Mar. 11, 1960]

#### THE MAN WHO GREW

It is a tragic loss to the country that a man like Senator Richard Neuberger, of Oregon, should have been fatally stricken when he was only 47 years old, and when he had apparently won a long and hard battle against cancer.

Neuberger was a man who grew with every day's experience in public life. A dozen years ago he was an editorial writer with a crusader's zeal. To him then everything seemed either black or white. But his experiences in politics, and particularly after he went to Washington, led him to see that on most issues there were only varying shades of gray. His views were greatly tempered through his contacts with men of different opinions and he was quick to take advantage of their knowledge.

Those who knew him well found him a better companion and far more interesting than when he was so violently partisan on many public issues. His untimely death has taken from the Senate a man with unusual promise.

[From the Washington Teamster, Mar. 11, 1960]

#### DICK NEUBERGER'S FINAL REMARKS—AN OPPORTUNITY TO SERVE

"Why not utilize the enthusiasm and talents of American youth to help sell democracy abroad? Representative HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, has introduced legislation to help accomplish this purpose. He proposes a nongovernmental study of the advisability and practicability of establishing a point 4 Youth Corps through which young men and women might serve around the world in U.S. technical cooperation programs. I have introduced identical legislation in the Senate.

"Such a program could well be a powerful force for increased world understanding. It would add manpower to carry out economic programs in underdeveloped nations, personally acquaint citizens in other lands of American ideals and aspirations, and provide American young people with an opportunity to serve their country in a stimulating fashion. One of the questions to be considered in the suggested study is whether

service in the corps should be considered as satisfying military service obligations. In the current cold war, we need persons with the ability to set up a rural school in the jungle as well as those with knowledge of how to operate a machinegun. How could we better explain the United States and its desire for world peace than through sending to aid needy nations our most valuable commodity—our youth."

The above paragraphs are excerpted from what will probably be the last edition of "Washington Calling," volume 6, No. 9, a column to the Oregon constituents of the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger. He passed away early Wednesday morning at age 47.

Not only will your editor of the Washington Teamster miss Dick Neuberger as a friend in the writing trade, but the State of Oregon, and indeed, the Nation will be the worse off for his untimely demise.

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

We certainly don't advocate that Congress can stand more journalists in its hallowed Halls, but we do believe that Neuberger was a credit to his first profession and a real champion in every sense of the word for his home State. He loved its people, cities, towns, and hamlets; its whistling winds on the hillsides; its ever-changing climate, beauty and native warmth.

And as an Oregonian he was a good neighbor to Washington. Best of all, he was a true friend of the workingman and his family.

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 10, 1960]

#### MAN WHO DIDN'T COME BACK (By Ed Koterba)

It was as he had left it 6 weeks before. It was a private office desk laden with impedimenta that told much of his character—the tiny statue of Thomas Jefferson, the 4-H emblem fused into a glass paperweight, the little felt donkey, the loaded desk calendar with speaking dates into April, and the books he had read or left unread.

This man of 47 years had no reason to believe he wouldn't return from Portland to his senatorial office soon, despite the words in the eulogy by Oregon's other Senator that "Dick Neuberger knew death was not long away . . ."

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

He was a prodigious writer. After his cancer operation, his staff knew he must rest. They rolled in a long black leather couch and set it in his room behind the desk.

And now Mary Jane Cox, his receptionist, was saying: "He never used it. . . . Instead of resting, he'd be at the typewriter."

Under the glass top the Senator had slipped a solitary entry, a billfold-size picture of an attractive woman, with her name typed in capital letters in the bottom margin, Maurine.

Along the wall there were the customary celebrities with penned personal notes, but the prominent spots went to his family. There was a picture of two of his nieces and one of the family cat, Muffet, a Manx.

Even for those who simply passed by room 115 there was a strong display of his personality, his philosophy. He had fought to save the vast resources of the Northwest's great outdoors, and there on the outside door hung a framed color photograph of Mount Hood with long-stemmed pink rhododendrons in the sloping foreground.

The book on the center of his desk remained as he had closed it—"America's Wonderland—The National Parks." It was one of the last books he had reviewed for the New York Times.

Strangely enough, what Senator Neuberger would not have been able to do in life he was able to accomplish in death. He had stayed—at least, temporarily—the harangue and anger of a Chamber torn against itself.

For 3½ hours the men and a lady of the Senate laid aside the bickering on civil rights to praise, as one, the works of the colleague who had now gone on to other things. And then they adjourned.

The sudden passing of Senator Neuberger also brought to an end the personal and painful assault against him by the colleague of his own State.

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

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

For on the Senator's date calendar stands this entry: "Talk on cancer, luncheon, Friday, April 1, Philadelphia."

[From the Trainman News, Mar. 14, 1960]

#### HE WILL BE MISSED

Senator Richard L. Neuberger's untimely death at the age of 47 represents a deep loss for the entire Nation. He was a battler for justice for all who make up our citizenry.

A dedicated proponent of liberalism, he also could be depended upon to do his utmost to bolster the welfare and advancement of the little fellow.

The Oregon Democrat many times was found on the firing line for organized labor. He delivered his abilities to other causes which to him represented a sense of fairness.

Senator Neuberger will be missed on the national scene.

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times, Mar. 10, 1960]

#### RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

The able newspaperman who became Oregon's junior Senator, Richard L. Neuberger, died unexpectedly early today at his home in Portland, Ore. Having won sensationally in 1954 as a Democrat from a Republican State, Senator Neuberger had filed only last week his intentions of seeking reelection. He suffered a cerebral hemorrhage following several weeks of illness when he had been beset by a series of virus infections.

At the age of 47, Senator Neuberger has been a most wholesome influence during the last 6 years of his life as a U.S. Senator and also in the 20 or so years before in which he was a prominent writer for newspapers and magazines. His interests primarily were in the conservation of natural and human resources. As a resident of the Far West, he believed sincerely in the public protection of the forests, the waters and the growing foods, whether they were on land or the fish of the seas. His writings on these subjects, as well as his advocacy of these conservation matters in the U.S. Senate, will be of great value as the years go on in the development of a sound conservation policy.

As a believer in the public's ownership of the resources, he was particularly effective in publicizing the hydroelectric power developments of the Northwest. He was a strong advocate of the public development of atomic energy. He genuinely considered that the American citizen had the primary

right to enjoy the huge power resources of the Nation.

The fact that he was a writer made him particularly articulate. Thus, he conveyed in terms that people could understand effectively the story of this Nation's resources. Unfortunately for him, he was not old enough in the 1930's to be a part of the huge governmental resource programs of that day. Many had been undertaken and even completed before he was old enough to work in their behalf. Yet, he was able to appreciate, after the development, their importance to the American people, and, thus, write ably about them in proposing programs which are yet to come. The things that he has been writing and saying since World War II will come to pass as the years go on and they will take place because of what he did and how he wrote before his death.

[From IUE News, Mar. 14, 1960]

#### NEUBERGER MOURNED BY IUE

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

(As a long-time member of the American Newspaper Guild, AFL-CIO, Neuberger was a fellow unionist.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Dick Neuberger made our world a finer and more promising place to live in; his departure from our ranks should inspire us to more vigorous advocacy of the causes of fraternity and economic democracy to which he devoted his fertile mind and great heart."

[From the Enginemen's Press, Mar. 18, 1960]

#### OREGON'S LIBERAL NEUBERGER DIES

PORTLAND, OREG.—Senator Richard L. Neuberger, long a supporter of liberal legislation

and an ardent backer of equal rights for the laboring man, died of a cerebral hemorrhage at his home on March 9, 1960.

Neuberger made political history in 1954 when he became the first Oregon Democrat to be elected to the U.S. Senate since 1914 and the feat sparked a Democratic upsurge in the State.

Neuberger has backed every liberal piece of legislation to come before the Senate since his election in 1954. In this respect his voting record has differed little from that of his senatorial partner from the State of Oregon, WAYNE L. MORSE. Both were extremely liberal and only in the field of foreign policy did MORSE and Neuberger differ. Vice President, National Legislative Representative A. M. Lampley, upon hearing of Senator Neuberger's death said, "He was one of the finest men in the U.S. Senate. You could always depend upon this man being on the liberal side of every issue. At no time in his senatorial career was he found wanting when legislation designed for the workingman was before that body. His leadership will be sorely missed by those of us who learned to respect him as a man dedicated to the service of his fellow men." Neuberger served as a member of the Oregon State Senate from 1949 until 1954 when he was elected to the U.S. Senate. Before that time he worked as a newspaperman and his articles and books have been widely published.

Senator and Mrs. Richard Neuberger had often been described as a political team. He, himself, referred to her as "the better half of his senatorial team." She is a proven votegetter and probably this accounts for the fact that many influential Democrats are anxious to have her appointed to serve out the unexpired term of her husband. She has indicated that she would do so. Under Oregon law, the Governor must appoint a Democrat to serve in the interim until the coming November elections.

[From the International Woodworker, Mar. 23, 1960]

#### RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

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

He was grossly criticized by some Republican political hacks for articles that he had published in the leading magazines of this country. Yet the fact that he was well known and highly regarded as a writer lent a great deal of support to the validity of the positions he took on many matters before the Senate.

It is safe to say that on some issues before the Senate he probably wrote more informed articles about the legislation to be considered than many of his less-informed colleagues ever read about the subjects.

No one could ever have accused Senator Neuberger of simply having an "intellectual veneer," for his writings proved his depth of understanding and profound knowledge and sympathy for his fellow man.

Neuberger knew Oregon better than many of us know the palm of our hand. Knowing Oregon, he knew its great needs in the areas of conservation and development of its natural resources.

He had the vision to transmit the needs of today into the planning for tomorrow.

There could be no more appropriate tribute to this man than to rename the John Day Dam now being constructed on the Columbia River as a lasting memorial to Senator Richard L. Neuberger who during his lifetime believed in and worked toward the full development of the Columbia River basin for the benefit of all the people.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer]

SENATOR NEUBERGER'S DEATH CUT OFF PROMISING CAREER

The untimely death of Senator Richard L. Neuberger of Oregon came at a period of his career when he was at the brink of emerging as a potent Senate force.

He had spent 5 years in Congress and at first may have been looked upon by some as a bit too vocal for a newcomer.

But the Senator was gaining in his own perspective, learning from experience. He even had broken with his old mentor, Senator WAYNE MORSE—an event which alone improved his stature. Moreover, he was in fact highly knowledgeable, particularly on conservation. His views on that subject were highly regarded.

Had he lived to be reelected this year—he was an odds-on favorite—he might have become one of the true stalwarts of the Senate. He had the intellect and despite serious illnesses, a tremendous vitality.

His change in thinking was illustrated last year when he wrote this:

"A brush with cancer tends to place many things in true perspective. Old antagonisms fade away. I no longer can transform political disagreement into any feelings of personal malice. When one is grateful to be alive, it is difficult to dislike a fellow human being."

There, in a paragraph, is a cue for many of us—and especially for the Senator's lawmaking comrades, whether they be flaming liberals or otherwise.

[From the International Woodworker, Mar. 23, 1960—Reprinted from the Toronto, Ontario, Canada, Globe and Mail]

SENATOR NEUBERGER KNEW, CARED ABOUT CANADA

Senator Richard L. Neuberger, who died in Portland, Oreg., was a true friend of Canada.

It was his belief that ties between this country and the United States were so close and unquestioned, both in war and in peace, that nothing should be done to strain them. He took the trouble to visit Canada—not once, but many times—in determined attempts to understand our people, our problems and our complaints against the United States.

He praised the Canadian family allowance program as a great social experiment for the United States to study and copy; and at one time advocated formation of a police force modeled after the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to protect the voting rights and lives of Negroes in the Southern States.

He was one of the first to offer a resolution in the U.S. Senate to create a joint Senate-House of Representatives committee to study Canada-United States relations.

Not all Mr. Neuberger's suggestions were acceptable to Canadians. His bill calling for joint action by the two countries to pave the Alaska Highway was coolly received in Ottawa; and Canadians were incensed by his suggestions that the two countries join together to form one great North American community.

But Mr. Neuberger did care something about Canada, and he did know something about Canada—which is more than could be said for many or most of his colleagues in Washington.

[From the Intermountain Jewish News, Mar. 18, 1960]

ADL, AMC MOURN SENATOR NEUBERGER

The Anti-Defamation League has lost a good friend and B'nai B'rith member and the Nation a great statesman. So said Sheldon Steinhauser, ADL regional director, who voiced the shock and regret of ADL leaders

at the sudden passing of Senator Richard L. Neuberger at 47.

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

Senator Neuberger's last appearance in Denver, November 15, 1959, was to speak at the American Medical Center Eleanor Roosevelt Cancer Institute and at ADL's "Torch of Liberty" award dinner. He was accompanied by his wife, Maurine, a candidate for his Senate seat.

IGNORED INJURY

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

Steinhauser recalled the Senator's obvious sincerity in urging the 400 ADL leaders to maintain a steady fight on behalf of the rights of mankind. "The history of the protection of civil rights," Senator Neuberger emphasized, "is one of erosion of resistance through the continuing abrasive action of organized and articulate groups such as the Anti-Defamation League."

LAUDED LEGISLATURE

The Senator praised the Colorado General Assembly as the first legislature to enact a fair housing act.

The use of political anti-Semitism against Senator Neuberger backfired in the 1954 election.

Steinhauser called Senator Neuberger "one of the most dedicated, sincere, and competent champions of civil rights and other liberal and humanitarian causes. His loss leaves a void in public life which will not be easily filled."

AMC REGRETS

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

A sponsor of the institution and himself a sufferer of cancer, Senator Neuberger participated in ground-breaking exercises November 16, 1959, for the \$2 million institute building.

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

Senator Neuberger was a member of the development committee of the institution headed by Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT.

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

RICHARD NEUBERGER

Senator Richard Neuberger was a liberal Democrat, a man avidly interested in government benefiting the people. His position was excessively progressive, often, in our opinion.

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

He wrote well. His interests were broad. He added something of value to the Senate and to American public life. His death from cerebral hemorrhage properly is cause for sincere mourning.

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

SENATOR NEUBERGER

After Senator Richard L. Neuberger, Oregon Democrat, had successfully undergone

a cancer operation he so beautifully and touchingly said: "A brush with cancer tends to place many things in true perspective \* \* \* old antagonisms fade away. I no longer can transform political disagreements into any feeling of personal malice. When one is grateful to be alive, it is difficult to dislike a fellow human being."

Neuberger was once an extremely controversial figure in politics. He mellowed with his service in the Senate. Oregon editors also mellowed. Many fought him heatedly in his 1954 campaign. In recent months they had praised him.

At one time Neuberger and WAYNE MORSE, companion Democratic Senator from Oregon, were close friends. It is to Neuberger's credit that he parted with the vindictive MORSE. MORSE once had even threatened to campaign against Neuberger who had announced for reelection and almost without opposition.

Now death suddenly takes Mr. Neuberger, not from cancer but a cerebral hemorrhage. And in the very prime of life. He was 47.

Neuberger was a writer of national fame. He was a spirited liberal but injected logic and fairness into all his political actions and thinking.

He was a champion of Government ownership, particularly natural resources covering water and power projects.

Senator Neuberger's death removes from the scene a distinguished Senator and citizen.

[From the Tarpon Springs (Fla.) Leader]

TRAGIC LOSS OF BRILLIANT LEADER

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

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

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

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

LOSS OF A FRIEND

First in the Oregon Legislature and later in the U.S. Senate, Richard L. Neuberger was a warm friend of rail labor.

The Senator was a writer and newspaperman before entering politics in 1940. He served as the New York Times correspondent in the Pacific Northwest.

He wrote many fine travel articles for popular magazines and many of them were good boosts for rail travel.

His death from a cerebral hemorrhage came as an extra shock because of his seeming victory over cancer two years ago.

At 47 he was far too young to die. Although he leaves a splendid record of service, he had much more to contribute.

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

NEUBERGER'S DEATH CALLED GRIEVOUS LOSS TO OREGON

GARDINER, OREG.

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

In my many years in Oregon, this State has suffered no greater loss than in the death of U.S. Senator Richard Neuberger—at the peak of his public service.

Dick and I differed politically, but we worked together on many occasions and earned each other's respect.

The first of these occasions was the great fight to reduce the compulsory student athletic fees in the bitter depression year 1933; the fee had been \$5 per term; Dick and his group asked for a cut to \$2.50.

The athletic gang (which had conspired to make Dick editor of the Emerald with the mistaken notion they could control him) balked at any fee cut. A bill was introduced in the 1933 legislature.

Dick, Gene Allen, and Steve Kahn came to my house one evening and asked if I would appear with them the following morning at a public hearing on their bill in Salem; they promised to pick me up at 6:30 a.m. with a car.

The ride to Salem in that old open "japopy" was almost as rugged as a trip to the North Pole, but in spite of icy roads we made it in time.

The chairman of the committee, a long-time friend of mine, gave us a courteous hearing, and when it was over—toward noon—we felt we had accomplished a blow for justice. Imagine my surprise when, on my way down the stairs in the old state-house, I encountered the late Harry Crain, of the Salem Capital Journal.

Harry wanted to know why I was in Salem and when I told him he laughed heartily.

"Bill, you've been suckered, you and those 'kids.' That committee signed a 'do not pass' last night and the House buried the measure this morning while you were in there arguing to the committee."

I dashed back to the committee room and seldom have I blasted any man as I did my friend, the committee chairman (his apologies were very feeble).

On the way home to Eugene, Dick and the boys planned an initiative to repeal the compulsory student fee entirely—and that was done, when we took the case to the voters.

This and other student fights undoubtedly led to the efforts to drive Dick out of the University of Oregon Law School a year later and to the vicious slanders which were propagated 20 years later in the campaign of 1954. It was my privilege to contradict those slanders, knowing the whole story, chapter and verse.

During the last year Senator Neuberger and I worked together for the great Oregon Coast (Dunes) Seashore project—a far-sighted program of restoration and conservation which I can only hope will not be impaired by his death.

WILLIAM M. TUGMAN.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Mar. 9, 1960]

#### DICK NEUBERGER EARNED HIS WAY

Dick Neuberger earned his way to greatness. Oregon's junior Senator, whose life was ended abruptly Wednesday morning at the peak of his public career, was not born to it, did not have it thrust upon him. He earned it, every step of the way, by hard work, devotion to duty, loyalty to friends and an abiding belief in certain principles. This was recognized, even by those who considered themselves his political enemies. Their expressions of regret, which rolled in Wednesday morning, were sincere.

It was not always so with Dick Neuberger. In his legislative career he had enemies aplenty. In the 1954 senatorial campaign he came through with a narrow victory only after putting up with an avalanche of personal abuse. Few men have gone to the Senate with more handicaps. Those who opposed him in the election vowed to oppose him in office, too. That the situation was so different less than 6 years later was a credit to Dick. He turned the other cheek time and time again, demonstrating that he

wanted to be a good Senator. By the time of his death even his earlier opponents believed him.

He was a native son, born here, educated here. He lived in Oregon. Washington, D.C., and its heady atmosphere was to him never more than a temporary duty station. Oregon was home. It is significant that in his illness he chose to return to Portland rather than to undergo medical treatment in the capital. He died in Oregon, too, which must have been the place he wanted to die. Anybody who ever sat on a bluff at Ecola State Park with Dick Neuberger and who had watched him enjoy Oregon, with a zestful, positive enjoyment, can understand his affection for his native State.

He always worked hard. At the university, where he was the fiery, unorthodox, controversial editor of the Oregon Daily Emerald, he outworked everybody around him. His personal correspondence was always tremendous. He wrote—letters, magazine articles, speeches, news stories, essays, anything. He would stop writing only when he stopped breathing.

Even with his heavy Senate load, he continued to pour out a volume of writing that would have staggered many a full-time author. His doctors told him to slow down, and he promised he would. He tried, too. But slowing down was the hardest work of all. His friends, those who had known him in more relaxed days, talked among themselves about his overwork, about his ashen color, about his obvious loss of weight. But he continued working, achieving fame and respect.

Through it all he remained a nice guy, always thoughtful, always interested. Childless himself, he maintained a deep interest in students—university students, high school students. He gave up more profitable patronage privileges in exchange for the right to appoint pages in the Senate.

It was neither irreverence nor disrespect that caused his friends Tuesday night and early Wednesday to begin the grim and seemingly callous speculation about his successor. The work of Government must go on. And it was an unfortunate accident of fate that had the Oregon senatorial contest thrown wide open only hours before the legal deadline. This frantic jockeying for position, this swapping of estimates of strength, is something Dick would have understood. There is just nothing else that can be done as the clock ticks toward 5 p.m. Friday.

It will be Oregon's good fortune if we can do as well in finding a successor. Let us hope he is as devoted to duty, as energetic, and as fine a man.

[From the Coos Bay (Oreg.) World, Mar. 9, 1960]

#### TOO MUCH TO DO IN ONE LIFETIME

Dick Neuberger couldn't turn it off. Always a man of driving energy and possessor of a bottomless well of ideas, he apparently was unable to adjust his pace to his physical condition after his development of cancer and the long, enervating treatments he underwent in the successful battle against it.

There was simply too much to be done in this world for Oregon's foremost author of ideas and exponent of discussion to be still.

His inability to reduce his pace, to leave off the constant telephoning and writing, discussing and worrying, must in the final analysis have caused his death.

Under the best circumstances, his friends understood, his life expectancy had been cut by the radiation treatments which eradicated the malignancies. But this still meant years of fruitful service to his people—at a normal man's pace. Dick Neuberger was not a normal man when it came to work. And so the expectancy of years was erased.

Neuberger was unusual on the Washington scene. He never found it necessary to become a Washingtonian. If he had represented Oregon in the Senate for 50 years, instead of 5, he would still have been chafing to return to the green hills and sandy shores of his home country. He still would have been irritated at his enforced stay in the Potomac swamp.

I will always recall a luncheon with Dick Neuberger in the summer of 1957—it was the day which the Senate passed the Hells Canyon Federal Dam bill—during which he expressed his personal frustrations at being in Washington.

"I don't think I will run for reelection," he said.

"I feel as if I were in jail, here. I can't write any more. I haven't time to get away with a typewriter and think and write," said America's most successful freelance writer.

"I haven't been able to go camping or hiking. I haven't been able to sit by a mountain stream or walk along a beach and listen to the surf."

"I don't like it here that well," he said.

But then under my doubtful questioning, he admitted that the elaborate courtesies shown a Senator and the rarefied atmosphere of the most exclusive club in America, were enticements difficult to resist, and that if he resisted them, he would be a rarity indeed.

Yet he might not have run for reelection if it hadn't been for another factor, more powerful than the natural attractions of Senate prerequisites.

That factor would have been pride.

There has never been any doubt in anybody's mind, including Dick Neuberger's, that his first election was achieved on the coattails of WAYNE MORSE. Everyone's first election is generally achieved on someone's coattails, but this was especially true in the case of Neuberger, the first liberal Democrat elected in a statewide race for many, many years, and doing it with the vigorous backing of Oregon's newest Democrat, Senator MORSE.

As a result, Neuberger was sometimes downgraded as a creature of Morse. Even after the idea became ridiculous, there was the constant intimation that Neuberger could not have made it on his own.

He wanted to make it on his own.

There's no doubt in anybody's mind that he would have done so. Up to the moment of his death he was virtually unopposed by a serious candidate, Democrat or Republican. His support split party lines in every direction. This was the result of his exemplary record in the Senate—a record of achievement for his Nation as well as for his State and party.

After life leaves, what is left?

That impression which remains after we are no longer able to answer earthly questioning is the sum total of our life, the remaining assets after the debts have been subtracted.

In the case of Dick Neuberger, the sum of life is great. He leaves behind a river of ideas and a reservoir of principle. These will inspire others.

When the unimportant factors are forgotten, his vigorous advocacy of democracy, education, charity, and tolerance will remain.

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Journal, Mar. 9, 1960]

#### DEATH OF A SENATOR

Dick Neuberger, as a young man, always "knew where he was going," his detractors said.

But he didn't. Most of these detractors, almost all of whom became friends as the years passed, now agree that Dick didn't really know until the past year or so.

He grew rapidly in the Senate. And he matured as his health waned.

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

For example, Neuberger called a Republican friend for advice on the recent hassle over the Oregon sand dunes proposal. It was this friend's advice that led to the compromise which probably will result in establishment of a national park on the coast. Yet it had become a perfect political issue, with all of the plus aspects on Neuberger's side. There's no doubt Neuberger wanted the park more than he wanted the political points.

Two months ago we gave a bit of gratuitous editorial advice. We pointed out that the Senator worked too hard on too many things (the Senate, politics, writing, speaking, etc.). We said that he should concentrate on being a Senator in the purest sense and let his body recuperate from the series of minor and major illnesses. We wondered if he could slow down and guessed that he had a bad case of Potomac fever—that he couldn't stop running.

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

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

Neuberger, as a writer, appreciated the dramatic. And the end of his career came dramatically, almost on the eve of the deadline for filing for his office. As a political historian he had a keen feeling for reputation beyond the present. One of his dreams of recent times was to have a place in history among the selfless, nonpartisan greats of the Senate. He didn't live long enough, in all probability, to achieve this. But he never had been more popular, and that popularity had nothing to do with party affiliations.

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

#### SENATOR RICHARD NEUBERGER

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

Even though Senator Neuberger died in the prime of life, he had achieved fame in two separate careers. Long before he became a member of the U.S. Senate he was nationally known as a writer. His command of the printed word was unusually good.

As a Senator he worked long and hard to achieve the goals in which he believed. During later years even his Republican opponents agree that he had matured and become a strong voice for his beloved State of Oregon.

There is little doubt but that he would have been returned to the Senate again this year with the backing of the majority of the voters of the State. His loss will be a blow to the people of Oregon and an unusually hard blow to the Democratic Party which will find his shoes hard to fill.

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune, Mar. 9, 1960]

#### RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

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

Since his high school and university days, Dick Neuberger has been a controversial character, hated by some, devotedly admired by others. But very few people felt "neutral" about him.

From the days when, as editor of the daily Emerald at the University of Oregon, he battled student leaders, administrative figures and faculty members, raising blood pressures and temperatures as he went, Dick has relished a fight.

Even in the last few years of his life, when he had mellowed considerably, he didn't back away from a battle which he felt important.

But particularly following his cancer operation, his sense of values underwent a considerable change, and partisanship no longer was a deciding factor in his thinking.

During his 5 years in the Senate (which started out with the "squirrels on the White House lawn" controversy, and which brought him both notoriety and ridicule), he became less strident, less combative, less convinced of his own omnipotence.

And, following his successful fight to save the great pine forests of the Klamath Indian Reservation from destruction, he was acknowledged throughout the State for a statesmanlike approach to matters of concern to Oregon.

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

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

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

And now, just as his growing maturity was bringing him to what could have been his most useful and most influential years, he is felled by a stroke—brought on, in no small measure, by the steady, constant grind of work which sapped his strength and vigor.

Richard Lewis Neuberger, 47, will go down in the State's history as one of the great public servants of this generation.

Nor will his stature be diminished by the fact that he had his enemies. Rather it will be enhanced.

For a man often is judged more accurately by the enemies he makes than by his friends. And, particularly in the last year or so, Dick Neuberger's enemies did him great credit—credit which will be accorded him for years to come.

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

#### SENATOR NEUBERGER'S DEATH TRAGIC LOSS

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

Cancer was not the direct cause of death, though one might assume that it contributed to a loss of resistance which, coupled with his habit of mercilessly driving himself, made him prey to other ills.

The sadness which comes now has no partisan lines, for Dick Neuberger had countless friends at National, State, and local levels whose political beliefs were different from his own.

So full and varied was his life that his activities cannot be summarized and appraised in the space permitted here.

Never one to hide his light under a bushel, Neuberger early found himself in the spotlight, often in the middle of controversy, on which he seemed to thrive. He had a penchant for presenting new and novel ideas and he would fight for them against seemingly impossible odds. He was a master of words, and for his opponents he put plenty of sting in them.

But nobody can speak of Neuberger now without reference to his mellowing. The Senator himself traced this primarily to his earlier brush with death from cancer, and he often said: "I no longer can transform political disagreement into any feelings of

personal malice. When one is grateful to be alive, it is difficult to dislike a fellow human being."

It was our observation that the maturing process began before his cancer illness. Neuberger turned away from extreme partisanship to accomplish things which could not have been done on a partisan basis. One of the most notable examples was his leadership in helping to win administration-sponsored legislation to protect Klamath Indians Reservation timber involved in termination. This was in line with his consistent effort in behalf of conservation of natural resources and coordinated basin development.

He fought unreservedly for many phases of administration foreign policy, even while under attack from constituents at home for so doing. While he believed that the Federal Government should actively do many things to better the lot of the people, functions which others believed should be left to private enterprise and the States, Neuberger developed a sense of fiscal responsibility. This was reflected in his espousal of unpopular increases in the Federal gasoline tax and postal rates.

In his recent effort to win a national seashore recreation area on the Oregon coast, he went to extreme lengths to get the cooperation of the State administration when it first seemed hostile to the proposal.

In his role as a freelance writer, Neuberger did more than any other citizen to publicize Oregon nationally. His writings were eagerly accepted in the top publications, and they reflected his profound love for this State. This reached a climax in Oregon's centennial year when Neuberger's articles reached a wider audience than could possibly otherwise have been won.

Neuberger's experience with cancer heightened an already held interest in the public health field. He wrote and worked tirelessly in behalf of a step-up in cancer research, using his own illness to dramatize the need. It may be that in looking back over his life this is the thing in which he would have taken most pride.

Dick Neuberger will be remembered for his flashing mind, his restless energy, his widespread interest, his remarkable talent for research, analysis, and communication. But influencing everything he did was his love and sympathy for and his understanding of his fellows, their hopes and problems.

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

This newspaper had its differences with Neuberger in the past. It did not support him in 1954, and he and we exchanged some harsh words. But in the last few years this had been changed into a mutual respect. We consider that Neuberger has been an outstanding American and citizen of Oregon. We profoundly regret his loss to the Nation and the State. Our deepest sympathy goes to his wife, Maurine, and other members of his family.

[From the East Oregonian, Pendleton, Oreg., Mar. 10, 1960]

#### RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

It isn't going to be easy to write this. It never is easy to write of a friend who has been taken by death. This is so very difficult because my friendship with Dick Neuberger goes back to the days when we were kids



learning to be newspapermen. It was a friendship that came, over the years, to mean more to me than I can express to you.

Dick Neuberger's death is a tragedy for so many people, not alone his friends. There was so much ahead for him to do, tasks that no one else in Oregon could do as well.

Before he went to the U.S. Senate he was established as a writer whose stories on any subject were sought by all the best magazines and by such great newspapers as the New York Times and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

In less than 6 years in the U.S. Senate he became a statesman who was admired and respected by men on both sides of the aisle for his intellect, his capacity to serve the people of his State and his fairness and tolerance.

Because of the respect Members of both parties had for him, he was getting more and more done for Oregon. He worked as effectively with many Republicans as he did with Democrats in the Senate. Members of the Republican Party in Oregon knew that he would unflinchingly place the interests of all citizens of Oregon ahead of any other consideration. They knew that they need not hesitate about going to him with their problems.

A few days ago he told me he intended to serve (if Oregonians desired that he should) one more term in the Senate. He wanted to do that because there was a lot of unfinished business in the Senate he wanted to have a hand in. He had become so effective in the Senate in his first term that he most certainly would have accomplished much in the second.

Another term and then he was coming home to Oregon to spend the rest of his years writing and enjoying life with close friends.

Dick Neuberger had an almost unbelievable capacity for work. He fulfilled his duties as Senator as well as any man Oregon has sent to Washington. But he also found time to write for magazines and newspapers, to carry on personal correspondence that would have kept most men busy had they nothing else to do, to make a great number of speeches, and to read every week more than most of us get to in a month.

His personal correspondence was of amazing magnitude. Children of his friends always were in his thoughts. He wrote to them and sent them gifts. So many letters to parents on important matters contained special messages for their children.

He loved young people. When he went to the Senate he was offered patronage rights. What was his first choice? To appoint a Senate page. He established a research internship on his staff for outstanding graduates of Oregon colleges in political science and journalism. He gave a large portion of his earnings from magazines to Oregon colleges as scholarship funds. The book he wrote for children about the Lewis and Clark Expedition was a best seller.

His devotion to the preservation of natural resources was deep rooted. He paid the wonders and beauties of nature more than lip service, as all who read his magazine articles knew. There was no subject he enjoyed more writing about. He enjoyed even more a day at the beach or at a lake or on a mountain trail. One of the most enjoyable days I've had was spent with the Neuberger family on the beach at Ecola Park, a day of such beauty that we spoke of it many times thereafter.

Dick could have done so much for this State and its citizens in the years ahead. But there is nothing to be gained now in speculating upon that. Let us speak instead of the high place he has in the history of this State because of all he accomplished in 47 years, as a writer, State legislator, and U.S. Senator, and in countless other ways. Those who knew him intimately saw early

a man of great stature, a stature that others recognized later. When he was elected to the U.S. Senate, I said to some who had doubts, "Dick Neuberger will be a fine Senator. Just give him time. He has all the qualities that a man needs to be a great Senator." That he measured up was so well recognized throughout Oregon that it was conceded by almost all the politicians that he would be reelected by the biggest margin ever given a candidate for the Senate from this State.

I could write much, much more about Dick Neuberger. But much of it would be personal and this is not the place for that. I shall close by saying that no man will pass this way whom I shall think better of.

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

**NEUBERGER'S RISE IN SENATE RAPID, IMPRESSIVE, DESERVED**  
(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Richard L. Neuberger came to the Senate as a critic in the highest literary sense and in the most partisan political sense. He departed as a creative and skilled legislator whose wholly unpartisan accomplishments seem destined to memorialize him for decades to come.

In his relatively brief 5-year career as U.S. Senator, Neuberger rose visibly in the estimate of impartial observers here, and even in the view of many who disagreed with much of the liberal program he advocated.

The change in Neuberger, one of the most evident witnessed in the Senate in years, came about in midway through his term when, coincidentally, he deliberately broke his political alliance with WAYNE MORSE.

Neuberger decided, he said in 1957, that Oregon could no longer afford to have two gadfly Senators. He did not begrudge Senator MORSE this role nor challenge his senior colleague's preeminence in that sphere. It served a useful purpose; but as for himself, he explained, he would thereafter concentrate on "getting things done" legislatively for Oregon.

In the 3 years or less left to him, Neuberger amassed an impressive legislative record. The achievement to which he devoted the most time and effort was saving the Klamath pine forests from the threat of clear-cutting and destruction as a source of sustained-yield timber, a watershed, and a wildlife sanctuary. The threat had arisen from a Republican-sponsored act ending Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe and Reservation. After developing a working liaison with Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton, he got through his bill to put the \$90 million forest under sustained-yield protection and to create a Federal wildlife refuge for the Pacific flyway.

**"MR. CONSERVATION"**

This accomplishment, his first major one, epitomized the endeavor which Neuberger exerted in behalf of conservation of resources. What he had determined early in life to crusade for in magazine articles and books, Neuberger the Senator learned to implement on the Federal statute books. Some thought he was extreme in his advocacy of conservation causes, while others thought of him as "Mr. Conservation" in Congress.

He next won enactment of a bill authorizing Fort Clatsop National Memorial to mark the end of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, of which he loved to write. He gladly shared honors for getting it passed with the Congressman in whose district it lay, Representative WALTER NORBLAD, a Republican—although everyone close at hand recognized that it was Neuberger whose skill got it enacted.

**MOST DECISIVE**

One of his first and most frustrating crusades in the Senate was against allowing com-

mercial signboards to clutter the new interstate highway network Congress was planning to finance. But his speeches and articles against obscuring the Nation's scenery ran into heavy lobbying from the billboard lobby and drew only halfhearted support from the administration. The outcome was a weak compromise to give States incentive payments if they ban billboards. It didn't please him, but he felt it was all that could be salvaged.

As a junior Senator, Neuberger was assigned to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, where he made his most decisive national contributions. Last year he put through the Senate a bill agreeable to the administration for providing health insurance and medical programs for Government workers, recognized as a model for similar programs in private industry.

**VOTED WITH GOP**

When the administration plugged for higher postal rates to cut the postal deficit and increase postal workers' wages, Neuberger gradually became convinced that more Government services had to become more nearly self-financing to avoid greater Federal fiscal deficits. While his party generally opposed Federal increase, Neuberger voted with the Republicans to provide a single-vote margin for the bill in committee. It was ultimately enacted.

Thereafter, Neuberger spoke more of the need for fiscal responsibility than for Federal spending programs, although he still advocated many of the latter in the field of public works, health, education, and welfare programs. For this new emphasis on pay-as-you-go, it was widely supposed that this liberal Democrat had suddenly become a conservative. Republicans who once denounced him now began to pay him compliments.

**SUCCESSFUL FIGHT**

Neuberger did not, however, renounce those liberal programs he had previously espoused. But he did insist that it was a liberal's responsibility to face the cost of new programs—not simply because it was virtuous to balance the Federal budget but because, he pointed out, the bulk of taxation and cost of interest on the national debt falls upon the low and middle income brackets, not just the rich and the corporate interests whom liberals often condemn.

After he fought back successfully from his cancer bout, Neuberger spoke and wrote more about the demands for more cancer research funds at the National Institutes of Health. But his massive program in this field was too costly for the administration to accept. Nevertheless, Congress steadily increased cancer research funds, for which he deserved at least an assist on the final scoreboard.

**UNTHINKABLE OPPOSITION**

Last year he launched his last major effort when he introduced a bill authorizing an Oregon Dunes National Seashore. He confidently supposed he could pilot it through Congress in short order. To Neuberger, the man of ideas and conservation vision, it was unthinkable that Oregonians could oppose a new national park with its great local and tourist benefits. But vocal opposition did arise, and in recent months Neuberger joined forces with Gov. Mark Hatfield to compromise their differences in behalf of the proposal. It was the one major achievement he hoped to chalk up in this year's session—but illness took him home to Portland this winter before he could get the bill underway.

**RAPID LEARNER**

Neuberger won the stature and esteem with which he departed Washington by the hardest route. For when he came here in 1955, he caused much headshaking when he charged President Eisenhower with law-breaking for reports that White House lawn

squirrels were being trapped and shipped to West Virginia because they dug up the presidential golf green.

But Neuberger learned the ropes rapidly, if with some awkwardness. He even wrote an article about the mistakes he had made as a freshman. In another article he said the best advice he had ever received was to keep in mind that the other fellow might be right. He frequently prefaced comments with, "I may be mistaken, but I think \* \* \*" and he displayed a tolerance in debate that was uncommon in a chamber where headstrong and willful men sometimes create the image of absolute certainty.

#### A PUBLIC MAN

Throughout his career, Neuberger was truly a public man. He yearned to communicate his ideas to the public, to persuade and to lead, to explain and to justify. He had faith that the citizens of Oregon, when given full and candid accounting of public business, would respond intelligently even at possible cost to themselves.

So in the final analysis, Neuberger's accomplishments came not only out of his conversion to the spirit of bipartisan accommodation within the Senate which marked his later years. It came also from his faith in the people's sustaining role in the democratic process.

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Press,  
Mar. 11, 1960]

#### PASSING IN REVIEW

(By Dewey Rand)

It is difficult for me to realize Dick Neuberger will no longer stride Oregon's political stage to represent his State in the U.S. Senate. Even his series of recent illnesses were no preparation for his tragic death this week at the age of 47.

It doesn't seem like two and a half decades since I first met Dick back in the gloomy and disturbing days of the depression, but it was. And it was then, in the thirties, that the bright young man became interested in politics as a cure for a serious national illness. This political interest led to one of his two extraordinarily successful careers. The other was, of course, as a writer.

Dick Neuberger's political history spans the period that has changed the State's political arrangement. Prior to the great depression the State was controlled by the Republicans and now Oregon is a two-party State. Dick, through his political activities and successes, had as much to do with this transformation as any other person. And all but the most partisan members of the Republican Party agree this change has been beneficial.

There is no need for me to review Dick's record, which is being so thoroughly covered by the press, or to join in the deserved eulogies he is receiving nationwide and that he deserves. I would like, rather, to mention a few personal observations and impressions of this man and of this period. They will shed little new light but they might be of interest.

One is the recently-acquired custom of Republican editors of saying that Dick Neuberger "has matured." I believe this is misleading, although not deliberately so. Of course all people mature as time goes on and experiences have their effect. But I believe these observers were misled by Dick's change in method rather than any basic change of philosophy. He did learn the practical methods of political accomplishment but in my periodic talks with him I did not find the change in his ideas his former critics claimed. These editors were, I believe, engaged in wishful thinking about someone they were stuck with, for Dick's reelection was conceded by nearly everyone.

One of my most distressing experiences was the result of the disagreement between Dick and WAYNE MORSE. I had admired these two men for many years and considered

them both my personal friends, as I did until the last day. But there was nothing I could do about this clash of personalities as much as I wished to and it was all the more tragic to me because I thought it all unnecessary. They were never so very far apart on the larger issues they were called upon, as Senators, to judge.

I visited with Dick shortly before he made his last trip to Washington, just before illness brought him home for the last time. He had decided then to run for reelection although he did not announce until last week. We talked of the coming campaign and I assured him I would do what I could to help. It was a small thing but he was pleased. And now I am pleased that I told him then that I believed he was an excellent U.S. Senator and had made clear my support was unreserved.

What more is there to say without being repetitious or emotional? There is, I think, one fact that has not been given much attention. That is, Dick's political career is not only a high compliment to him but also to the political arrangements in which it could happen. In a conservative State and as a member of a minority party—in the beginning—a young man reached the U.S. Senate and was a credit to that body, and over the sometimes bitter opposition of many who now praise him.

And when I appreciate more fully that he has left the stage I will miss, more than I do today, his brightness and imagination, his skillful political activities in behalf of issues in which we both believed. But most of all I'll miss his steady friendship as will hundreds of others.

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Press,  
Mar. 11, 1960]

#### RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

The sudden and tragic death of U.S. Senator Richard L. Neuberger leaves a void in the State of Oregon that will not soon be filled, if it ever is.

He was a great humanitarian who, through his congressional influence, contributed immeasurably to a better life for people all over the world. He was a loyal native son of Oregon who never missed an opportunity to bring credit and improvement to his State. But more than all that, he was a particularly gifted writer who, in addition to doing good works, could persuade others to do them. His great talent in making complicated public issues clear to the public will be sorely missed.

It is ironic that this useful man, who struggled so hard for better health for others and had done so long before his own health began to deteriorate, should be struck down just when he was becoming most effective in this field.

The Senator, a fierce partisan through most of his life, had mellowed and just begun to specialize in the field of health, in which field he saw no partisanship. He said, after his scare with cancer, that he never again could be so partisan after seeing the most wealthy Republican wrapped in a sheet, as he was, undergoing an examination that would determine whether his life would go on or whether it would end.

In the course of events there will have to be a successor to his seat in the Senate and, because the Democratic Party has become a vigorous one in Oregon, there are a number who could fill it. But none could fill the same role that Senator Neuberger filled.

As this is written, a number of possibilities present themselves. One is that Maurine Neuberger, herself a person of great stature and ability, be appointed by Governor Hatfield to fill out the remaining months of her husband's term. As the Senator's No. 1 advisor, she is in a particularly good position to carry out matters as he would have done. It would seem almost cruel for her to have to face a decision on this at this

time, and maybe the appointment should be held up for a time for this reason, to give her a chance to consider it with perspective.

It is certain that others will have to consider the race. In spite of the genuine grief felt by Oregonians of both parties, the deadline for filing at 5 p.m. Friday, March 11, is inexorably coming upon us and cannot be ignored.

It can only be hoped that both political parties will be able to come up with candidates who would be able to serve the people of Oregon as conscientiously and as ably as Senator Richard L. Neuberger has done.

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

#### FULFILLMENT

On that day in November 1954, when the late count of ballots showed that Richard L. Neuberger had defeated the veteran incumbent, U.S. Senator Guy Cordon, the Oregonian's editorial comment began:

"Someone—perhaps it was Woodrow Wilson—once observed that when a man goes to Washington, D.C., he either grows or swells."

The man who wrote those words, the late Philip H. Parris, then editor of the editorial page of the Oregonian, also said of the Senator-elect: "We know he has the intelligence to grow into a truly great Senator." Mr. Parris did not live to check the record of Senator Neuberger's performance. And now, near the end of his first term, Senator Neuberger is gone—the victim of a cruel fate which gave him victory over cancer only to end his life by cerebral hemorrhage.

It must now be recorded for posterity that Senator Neuberger, in Washington, D.C., and in the hearts of his many personal friends, his loyal political supporters and his opponents in past political battles, did not swell. He grew. His stature as a Senator and as a man became greater in each year of his service. He was well on the way to becoming a statesman.

Dick Neuberger, a prodigious worker and enthusiast for each cause he embraced, was a product of the great depression and this was reflected in his prolific writings and in his politics. In his earlier days he was, to some extent, a prisoner of his own campaign techniques. He was an admirer of George W. Norris and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a New Dealer and liberal, an inheritor of the Gifford Pinchot-Teddy Roosevelt traditions in conservation of natural resources, the defender of the unfortunate and aged, the successful spokesman for a minority party in his State.

As an author, his touch was professionally sure in touching the springs of hope, ambition, and idealism in the breasts of his readers. He became perhaps the greatest publicist for the Pacific Northwest and Alaska in modern times.

Five years in the United States Senate taught him, he frankly said, that all is not black nor white, that the civil rights viewpoints of a southerner are entitled to respectful opposition, that personal vendettas are a waste of energy and degrading, that a Republican President is entitled to support of Democrats on vital security and world issues. He mellowed and became a better Senator long before the devastating diagnosis of cancer gave him even more humility.

Dick Neuberger's capacity for growth was fully demonstrated before his untimely death. It was matched only by his capacity for hard work and his dedication to those principles of government he believed to be valid. He was not handcuffed by tradition. His active mind sought always to find new and better ways of accomplishing the shining goal of a more fruitful life for all. It is tragic that he was not allotted his full time in which to grow.

[From the Lebanon (Oreg.) Express, Mar. 10, 1960]

#### DEATH CUTS SHORT A BRILLIANT POLITICAL CAREER

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

Although he recovered from a bout with cancer but a short time ago, illness which followed plus months and years of strenuous effort in serving his party, his State, and his country proved too great a burden for the man who in recent months has done more to win the respect and admiration of former political foes than any man we can remember. Neuberger was a fighter to the end; a champion of everything he believed to be right and best for the people he served. History will mark him as one of Oregon's outstanding Congressmen and without question the loss of his services will be keenly felt in many areas.

Following Neuberger's election in 1954, which shattered a 40-year record of Republican representation from Oregon in Congress, he became a controversial and sometimes extremely partisan figure. Maturity gained in his congressional career, a broader attitude, and deepening respect for those of other political beliefs won for him in his last years the friendship of many who were formerly bitter opponents.

We like to recall what he wrote for the press following his successful operation for cancer: "A brush with cancer tends to place many things in true perspective \* \* \* old antagonisms fade away. I no longer can transform political disagreements into any feelings of personal malice. When one is grateful to be alive, it is difficult to dislike a fellow human being."

We will remember him not only as our Senator whom we always admired and respected, though often disagreeing with him in these columns, but as a personal friend who with his charming wife was often a guest in our home.

To her we extend our heartfelt sympathy, knowing she will find comfort in the knowledge that he gave his life in service to his country. What more can be asked of any man?

[From the Milwaukie (Oreg.) Review, Mar. 10, 1960]

#### RICHARD LEWIS NEUBERGER

Dick belongs now to the great legends of Oregon.

Oregon-born, a product of Portland's schools and the University of Oregon, Dick Neuberger loved his Oregon and the Northwest above everything. His effective voice, the best-selling products of his prolific pen, his tireless political liberalism, all served the people of his native Oregon as did no other man of our time.

His breakthrough in the Senate election of 1954 turned the Oregon tide after 50 years of entrenched Republicanism. He had piloted this development as author and legislator through the dynamic years, with Maurine, as a State legislator.

To Maurine, to his mother and father, to his sister Jane Goodsell and her children who were their uncle's favorites, is left a heritage unmatched among the great Oregonians of our century.

[From the Albany (Oreg.) Greater Oregon and the Benton County Herald, Mar. 18, 1960]

#### A GREAT PUBLIC SERVANT

All Oregon was stunned last week by the sudden death of Richard Lewis Neuberger of a cerebral hemorrhage. Nor were we alone; in other States and in the Nation's Capital, many mourned with us.

Dynamic is a descriptive term that fits Dick Neuberger, a political liberal who was the first Democrat to be elected to the U.S. Senate from Oregon in 40 years. His effective speaking no less than his brilliant writing served the people of his native Oregon as had no other. His years of service in the State legislature, where he and Maurine formed the able team that also worked for Oregon in Congress, likewise should not be forgotten.

To Maurine, to his mother and father, and to his sister and her children who were their uncle's favorites, we offer heartfelt sympathy. Dick, as he liked to be called, will be remembered as one of the great Oregonians of our century.

The untimely death of Senator Neuberger, who was only 47, has been a shock to us all. But, now that the final tribute has been paid, our thoughts must not linger with the past but must turn to the future. Dick would have wanted no delay on his account in proceeding with the work in which he was so vitally interested.

For the great service Senator Neuberger has rendered to Oregon, we can show our appreciation in no more fitting way than to elect his wife, Maurine, to the seat which he held. We are positive that Dick would have wanted this, just as we are confident that he would have been reelected to office.

Maurine Neuberger has worked closely with her husband in the Senate and is by far the best qualified candidate to carry on with his work. Should the Governor fail to appoint Mrs. Neuberger, we feel she should be elected by an overwhelming majority in the coming election.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Mar. 10, 1960]

#### FIVE YEARS OF SOLID ACHIEVEMENT

All through Wednesday the teletype machines brought in their pounds and pounds of paper telling of the death of Senator Richard L. Neuberger. Much of the wordage expressed sorrow at the loss of a man who was a personal friend to thousands. That was a natural first reaction. One of the world's really nice people was dead. But we cannot forget that Oregon and the Nation also lost a Senator of great ability and achievement. Perhaps other Senators have accomplished as much in 5 years. Many have done much less.

The Neuberger file in any Oregon newspaper office is a thick one. Leafing through it, the researcher finds a commendable record of things done and a portfolio just as commendable, of plans. Here are a few of the accomplishments:

The forests and marshes of the Klamath Indian Reservation will be forever under sustained yield management, thanks to Mr. Neuberger's hard work.

Oregon has its first historic shrine, the National Park Service's Fort Clatsop near Astoria, thanks to the efforts of a man who was the country's greatest living fan of Lewis and Clark.

The country has standards to protect roadside beauty and scenery along the 42,000-mile interstate highway system, thanks to a man who liked grass and trees.

The Yaquina Bay project, a \$19 million job, was authorized, thanks to a man who recognized the need for industrial development, commerce, and trade.

The Federal gasoline tax was raised and postal rates went up, thanks to a man who felt that highway users and letterwriters ought to pay their fair share for the benefits they receive.

Public employees can take part in a voluntary health insurance and medical program, thanks to a man whose concern for human health was a passion. This was the passion, stimulated perhaps by his own bout with cancer, that moved him to urge greater Federal aid for medical research.

His work was not done. Still close to his heart was the establishment of a seashore recreation area on the coast and legislation for a Columbia River regional development corporation which would work to make basin improvements self-financing.

He was a visionary, true enough. The country needs visionaries. Most of the established programs, public and private, were once visionary. They became realities because visionaries refused to think of them as unattainable. Senator Neuberger, however, was not an irresponsible visionary. He sought to blend social welfare with fiscal responsibility. He was a "pay as you go" man.

Had he lived to serve another term, he might have achieved his greatest goal, one that would assure him a place in the list of truly great Senators. He might have made more progress in his program for medical research, especially into cancer. He, as no other Senator, could have spoken on the floor of the Senate in behalf of millions who are suffering, or who will suffer, from this condition. Public health, even more than conservation, had become his great interest. Suggestions are already being advanced about suitable ways to memorialize his name. It should be done—in one or the other of these fields.

#### EDITORIAL WRITERS PAY TRIBUTE TO NEUBERGER

Oregon newspapers today paid editorial tribute to Senator Richard L. Neuberger who died Wednesday.

The Portland Oregonian, for whom Neuberger once worked as a youthful sports writer, referred to an editorial written by the late Philip H. Parrish, after Neuberger's 1954 election.

It began "someone—perhaps it was Woodrow Wilson—once observed that when a man goes to Washington, D.C., he either grows or swells."

The newspaper's editorial today said "it must now be recorded for posterity that Senator Neuberger, in Washington, D.C., and in the hearts of his many personal friends, his loyal political supporters and his opponents in past political battles, did not swell. He grew. His stature as a Senator and as a man became greater in each year of his service. He was well on his way to becoming a statesman."

Former Gov. Charles Sprague said in the Oregon Statesman that Neuberger "was a genuine liberal on matters of human welfare. He was moved by suffering and distress, and thought this great and rich Nation should not hesitate to move to their relief." He said, "for Richard Neuberger the epitaph should be: Distinguished journalist, conscientious legislator, ardent conservationist, able statesman."

The Bend Bulletin said "Neuberger and his wife, Maurine—a charming lady who stood stanchly at her husband's side—made one of the Nation's most prominent political teams. It is broken up now and Oregon and the Nation are the losers."

The Eugene Register-Guard said "Dick Neuberger earned his way to greatness. Oregon's junior Senator whose life ended abruptly at the peak of his public career was not born to it, did not have it thrust upon him. He earned it every step of the way by hard work, devotion to duty, loyalty to friends, and an abiding belief in certain principles. This was recognized even by those who considered themselves his political enemies."

The Medford Mail Tribune said, "And now just as his growing maturity was bringing him to what could have been his most useful and most influential years he is felled by a stroke brought in no small measure by the steady constant grind of work which sapped his strength and vigor. Richard Lewis Neuberger will go down in the State's

history as one of the great public servants of this generation."

The Coos Bay World called Neuberger a "man of driving energy and possessor of a bottomless well of ideas."

"There was simply too much to be done in this world for Oregon's foremost author of ideas and exponent of discussions to be still."

"In the case of Dick Neuberger, the sum of life is great. He leaves behind a river of ideas and a reservoir of principles. These will inspire others. When the unimportant factors are forgotten, his vigorous advocacy of democracy, education, charity, and tolerance will remain."

Oregon Journal: "Dick Neuberger will be remembered for his flashing mind, his restless energy, his widespread interest, his remarkable talent for research, analysis, and communication. But influencing everything he did was his love and sympathy for and his understanding of his fellows, their hopes and problems. He could be militantly independent and tough minded in a fight for a principle. But he didn't want to hurt anyone personally, not even his severest critic. \* \* \* We consider that Neuberger has been an outstanding American and citizen of Oregon."

[From the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin, Mar. 9, 1960]

#### RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, 1912-60

Richard L. Neuberger, junior U.S. Senator from Oregon, died early today in a Portland hospital following a cerebral hemorrhage suffered yesterday.

Ironically, he died of the same ailment which took his longtime political hero, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It is difficult to write of Neuberger and his career in an objective fashion. Neuberger was not a particularly objective man in the first place. In the second, he was a close personal friend of the editor of this newspaper and was on good terms with many members of its staff.

Dick Neuberger first was elected to the U.S. Senate, by a very close margin of victory, 6 years ago. He was then one of the Nation's more controversial political figures.

His career in the Senate got off to a rather shaky start. But he matured quickly, and at the time of his death was noted as an effective Member of the Senate. He was a fine Senator for Oregon.

Neuberger was an extreme partisan earlier in his political career. His maturity, plus the fact that his bout with cancer 2 years ago brought him expressions of hope and good will from all walks of American political life, had dimmed his partisanship.

Future historians of the Senate probably will not recognize Neuberger as a "great" in that body. Such honors never are accorded those who serve only one term.

But Oregon historians will recognize him, we are sure, as one of the most articulate men ever to serve in high office in or from this State.

"The king is dead, long live the (new) king," is a saying used often to indicate the fleeting attention given to a politician who dies in office. No sooner is the death announced than the infighting begins to determine his successor.

The balance of Neuberger's term will be filled by a man appointed by Gov. Mark Hatfield, although there may be considerable juggling over the political faith of the appointee.

But, Neuberger's death occurred only a little more than 48 hours before the final deadline for filing for nominations for the May primary. And it creates the biggest shuffle ever known in Oregon politics.

Neuberger was assured of the nomination. He faced no serious opposition. Now that picture is completely changed, and serious

Democrats—probably led by ex-Gov. Robert D. Holmes and Congresswoman EDITH GREEN—can be expected to do some serious maneuvering and real soul-searching in the next 48 hours.

Republicans, too, had been hardput to find a serious candidate. One mentioned was ex-Gov. Elmo Smith, Albany newspaper publisher. If others were interested in the race, word of it had not reached the high country.

Neuberger and his wife, Maurine—a charming lady who stood stanchly at her husband's side—made one of the Nation's more prominent political teams.

It is broken up now, and Oregon and the Nation are the losers.

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

#### RICHARD NEUBERGER—A FRIEND

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

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

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

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

Like all mortal men he had his faults and his weaknesses, but they were never due to cruelty, vindictiveness, or a lack of courage. To always be right is more than any of us can achieve.

Stone monuments are often erected to honor the memory of great men but they serve no real purpose. The real monument honoring any true Christian is in the hearts of those who were inspired by his example.

The memory of Richard Neuberger will be a warm and cherished one in the hearts of many, many people.

[From the Oregon Labor Press, Mar. 18, 1960]

#### DICK NEUBERGER'S COURAGE WILL BE LONG REMEMBERED

(By James T. Marr)

Through most of my years in the labor movement I can remember Dick Neuberger. Back in the early 1930's, when he was still a student at the University of Oregon, Dick was working for progressive legislation that would benefit people.

Dick was the people's friend. He was always opposed to special-interest legislation that would not benefit the ordinary person. He was a great humanitarian.

I well remember, from those early years, that Dick joined with the Oregon State Federation of Labor and the Oregon State Grange in their battle to defeat the general sales tax.

Two of Dick's earliest and closest friendships in the labor movement were with Ben Osborne and Kelley Loe. They fought to-

gether, side by side, in many a battle for the people's benefit in the Oregon political arena.

Ben Osborne was an iron worker and a dedicated trade unionist who provided great leadership as executive secretary of the Oregon State Federation of Labor through the depression years until his death in 1938. Kelley Loe, a printer by trade, was one of Oregon's most revered trade-union leaders. He served as legislative assistant to Ben Osborne and his successors until his death in 1957. Ben and Kelley were close friends and coworkers with Dick Neuberger during his early years as a student and young freelance writer—long before his first campaign for public office.

It was during the 1941 session of the State legislature that I began to follow Dick's career with close interest. Though it was his first session in the legislature, Dick served with distinction and his qualities of leadership and courage were immediately apparent.

During that 1941 session, many bills harmful to the interests of the people were introduced. Dick fought them with courage, brilliance and tremendous energy. It was during that legislative session that the people of Oregon began to learn that Dick was their champion.

After serving in the Armed Forces in World War II, Dick returned to public service when he was elected to the State senate in 1948. He served with great distinction as a State senator in the 1949, 1951, and 1953 sessions of the legislature.

His voice was heard supporting many causes that were not popular in that day. With his tremendous fund of knowledge and energy, and his passion for research, Dick got the facts and presented them in a most effective way.

The facts usually fell on deaf ears in those years, but much of the progressive legislation that has been enacted in Oregon has resulted from Dick Neuberger's early support and constant advocacy.

Late in 1953, when a liberal candidate was being sought for the U.S. Senate, Dick was asked to make the race. I feel proud of the small part I had in persuading him to become a candidate.

And I can remember, as if it were yesterday, when Dick called my home early on that historic November morning in 1954 before all the votes were counted. He believed at that moment that he had failed to win election. But before the day was over the picture changed: the "lunchbox vote" was counted and Dick became a U.S. Senator.

He served with all his might. He gave everything he had, including his life, to serve mankind.

Dick will be missed not only by members of labor unions but by all citizens of Oregon and the Nation.

When history is written the name of Dick Neuberger will fill many pages. Because of his faith in people, because of his great work to develop and protect the natural resources of the Pacific Northwest, because of his unflinching humanitarianism, the memory of Dick Neuberger will never die.

[From the Roseburg (Oreg.) News Review, Mar. 10, 1960]

#### SENATOR NEUBERGER

(By Charles V. Stanton)

The sudden death of Senator Richard L. (Dick) Neuberger is a great shock.

A controversial figure in State and National politics, Neuberger was high among the Nation's characters on the political stage. Fate blotted out a future that held for him great political promise.

It seems somewhat odd that the Senator, a recent cancer sufferer, should die from what apparently was an unrecognized physical con-

dition. Overjoyed that he had been found free from malignancy, after surgery, Neuberger recently had suffered from several ailments which, in themselves, seemed minor.

A hard worker, worried by his physical condition, driving himself to serve in the office to which he had been named, he became victim to virus infections and a nervous disorder. He had taken a brief vacation in an effort to regain his health, had filed for reelection and, apparently, was preparing for a vigorous campaign, when he suddenly was stricken by cerebral hemorrhage.

#### PUBLIC STIRRED

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

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

On the other hand, I held him in high esteem because of his dedication and sincerity of purpose.

Neuberger had an uncanny ability to seize upon the weaknesses and frailties of men and politics in general and to "needle" his contemporaries. In that respect he unquestionably helped to clean up various practices and to produce a better brand of politics.

In this column I have opposed from time to time what I felt were "schemes" carrying political motivation. In such cases I have unquestionably been harsh in my criticism. But I have also felt that many of the Senator's acts and proposals were good, and have so stated in the column and in personal correspondence.

#### RESOURCES SAVED

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

The Klamath Indians are to be freed from their status as wards of the Government. But involved in the legislation abolishing the former status is the disposition of assets belonging to Indians on the reservation. Included in those assets is a tremendous block of extremely valuable timber.

Efforts were made by some interests to get that timber into private hands. In such case it would probably have been removed much too rapidly, and with inadequate financial returns to the Indians.

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

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

By his action he promoted accord and secured the adoption of a plan whereby the timber on the reservation will remain as a perpetual supply, while, at the same time, the Indians are assured of equitable payment for reservation resources.

Thus the beautiful pine timber in the Klamath Reservation will forever be a monument to the Oregon Senator to whom conservation was almost a second religion.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Reporter, Mar. 10, 1960]

#### MEMORIAL FOR A SENATOR

Senator Richard L. Neuberger, in a formal announcement of his candidacy for a second term in the Senate issued little more than a week before his tragic death Wednesday,

listed what he considered some of his major legislative achievements in his 6 years in Washington. Among them are sponsorship of measures setting standards for protection of roadside beauty along the Interstate Highway System, establishing the Fort Clatsop historic shrine under the National Park Service and authorizing \$90 million to save the pine forests and wildlife marshes of the Klamath Basin and Indian reservation.

He mentioned also two legislative projects he regarded as "hopefully close to success." These are creation of the Oregon seacoast national park in Lane, Douglas, and Coos Counties and legislation setting up a Columbia River regional development corporation which would channel revenues from existing projects to needed undertakings in water power, navigation, irrigation, and flood control.

It will be noted that these legislative projects mirror Senator Neuberger's deep concern for preservation of the natural beauties and resources of his beloved Pacific Northwest. This same concern was the central theme of the writings which gained him national recognition before he began his legislative career.

These legislative accomplishments constitute a fitting memorial to Senator Neuberger. Oregonians enjoying the beauties of our forests and coastline now and in years to come will have reason to be grateful for his devotion to the public interest and to this rugged land from which he drew his inspiration. We are the richer for the efforts of this dedicated public servant who did not hesitate to give his life to further that devotion.

[From the Florence (Oreg.) News, Mar. 10, 1960]

#### SENATOR NEUBERGER

Senator Richard L. Neuberger who passed away in Portland yesterday was a controversial figure in this area.

Although we have not approved of some of his proposed legislation, especially the creation of a national park south of Florence, nor of his methods in furthering his projects, we have appreciated his attitude in one respect: the voters always knew where he stood on vital issues.

In this respect Senator Neuberger was forthright. He did not waver. It would be gratifying if more of our public officials displayed this courage.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Mar. 14, 1960]

#### NEUBERGER AS OREGON EDITORS SAW HIM

##### FROM THE MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

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

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

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

FROM CHARLES A. STANTON'S COLUMN IN THE ROSEBURG NEWS-REVIEW

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

"The Klamath Indians are to be freed from their status as wards of the Government. But involved in the legislation

abolishing the former status is the disposition of assets belonging to Indians on the reservation. Included in those assets is a tremendous block of extremely valuable timber.

"Efforts were made by some interests to get the timber into private hands. In such case it would probably have been removed much too rapidly, and with inadequate financial returns to the Indians.

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

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

"By his action he promoted accord and secured the adoption of a plan whereby the timber on the reservation will remain as a perpetual supply, while, at the same time, the Indians are assured of equitable payment for reservation resources.

"Thus the beautiful pine timber in the Klamath Reservation will be a monument to the Oregon Senator to whom conservation was almost a second religion."

#### FROM THE COOS BAY WORLD

"There has never been any doubt in anybody's mind, including Dick Neuberger's, that his first election was achieved on the coattails of WAYNE MORSE. Everyone's first election is generally achieved on someone's coattails, but this was especially true in the case of Neuberger, the first liberal Democrat elected in a statewide race for many, many years, and doing it with the vigorous backing of Oregon's newest Democrat, Senator MORSE.

"As a result, Neuberger was sometimes downgraded as a creature of MORSE. Even after the idea became ridiculous, there was the constant intimation that Neuberger could not have made it on his own.

"He wanted to make it on his own.

"There's no doubt in anybody's mind that he would have done so. Up to the moment of his death he was virtually unopposed by a serious candidate—Democrat or Republican. His support split party lines in every direction. This was the result of his exemplary record in the Senate—a record of achievement for his Nation as well as for his State and party."

FROM FRANK JENKIN'S COLUMN IN THE KLAMATH FALLS HERALD AND NEWS

"This leaves the way clear for him (Governor Hatfield) to appoint Mrs. Neuberger to fill out her husband's unexpired term, which has less than a year to run.

"The fact that they have worked as a team makes her a logical choice for the interim appointment. Mrs. Neuberger is thoroughly familiar with all the duties of the office. With all the personnel. With all of the current problems. She has been a partner in the job. She can carry on from where her husband left off. It would take anyone else the remainder of the unexpired term to learn the ropes and get the job in hand.

"That makes her a natural choice for the interim appointment. It would, of course, give her a considerable advantage in the campaign for election to a new term. But it would also give Oregon voters a good opportunity to study her and her opponent during the upcoming campaign.

"Besides, I find myself coming around to the belief that it might be a good idea to get more women into politics. The men haven't done too good a job. If they had done a better job, we might have fewer problems to face in these days."

FROM CHARLES A. SPRAGUE'S COLUMN IN THE OREGON STATESMAN, OF SALEM

"It is not easy for me to write of Richard Neuberger. We had become good friends,

and my respect had grown into warm admiration for the man himself and for the work he was endeavoring to do in representing the people of the State in the Senate.

"I think I have never known a man whose mind was so fertile. He was constantly coming up with fresh ideas, particularly in those areas of his interest: government, politics, conservation, human welfare, education, and lately health. His mind was seminal, originating proposals in what seemed to him the public interest. Moreover he was amazingly productive. How he turned out the volume of writings, of letters, of speeches that he did was beyond my comprehension. In the midst of his work in Washington, he found time to keep in touch by letter or card or phone call with his constituents. Nor was his circle limited to a few close friends. It was wide for he took every good citizen into his confidence.

"As for Neuberger's personal character I have known few men in public life who were as frank and honest as he was. He practiced no deceit himself, could not tolerate it in others. His mind and heart were always open, to be read freely by all.

"One cannot close a tribute to Dick Neuberger without including the other member of the partnership, his wife Maurine; for theirs was a partnership, with hopes and ambitions, effort and attainment and discouragement fully shared. It was a beautiful relationship; and now that the partnership is broken by death the sympathy of a great multitude goes out to her.

"For Richard Neuberger the epitaph should be: Distinguished journalist, conscientious legislator, ardent conservationist, able statesman."

#### FROM THE CORVALLIS GAZETTE-TIMES

"While maintaining his 'liberal' outlook he nevertheless recognized a fiscal responsibility that is lacking in most people with similar leanings. In his campaign announcement for a second term he said he had always emphasized the broad humanitarian needs of the American people, but that he had insisted that programs of social welfare be paid for in our own time by current revenues rather than being financed in the form of deficits. 'This may not be popular' he said, 'but I know it is right.'"

#### FROM THE SALEM CAPITAL JOURNAL

"Neuberger, as a writer, appreciated the dramatic. And the end of his career came dramatically, almost on the eve of the deadline for filing for his office. As a political historian he had a keen feeling for reputation beyond the present. One of his dreams of recent times was to have a place in history among the selfless, nonpartisan greats of the Senate. He didn't live long enough, in all probability, to achieve this. But he never had been more popular, and that popularity had nothing to do with party affiliations."

#### FROM THE ASTORIA-BUDGET

"The loss to Oregon in Senator Neuberger's death can only be measured in what he might have achieved had he been spared for continued service.

"The spontaneous and sincere expressions of shock and sadness by leaders of both political parties in State and Nation are evidence of the high respect he had attained in the opinions of his fellow citizens."

#### FROM AN EDITORIAL BY J. W. FORRESTER IN THE PENDLETON EAST OREGONIAN

"His personal correspondence was of amazing magnitude. Children of his friends always were in his thoughts. He wrote to them and sent them gifts. So many letters contained special messages for their children.

"He loved young people. When he went to the Senate he was offered patronage rights. What was his first choice? To appoint a Senate page. He established a research internship on his staff for outstanding gradu-

ates of Oregon colleges in political science and journalism. He gave a large portion of his earnings from magazines to Oregon colleges as scholarship funds. The book he wrote for children about the Lewis and Clark expedition was a best seller.

"His devotion to the preservation of natural resources was deep rooted. He paid the wonders and beauties of nature more than lipservice, as all who read his magazine articles knew. There was no subject he enjoyed more writing about. He enjoyed even more a day at the beach or at a lake or on a mountain trail. One of the most enjoyable days I've had was spent with the Neuberger family on the beach at Ecola Park, a day of such beauty that we spoke of it many times thereafter."

#### FROM THE BEND BULLETIN

"Neuberger was an extreme partisan earlier in his political career. His maturity, plus the fact that his bout with cancer 2 years ago brought him expressions of hope and good will from all walks of American political life, had dimmed his partisanship.

"Future historians of the Senate probably will not recognize Neuberger as a 'great' in that body. Such honors never are accorded those who serve only one term.

"But Oregon historians will recognize him we are sure, as one of the most articulate men ever to serve in high office in or from this State."

#### TIME TO FARM EFFECTIVELY

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the Family Farm Income Act of 1960. In so doing I am supporting the legislation proposed by many of my colleagues who have expressed dissatisfaction with the administration's farm policy, including my colleague from eastern Oregon AL ULLMAN. Many variations of farm policy renovations have been introduced this Congress. From them I am hopeful that the hard-working Committee on Agriculture will report a bill which will solve the ever-mounting too long continued crisis in American agriculture.

Around us we watch as surplus commodities stockpile. We are told that in time of drought our surplus would be used up. It makes as much sense to pronounce solemnly that in the event of extreme heat the Potomac would dry up.

Our agriculture know-how is the best in the world. Our farmers produce more and more on less land. The administration's soil bank program has in no way alleviated the problem of overabundance. It is time for a change. It has been time for a change for a long, long time.

The Family Farm Income Act of 1960 is designed to raise family farm income while simultaneously reducing the cost to taxpayers.

Representative POAGE, the knowledgeable vice chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, calls this legislation a farmers' bill of rights. He says it answers the President's call to draft effective farm legislation. He has explored the bill completely with other farm experts and has already offered corrections which improve it.

It is not difficult to point out the trouble spots in agriculture today. One only has to look at the revealing drop in net farm income in 7 years. It has dropped from \$15.3 billion in 1952 to \$10.3 billion in 1959. The per capita farm income has failed to even remain at half

that of the city resident. The parity ratio, the relationship of farm prices to other prices, has dropped from 100 percent in 1952 to 77 percent in 1960.

As my colleague, Representative GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, noted in February, farm prices are down 16 percent from the 1952 figure while costs are up 11 percent. The squeeze is not new to the family farmer.

There are other trouble spots which have been recounted often in this House. Farm indebtedness is up \$6.8 billion this year over 1952; interest charges have climbed. Representative MCGOVERN notes they are up 80 percent since 1952.

Statistics show that the farm population declined 3.5 million in 8 years. While this occurred the number of farm units dropped.

The legislation I have introduced has been designed to restore family farming to its rightful position.

It restores the farmers' bargaining power through self-imposed commodity regulations on production and marketing.

By balancing production with demand our national economic health would be strengthened. I believe that farmers can develop their own program to establish nationwide marketing quotas which will insure production to meet demand. I believe that it is possible to cut our reserve surpluses by 10 percent each year in an orderly program of distribution.

The bill I have introduced provides for the use of direct compensatory payments up to a maximum of \$5,000 to any one producer to assure him a fair return for his marketing quota. This relief will be used only if needed. My farmer friends suggest that properly established marketing quotas will eliminate need for such compensatory payments.

Under this proposed bill each farm operator would have to place at least 10 percent of his tillable acres in a soil-building base. He could add to 30 percent more for which he would be compensated in payments of surplus Government-held feed grains rather than through cash payments as now established under the soil bank program. I think the two-pronged effect of such a system is obvious.

Under title II a new type of food distribution program is proposed. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is directed to increase the amount of high protein foods such as dairy, poultry, and meat products distributed to the needy, to institutions, and through the school lunch program. To carry out the program, the Secretary is directed to purchase any of the products which are not in the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Under the language of the bill:

Whenever any donee eligible to receive commodities desires to do so, such commodities may be purchased on the local market in accordance with the regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, thereby relieving the Government of the necessity of storing and transporting such commodities. The sum of \$500 million per annum for each year is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

As proposed the estimated cost of the program would be limited to no more than 5 percent of the annual market value of each of the commodities participating in the program. It is estimated that the program would cost about one-tenth the sum now being spent—or \$0.5 billion yearly as compared to today's \$5.3 billion.

In discussing this legislation with my colleagues I am aware that amendments will be necessary. I understand, for example, that the dairy industry has a working marketing program and does not feel it is wise or necessary to change it. Changes in wheat marketing are needed. I know that revised bills include such provisions.

My purpose in joining with my colleagues is to lend support in an area which does affect every other area of our economy. A healthy and strong farm economy is not an impossibility.

Surplus food, stored in warehouses at high cost to the taxpayer, benefits no one.

Poor acreage confined to a soil bank program does not meet the need to take out of operation highly productive land. This sort of operation does little more than rob the taxpayer as well as cripple the farmer.

The taxpayer and the farmer demand a new, effective farm program. Piling up surpluses is no answer. The Family Farm Income Act of 1960 offers the best route out of a distressing situation.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS ON FOOD FOR PEACE PLAN

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have permission to extend their remarks following my remarks on the food for peace amendment which was offered by me today.

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

There was no objection.

#### UPWARD ADJUSTMENT OF RESIDUAL OIL IMPORT LEVELS IS DEPLORABLE AND INEXCUSABLE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound regret that I learned the Department of Interior was again bowing to the will of import companies. There is no justification whatsoever for this about-face which defies a Cabinet committee's security standards and strikes another cruel and unnecessary blow at labor and management in the domestic fuel and railroad industry.

The import levels were created to prevent foreign oil from enervating the American coal industry's emergency potential. For more than a decade incoming shipments of residual oil have closed mines, relegated mineworkers to the ranks of the unemployed, shoved

railroad cars into an inactive state of deterioration, and taken away the jobs of maintenance and operating personnel. The effect on our whole business community has been primarily responsible for the serious labor surplus prevailing in coal communities and railroad centers.

I say to you frankly that, while I was gratified at the White House order initiating the mandatory control program on April 1, 1959, I was not at all satisfied with the import levels decided upon. Using 1957 figures to establish the criterion reflected a generosity toward importing companies that was unbecoming from the standpoint of the domestic economy. In 1957 the importers had shipped a total of 173 million barrels of residual oil into fuel markets of this country. It was a record year. Those imports amounted in energy value to more than 41 million tons of coal.

Having seen the gradual erosion of what has taken place in Pennsylvania's mining communities as a consequence of the rising tide of residual oil from foreign refineries, I favored a cutback that would reopen employment opportunities in my State and in the other regions where foreign oil had literally wrecked opportunity for miners, railroaders, and other workers whose livelihood is reliant upon a vigorous domestic coal industry. The White House, after careful consideration of the problem, came to the conclusion that it should adopt the quota limitations recommended by the Cabinet Committee charged with the responsibility of deciding at what point oil imports become a threat to the national security. The 1957 figures were set as the safe level.

Those of us seriously concerned with the impact of oil imports accepted the decision with reluctance. We were at least pleased that the White House had finally taken this official recognition of the importance of the coal industry and its relationship to the mobilization base. So we sat by and waited for the results. We felt that the limitation on the volume of residual oil imports thus established might at least provide an indication to the coal industry of just how far importers are allowed to go. The coal industry could make its plans accordingly. Railroads could use this information in projecting their operations to conform with general economic expectations of the coming years.

Now the status has been summarily upended. The Department of the Interior not long ago gave what I considered assurance that it would not cater to the arrogant demands of importers who willfully and flagrantly disregarded quota limits in the early part of this year on the assumption that they would be bailed out of an embarrassing market situation when their allocations had been exhausted. The upward revision has indeed paid off for the importers. They have now been cleared for delivery of another 12 million barrels of residual oil over the established limit.

This concession to major shippers is deplorable and inexcusable. I charge that the Department of Interior is inviting public distrust unless it hereinafter

returns the quota limitations to the originally published levels and pledges that there will be no further concessions to oil importers under any circumstances. It is a solemn duty to the many families who depend upon coal production for a livelihood and to the millions more whose very security is interlocked with the ability of the coal industry to maintain the capacity that would be required in an emergency.

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I find it necessary to address the House on a situation existing today affecting not only many hundreds of valuable, skilled craftsmen of the Federal Government, but indeed, to a degree, our entire national defense effort. I am referring to the deliberate phaseout of the Naval Weapons Plant located here in Washington, D.C.

During the course of my remarks, it is my intention to point out in detail certain policy decisions made by the present administration which I believe adversely affect our defense effort. In addition, I intend to review the inconsistencies in statements made to me as a Member of Congress, to several congressional committees, and to the public at large, concerning the mission of the Naval Weapons Plant.

In order that all may know exactly the nature of the installation under discussion, a brief description of this fine facility is in order. The Naval Weapons Plant is located in southeast Washington, on the north bank of the Anacostia River. It has a total acreage of 316 acres. Its total value in the plant account is currently listed at \$104,616,800, which is further subdivided as follows:

Land.....	\$1,922,500
Buildings.....	48,818,500
Equipment.....	53,875,800

The estimated value of the plant's present materiel inventory is \$142,018,907.

A review of the total employment figures of the weapons plant beginning on June 30, 1956, to date will substantiate my deliberate phaseout charge:

Date:	Personnel on board
June 30, 1956.....	8,046
June 30, 1957.....	7,255
June 30, 1958.....	6,197
June 30, 1959.....	5,830
Feb. 15, 1960.....	5,740
Oct. 1, 1960 (approximate).....	4,200

In order to explain why I feel it necessary to address this body this afternoon,

I would like to review briefly my relationships with the Navy Department through the Bureau of Ordnance in connection with two Government installations, the Naval Propellant Plant at Indian Head, Md., and the Naval Weapons Plant here in Washington. Beginning in 1955 I was confronted with a continuing series of layoffs at both installations, which were quite obviously tragedies to the individuals concerned and also created economic havoc in the local communities affected. With the rapid change in weapons development, with emphasis shifted to missiles, many of these reductions in force were unavoidable. However, many serious questions have been raised as to contract decisions, whereby Government installations were being bypassed in order to place work with private industry.

Until the past year and a half, I have always found the Bureau of Ordnance, now known as the Bureau of Weapons, to be cooperative, and believe that the Bureau recognized that I was genuinely interested in assisting the Department of the Navy in this conversion from obsolete conventional weapons to those demanded for the missile age. Unfortunately, I have at times been furnished incorrect information or denied information that would have assisted me in the discharge of my duties. There have been other instances when I became convinced that certain individuals in the administration were, to a large degree, unaware of the capabilities of their own installations.

An abiding conviction that I have acquired during the years that I have been privileged to represent the Fifth District of Maryland here in Congress is that to the majority of Americans their Congressman is the Federal Government. When a decision is made that affects an individual and the community in which he resides, little thought is given to the distinction between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. It is their Congressman who enacts the laws and appropriates their taxes for the management of the Federal Government. When a decision is made that virtually destroys a man's ability to earn a livelihood for his family, an explanation is demanded, and rightfully so; and his Congressman is the one looked to for this explanation. Today we find the Naval Weapons Plant very clearly and definitely being phased out by the Department of the Navy. My attempts, and attempts by several of our committees, to obtain the explanation demanded by the people, have been unsuccessful. Questions that I am raising today must be answered to the satisfaction of all of us; and until such answers are forthcoming, I believe it is the duty of this body to direct the executive branch of the Government to postpone further reduction actions.

Frankly, I am disturbed, as I know many of you are, over the increasing tendency throughout the entire executive branch to pat us on the head stating, "We'll tend the store. You just provide stock. If we get in trouble, we'll let you know." No Member of this body was elected for the purpose of rubber-stamping administration requests. I do not

intend to echo a bureau's policy statement concerning the necessity for reduction or for allowing Government facilities to be idle until I am convinced that such action is clearly in the best interests of our entire country.

Whenever one attempts to defend Government installations, invariably a discussion of private enterprise versus governmental industry ensues. It is about time, I believe, that we stop trying to make a distinction between two important segments of our economy in this fashion. What we should be debating and considering is how to achieve the maximum utilization of all industrial facilities, be they Government or private. To allow any facility that is capable of supplying the needs of our defense and space effort in this deadly struggle with Soviet Russia to lie idle is unthinkable. But yet we are doing just that with the Naval Weapons Plant.

I, for one, will not apologize for defending as fine an installation as the weapons plant. In fact, I am proud to act today as the spokesman for the hundreds of dedicated employees of the plant. This installation has proved itself time and time again since its founding on October 2, 1799. Its many skilled craftsmen and engineers are known throughout the entire industrial establishment for having the capability of doing the best possible job in the shortest possible time.

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

Incidentally, I might add that the same objections of obsolescence and lack of know-how were applied to the Naval Propellant Plant, located at Indian Head, Md. Fortunately, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. VINSON, granted my request for an investigation of the bypassing of the Naval Propellant Plant in 1958. With pride, I must state that when the Special Subcommittee on Investigations began its investigation of the plant, the employment level at the propellant plant was 1,379. As of March 1, 1960, the level has reached 1,937. The propellant plant is now producing a key item for the Polaris missile, this notwithstanding the statement that the plant did not have the know-how or the technical capability to compete in today's propellant business. I am pleased to say that such was not and is not the case, and that this fine installation is contributing significantly to the defense effort on the Nation's No. 1 weapon, Polaris.

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

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

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

Officials at the factory went on to say that they expected this to be the last

major personnel shakedown that has seen the agency shrink from a Korean war high of 11,500 employees to 7,776. This reduction was understandable and I believe unavoidable.

But from this period on, the unwillingness or inability to make decisions that would assist the plant in its conversion efforts has led the plant, despite numerous warnings, to its present-day situation. I was informed in 1957 that by the start of the 1958 fiscal year employment at the gun factory would begin a small, gradual rise and would stabilize itself above the present civilian strength. The factory was then assigned the huge task of building the launching equipment for guided missiles to be installed on ships. I will discuss these contracts which were performed in such creditable fashion later on in my remarks.

Notwithstanding these most reassuring words, at least reassuring to the employees of the gun factory and to me, less than 1 year later, on August 14, 1957, I was advised that the Naval Gun Factory planned a reduction in force by June 30, 1958, of 255 additional employees.

In his statement to me of August 14, 1957, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Materiel indicated that no further reductions would be required during fiscal year 1958. Nevertheless, 4 months later in January of 1958, the superintendent of the gun factory announced a further reduction in force of 500 employees. It is entirely possible that with cooperation with representatives of the various employees associations, and with better administration, the impact of this reduction in force could have been lessened considerably. It was shortly after this regrettable reduction in force took place that an article appeared in the Log, which is the official publication of the Naval Weapons Plant. I would like to quote from the article appearing in the March 25, 1958, edition, as follows:

#### AT LEAST A YEAR OF WORK IN SIGHT FOR ON-BOARD EMPLOYEES

A number of rather sensational stories appearing in the local press recently resulted in a spate of rumors here. The local newspapers were quite pessimistic in tone regarding the role of the gun factory in the new Navy. It was even hinted that the Naval Gun Factory might be forced to shut down.

Actually, say gun factory officials, we are getting more work now than we have for some time. Although we have passed through some lean periods during the last 2 or 3 years, culminating in the recent reduction in force of about 500 workers, we now have enough work in sight to maintain our present work force of about 6,280 employees.

Concern for the gun factory's future role was felt because we have long been known as one of the principal makers of guns for the fleet. Since guns are no longer being produced in quantity, some have thought that our usefulness is now nearly ended.

Meeting with employee group representatives on March 7, Capt. Thomas S. King, manufacturing officer, said that the workload in prospect for the next several months is the best since he arrived at the gun factory. Captain King came here in November of 1955.

To sum up, the gun factory still is fulfilling its old role as an important armorer of the fleet. Expectations are that it will continue to do so.



In the April 11, 1958, edition an interesting article appeared describing a large floting job under a contract to produce 10,000 canisters for the Sidewinder missile.

It has been reported that the weapons plant is unable to produce the weapons demanded by today's modern Navy. At this point I think it well to refresh the recollection of all on the fine performance in the Formosa Straits several years ago, when a large number of Chinese Mig's were shot down by Free China's jets armed with the Sidewinder missile.

On July 23, 1958, when further r.i.f.'s were announced, they were deemed necessary as a part of a modernization program consistent with an assigned new role to the naval gun factory. This new role and optimistic statements about the future were set forth in glowing terms in the July 3 edition of the Log. Excerpts are as follows:

**NAVY ASSIGNS GUN FACTORY NEW ROLE FOR MISSILE AGE—WILL KEEP PLANT OPEN FOR DESIGN, PROTOTYPE WORK AND TESTING**

The Naval Gun Factory, now in its 159th year, is about to take on a new look. The Navy has decided not to scrap it along with its guns, but to give it a new mission.

The gun factory will become primarily a plant for research, design and the prototype manufacture of the new missile age weapons, Capt. Charles E. Briner, NGF superintendent, announced recently.

The Navy's decision to maintain the gun factory as an important facility for the design, prototype manufacture and testing of new type weapons should allay some fears of gun factory workers who have been working under a cloud of uncertainty as to their future careers. Probably less than 5 percent of the total work force now on board will be affected by the change.

But once that changeover is effected, once the gun factory has settled down to its clearly defined place in the Navy, there should be a considerable uplift in employee spirit. For although most workers have not lost faith in the gun factory, morale should improve with the new mission. Once again the gun factory is going to be a good and a most interesting place to work.

In August 1958, in a letter to the board of trade, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Richard A. Jackson estimated that the transition in the Naval Gun Factory would take 5 years and would result in large savings and high employment here. He also wrote that although the changeover would require adjustments in personnel, the program would be executed with a minimum personnel dislocation. It was at this time that Rear Adm. T. A. Ahroon, Acting Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, told the Washington Board of Trade that "none of the facilities at the Naval Gun Factory are in excess to the needs of the Navy." This was now in the latter part of 1958. On September 24, 1958, a statement was made by the superintendent of the gun factory, in connection with a still further reduction in force, and I quote:

I realize there have been some pretty wild rumors. Right now let's get one thing absolutely straight. The gun factory is not, and I repeat, the gun factory is not planning new major reductions in force involving a large number of employees. The modernization of the gun factory is proceeding, and I know the Bureau of Ordnance is proud of

the excellent work being done here and that the Bureau will continue to utilize the facilities of the gun factory to the maximum extent possible. I expect that, with normal attrition, only a very small percentage of our civilian employees will be affected by the changes that will be required of the gun factory.

I had every reason to believe that the superintendent of the gun factory made this statement in absolute good faith, as did the factory's employees. Unfortunately, those above him did not share his views.

On December 12, 1958, we find an editorial appearing in the Log, stating the following:

**WORKLOAD SITUATION VERY GOOD**

There appears to be some confusion as to what has been happening at the Naval Gun Factory in regard to our workload over the last few months. Let's try to square this away right now. Today the Naval Gun Factory can be said to be in a period of saturated workload. What I mean by this is that our current workload has caught up with our shop capacity and if we don't watch out, it will bog us all down.

In business, production outfits run through lean years and fat years. We have, in the last few years, been caught in the post-Korean war aftermath of lean years for work when we still had too many direct and indirect workers to handle the jobs being assigned us by the Bureau of Ordnance and our other customers. This year, after completing our reduction-in-force actions of last spring, we have slowly managed to shift over to a year of prosperous workload.

Our major problem now is not that of getting more work, but how to get the already heavy commitments into the shops and the finished products out on schedule. This has happened mostly because of major programs started in the last 6 months. In the guided missile launcher programs some design problems have been difficult and the schedules are now really tight. Our job is to produce quality ordnance for the fighting fleet. However, we also must meet ship conversion or building schedules. At present, all three of our current major missile launcher programs are "hot."

We now have the best and most optimistic work situation that the gun factory has had for several years; and, for a change, it is actually financially supported for well over a year.

And on January 7, 1959, the following New Year greetings from the superintendent of the factory:

**NEW YEAR GREETINGS FROM THE SUPERINTENDENT**

The new year, 1959, holds great promise for the Naval Gun Factory if we continue our efforts to stretch our dollars. The workload looks good, and I am sure that with concentrated teamwork the Naval Gun Factory will continue to occupy an important place in the ordnance development program of the Navy.

I extend to each of you my best wishes for much happiness and success in the coming year.

Capt. CHARLES E. BRINER,  
U.S. Navy.

It was during the month of December 1958 that the Hébert Subcommittee on Special Investigations, at my request, investigated the conflicting statements concerning the outlook of the gun factory. During testimony I attempted to determine whether the Government's plants today are given a chance to support private industry to the extent of

protecting the taxpayers' investment in idle equipment. Assistant Secretary of the Army for Logistics Higgins answered as follows:

I see your point. Yes, I would say generally, no, this is not the policy. If we could buy this in competition on the outside, we would do it.

I then asked:

Despite the fact that it would mean a plant sitting idle?

The answer from Mr. Higgins was:

That is right. Yes, sir.

Further on, in testimony before the Hébert subcommittee, significant questions were asked of Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bantz and Admiral Stroop. During the course of this testimony an internal survey was mentioned for the first time. A very interesting history will follow as to what the attitude of the Department of the Navy has been on its own survey and how my attempts to obtain pertinent facts contained in the survey, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, were rebuffed by the Department of the Navy.

During the course of the hearings, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bantz agreed, in response to my questioning, that our facilities could be utilized to a greater extent than they are and assured me that the Department is more conscious of the value of producing component parts of the Navy's weapon systems in facilities such as the Naval Gun Factory. These were reassuring words to the committee, but unfortunately actions during the next 12 months made a mockery of these words.

A most informative discussion took place during the hearings between Mr. Bates, a member of the subcommittee, and Mr. Bantz and Admiral Stroop, concerning the computation of overhead costs. Admiral Stroop readily admitted that "if you want to play with overhead, you can get any kind of a price you want."

The reason why the overhead discussion is so important is that the true cost of items manufactured at the plant is not being fairly computed. Admiral Stroop referred to the 23 tenant-type activities at the plant. Approximately \$1.40 an hour is loaded into the Naval Weapons Plant's total costs price as a result of such tenant activities, which in no way contribute to the produced item.

A most interesting sidelight, which is germane to this discussion, is the number of personnel in one of the facilities of the weapons plant serving tenant activities. In the Supply Department, of 900 employees only 250 are involved in supply of the industrial facility.

The subcommittee stated that in its opinion this was a vital facility to our defense effort and relied upon the assurances given by the witnesses that the recommendations of the survey referred to previously would be given serious consideration and implemented wherever possible in order to create a more stabilized situation at the plant. Since it became readily apparent to me that the survey in question would have a great bearing on the future workload

of the plant, on December 2, 1958, during a conversation with Admiral Stroop after his testimony before the committee, I requested that I be furnished a copy of the survey.

It became necessary for me on December 12, 1958, to make a formal request of the Secretary of the Navy, which was denied. For the first time the term "internal administrative document" was employed. I protested this designation directly to the Secretary of the Navy and, after a delay of 5 weeks, I received a reply to my protest signed by Assistant Secretary Bantz, which once again denied my request. I felt most strongly that if I, as an individual Member of Congress, did not have a right to this survey, then most assuredly the House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, did. Here was a clear case of government in darkness. It is my belief that all the people have a right to know how their Government is being run and that we, as the elected representatives of the people, have a duty to ascertain the facts upon which intelligent decisions can be made and to inform our people of these facts and decisions.

It is for this reason that I made repeated demands for the survey in order that I could form my own opinion as to the plant's prospects for the future.

It became necessary for me to refer this denial to the House Committee on Government Operations, the Subcommittee on Government Information, under the chairmanship of our distinguished colleague, Congressman JOHN E. MOSS. The committee, on April 20, 21 and 23, held extensive hearings on this arbitrary denial and completely vindicated my position that I, as a Member of Congress, was entitled to the survey in question.

It must be emphasized again at this point that the survey board I refer to was convened by the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance on March 21, 1958, with Capt. B. L. Lubelsky, U.S. Navy, as chairman. To use Admiral Stroop's words, Captain Lubelsky is "an outstanding industrial engineer with considerable experience, both in the Bureau and our activities."

Quite properly, there were doubts raised as to certain of the recommendations and, more importantly, considerable confusion did exist as to why many of the sound recommendations contained in the survey were not implemented.

I have emphasized the Lubelsky report and the reliance placed upon it by the committee for a reason. At the conclusion of my remarks, I will submit a reorientation proposal for the plant prepared by highly trained and capable engineers. The proposal, to a large extent, is an outgrowth of the original Lubelsky report, which, incidentally, cost the taxpayers \$12,135 to prepare, yet Congress has been denied access to it.

During the course of the Moss subcommittee's hearings, Mr. Bantz, in an attempt to discredit certain public statements that were made, said this concerning the future outlook of the

Naval Gun Factory—and this was approximately 1 year ago:

I would like to say this to you. We have talked about this Naval Gun Factory here in Washington for a little over a year and a half. There has been a lot of publicity given it. Since my tenure of office down here, there has never been, to my knowledge, and I would have known, any plan to close the Naval Gun Factory; there is no such plan now.

Further in the testimony, the possibility of a name change was raised with Secretary Gates, and the Secretary indicated his approval of such a step. His comments certainly led all of us to believe that the plant would remain as an active producer of naval weapons.

Subsequently, on May 18, 1959, the Navy announced the name of the Naval Gun Factory would be changed to the U.S. Naval Weapons Plant, effective July 1, 1959.

Prior to this announcement, and shortly after the conclusion of hearings held by the Hébert subcommittee, the long-range outlook for the Naval Weapons Plant brightened considerably. On February 25, 1959, the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, in a letter to the superintendent of the plant, advised the plant of the implementation of a program to be known as Project Fire Control. I quote from this letter:

1. In order to provide a needed "in house" capability in the fire control area, the Bureau of Ordnance is planning to assign manufacturing of guided missile fire control to the Naval Gun Factory. This step, being one of major proportions, will require the highest and most effective type of management by the Naval Gun Factory and the Bureau of Ordnance, and the complete support of higher levels within the Navy Department.

Understandably, after this letter was made public to the employees of the plant, morale rose considerably, and it seemed at long last that the plant could look forward to a reasonable future in remaining a full partner in our defense effort. Late in October 1959 rumors began to appear concerning the possible loss of the aforementioned fire control contract. I immediately dispatched a telegram to the Secretary of the Navy and was joined in this by the Governor of the State of Maryland. This apparent breach of faith on the part of the Navy caused considerable consternation and very directly has led to the present-day situation.

In my telegram, I asked for a complete report on the status of the previously awarded contract. My telegram, in the absence of Secretary of the Navy Franke, was acknowledged by Under Secretary Fred A. Bantz, and I quote from his telegram of October 28:

In the absence of Secretary Franke and in reply to your telegram of October 27, 1959, I would like to assure you that at the present time the Navy has no plans to transfer any work which has been planned for the Naval Weapons Plant, Washington.

Sincerely,

FRED A. BANTE.

The rumor subsequently proved to be true, inasmuch as the approximately \$10 million contract was pulled from the

weapons plant. Originally an outright cancellation was not made, however, as the Bureau of Ordnance informed the plant that budget troubles threatened to delay the contract for another 6 months. Capt. Charles Briner, plant superintendent, was quoted as being "a little upset" by the events. "We are ready and prepared to do the job," he said, "and all we need is the money." But Briner said the Bureau had promised him again that week, this was in October, that the plant would get the contract eventually and that there were no plans to transfer it to a private concern as had been reported. "If and when the plant gets the contract," Briner said, "several hundred new employees would be added to assemble electronic parts and to work in the electronic field."

It was at this stage of the proceeding, before the weapons plant had been informed officially that it would not receive the contract as promised, that I was advised by letter of November 10, 1959, by Admiral McCain, Chief of Legislative Affairs, that the Navy had established a new ad hoc committee of four civilian industrialists to study a number of activities administered by the Navy. Among the activities to be resurveyed was the Naval Weapons Plant, Washington, D.C. I was assured that I would be advised of developments after the committee completed its examination and submitted recommendations.

The ad hoc committee referred to in this letter has long ago completed its findings and has submitted its recommendations to the Secretary of the Navy, the Under Secretary of the Navy, and the Chief of the Bureau of Weapons. To date I have received no information whatsoever officially from the Department of the Navy concerning the recommendations of the committee. On January 15, 1960, I discussed this matter by telephone with Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Materiel Milne, and was informed that the report by the four industrialists had not yet been completed. There is no doubt that the report in question has now been completed and is under active consideration by the responsible officials in the Department of the Navy as of this very moment.

I find it difficult to understand the necessity for an additional committee such as this one. The Navy saw fit to a degree to ignore the carefully prepared Lubelsky survey, which took 6 weeks to prepare, as opposed to the few hours spent by the civilian industrialists at the weapons plant.

On December 2, 1959, I was advised by Admiral McCain that the program known as the electronics fire control program planned for the Naval Weapons Plant for spare fire control systems for the Terrier and Tartar guided missiles, would be withdrawn from the plant. I was informed that the cancellation of this program would have no immediate effect on the level of employment at the Naval Weapons Plant, and was assured that every effort was being made to find additional future workload for the Naval

Weapons Plant to take the place of the guided missiles fire control program.

On December 10, 1959, a lengthy meeting was held with Secretary of the Navy Franke and Under Secretary Bantz concerning the cancellation of this fire control contract. I was assured that there was no basis for rumors that the contract cancellation was caused by transfer of the work to private industry, and that every possible effort would be made to find additional work for the plant.

These words were fine, indeed, but I most regretfully must report today, that in my opinion, not one single specific thing has been done. In fact, as I will develop in a few moments, every effort has been made in recent weeks to prevent the Naval Weapons Plant from procuring additional work on its own.

On January 8, 1960, the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade brought the entire matter to the attention of the Senate Subcommittee on Preparedness Investigation of the Committee on Armed Services.

Under unanimous consent I insert the entire letter at this point in the RECORD:

THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON  
BOARD OF TRADE,  
Washington, D.C., January 8, 1960.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Preparedness  
Investigating, Committee on Armed  
Services, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: We understand that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has referred to your subcommittee Senator BUTLER's letter to him of December 8, 1959, requesting an investigation of the Navy's policies surrounding the cancellation of programs in the shore establishments of the Navy. Senator BUTLER is, of course, immediately concerned with the naval weapons plant here in Washington.

Understandably, the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade is also deeply concerned about the future of this installation which has been for more than 150 years extremely important to the economy of the National Capital. This establishment was an important employer in the area even before the National Government was transferred to Washington in 1800.

Our research department has carefully reviewed this matter and estimates that, in addition to the approximately \$36 million payroll of the more than 6,000 military and civilian personnel, the weapons plant supports 8,250 gainfully employed people in the Washington metropolitan area with a total 1958 payroll of \$33 million. The total economic impact, therefore, on this community of the naval weapons plant is approximately 14,500 jobs having \$69 million annual payroll income. This is 1.6 percent of all employment in the metropolitan area of Washington. These jobs support approximately 10,000 households and a population of some 25,000. We estimate that total retail sales attributable to the weapons center and supporting employment is about \$45 million a year. These statistics make it clear why this organization is deeply concerned about the trend which seems to be in progress.

The current cycle of work reduction in this plant began in the spring of 1958. On May 29, 1958, the then president of the board of trade communicated with the Honorable Thomas S. Gates, the then Secretary of the Navy, transmitted to him information about the importance of the plant in this community and sought his assurance that the present level of employment would be held.

Subsequently on July 2, 1958, a committee from this organization discussed the problem with the then Under Secretary of the Navy William B. Franke at the Pentagon. We inquired of Mr. Franke if the employment level would be held and understood him to assure us that it would not go below something over 5,000.

At this conference we advised the Under Secretary that we would not support or request continuation of the present level of employment if it would be demonstrated that it was inefficient or uneconomical to continue operation of the weapons plant. We requested him to advise us if such a determination had been made and if so, if the Navy Department would then be willing to declare all or part of the plant surplus so that we might seek to interest a private employer who could use the facilities. The Navy Department on July 29, 1958, advised us that at the present time, none of the facilities at the Naval Gun Factory are excess to the needs of the Navy."

Some months ago we began to hear rumors that an effort was being made to transfer the fire control systems program which had been assigned to the naval weapons plant to another facility. On inquiry to responsible officials of the Navy Department we were advised that there were no such plans.

Understandably, therefore, we were considerably surprised to learn early in December 1959, that the guided missile fire control systems program had been canceled.

It seems to us utterly inconceivable that responsible officials of the Navy Department can change their minds at frequent intervals about the workload at the weapons plant. This is a very valuable facility. The property is carried on the books of the District of Columbia tax assessor at \$44,581,897 and of course such a figure does not fully reflect current values. The plant has been in operation more than 150 years. Many competent people have been trained there and are now employed there. As indicated above, this plant has a very significant economic impact on the National Capital area. It would seem to be highly essential that the Navy Department formulate a sound policy toward this plant, make its plans known to the responsible elements of the community and then proceed to follow same.

We sincerely trust that the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee will carefully review this matter promptly. We will welcome the opportunity of furnishing additional information and appearing at any hearings which may be held.

Very truly yours,

E. K. MORRIS,  
President.

Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1960, a meeting was held by the board of trade and representatives of the plant to discuss the future of the plant. Secretary Milne gave his assurances that a decision would be immediately forthcoming and that the board of trade would be advised what, if any, facilities were available for the use of private industry. I have been advised by Mr. Gunther, of the board of trade, that over 105 civilian industries have expressed interest in the plant and its highly skilled personnel. Obviously, if the present rifts are allowed to continue and these individuals, by necessity, must leave the Washington area to find new employment, then the attraction that certain of the plant's facilities may have for private industry will be considerably lessened, if not completely nullified.

While I am still convinced that there is absolutely no justification for the Navy Department to allow this facility to wither on the vine, I nevertheless feel that the most important issue to be resolved here is what steps must be taken and taken now to restore this defense plant to the industrial establishment of the United States, for it is inconceivable to me that we can afford to squander the type of facilities that are here, and more important that we can afford to lose for 1 day the highly skilled crafts and highly trained engineers available to our defense effort.

During this period, as a result of unusual publicity given to the plight of the plant, the general public seems to have been given the impression that we are discussing an obsolete facility that is of little or no use to the Defense Establishment. Letters of commendation recently received by the plant should correct this erroneous impression.

Under unanimous consent I include at this point in the RECORD a letter dated February 8, 1960, from the Chief of Naval Operations to the Superintendent of the Naval Weapons Plant—subject: Superior performance of the Naval Weapons Plant:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY, OFFICE  
OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,  
Washington, D.C., February 8, 1960.  
From: Chief of Naval Operations.  
To: Superintendent, U.S. Naval Weapons  
Plant.  
Via: Commandant, Potomac River Naval  
Command.  
Subject: Superior performance of Naval  
Weapons Plant.

1. The Naval Weapons Plant recently participated in a quick reaction capability program which required modifications to certain shipboard fire control systems and the installation of several units of classified experimental electronic countermeasures equipments. This task involved considerable engineering effort and required completion in a minimum time.

2. Engineers assigned by the Naval Weapons Plant accomplished this project expeditiously and with the highest quality of engineering and workmanship. The close liaison and coordination with the Naval Research Laboratory scientists resulted in very quick fabrication and test of the components of the system. It is now evident that without the close support and coordination of the Naval Weapons Plant the project would have been delayed by at least 6 months.

3. The Chief of Naval Operations commends the superintendent, U.S. Naval Weapons Plant and the personnel under his command for the expeditious and excellent performance in this important electronic countermeasures project.

WALLACE M. BEAKLEY,  
Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, (Fleet  
Operations and Readiness).

On February 17, the Navy Department announced the large-scale reduction in force, one of which is currently taking place.

The Navy Department in its statement of February 17 in its fact sheet on the Naval Weapons Plant makes the following statement:

There is no additional work which can be assigned to offset the decline in work in process which necessitates these reductions in force.

This statement, which may have been true when issued, is definitely no longer true. The facts in the case are that the Naval Weapons Plant today is actually turning down work that could be assigned to the plant.

One specific example, which has been recently brought to my attention, involved what was, it is true, a small contract—total price, \$6,500. It was solicited by personnel of the plant from the Maryland Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. It was a contract involving 10 castings. The material in question was delivered to the plant for processing and had to be picked back up by the Maryland Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. when the plant stated that they could not honor the scheduled delivery deadline suggested by one of its own officials because of lack of personnel. It was necessary for the Shipbuilding & Drydock people to pick up the castings and return them to the Baltimore area.

Another recent case which has been brought to my attention involved the attempted placing of an approximately \$1 million order by the Marine Corps by its equipment board located in Quantico, for the manufacture of handling and loading equipment. I have been advised that this contract, an eventual joint contract for both the Marine Corps and the Army, would have ultimately led to an additional \$10 million contract for the Army. Immediately after this contract was directly placed, high officials in the Bureau of Weapons issued instructions that there would be no more direct solicitation of workload for the weapons plant if the contract in question was in excess of a certain amount, which has fluctuated from \$25,000 to \$50,000. I do not contest the right of the Chief of the Bureau to exercise control over work being placed in the plant; but I do question the reason behind the interrogation of weapons plant officials as to whether or not they directly solicited the work in question. It is my understanding that a portion of the contract has now been placed with the plant, and I am certainly hopeful that the full potential of this contract can be realized. Very recently, the Bureau placed with the weapons plant an order for 200 Tartar missile booster sustainers. This was not an act of charity on the part of the Bureau, but was a necessary production requirement that had to be fulfilled on time. There is only one other facility to my knowledge that is in the production of this most important item.

I have been further advised that as a result of adverse publicity and uncertainty demonstrated by the Bureau, many skilled employees of the plant have voluntarily left in recent weeks, making it impossible for the plant to schedule certain items that they otherwise would have been able to schedule. Frankly, inasmuch as this uncertainty has hung over the heads of the employees of this fine installation since 1956, I, for one, cannot blame them for seeking other employment which will offer them a degree of security that apparently the Navy cannot or will not provide them.

I am sure that in some cases on certain of these points there are honest, legitimate answers that can be offered

as reasons for the condition that exists; but I submit that it makes absolutely no sense to the employees of the plant to be told that we are in a phaseout operation and that there is no work that can be scheduled that will restore a degree of stability to the plant, when every single employee at the plant knows that work is being turned down daily.

While I do not have the exact figures concerning work orders placed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I am advised of an internal memorandum whereby there will be no acceptance of work orders from this agency by liaison personnel. This, notwithstanding the fact that a considerable number of small orders have been placed with the plant during the past year by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and that NASA itself has expressed complete satisfaction with both the price and the quality of the job done by the plant.

During the recent conference, held by representatives of the plant and the board of trade with Secretary Milne, he expressed considerable surprise to learn that recruiters are still touring the country looking for engineers and technicians to staff the plant.

So here we have a situation where apparently the Navy is officially encouraging recruiting of certain engineering skills for what the Navy has termed a facility that is to be reduced considerably and, in my opinion, is to be deliberately phased out completely as an industrial entity.

As recently as March 3, 1960, Admiral Strop in testimony before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee assured the committee that there was enough work to keep the plant open through calendar 1961, but that there was not enough to keep the work force even at the predicted October level unless new orders are forthcoming, and none are in sight. This statement appears to be inconsistent with the aforementioned shutdown of work orders.

What has brought about this situation? Most assuredly a partial answer to that question stems from the official policy of the present administration; and, therefore, if we accept this policy, then we need not be surprised as to the condition that faces not only the naval weapons plant but many Government installations throughout the United States.

I would like to quote from the Bureau of the Budget Bulletin No. 60-2, dated September 21, 1959:

The Federal Government will not start or carry on any industrial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product or service can be secured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels.

The bulletin further states:

Continuation of Government operation on the ground that procurement through commercial sources would involve higher costs may be justified only if the costs are analyzed on a comparable basis and the differences are found to be substantially and disproportionately large.

The bulletin continues:

The admissibility of large and disproportionately higher costs as a possible com-

mercial reason for continued Government operation does not alter the general policy which establishes a presumption in favor of Government procurement from commercial sources and does not prohibit procurement from more costly commercial sources.

What this policy states is that there should be no commercial-industrial activity in the Federal Government. All such existing activities are illegitimate and must and will be stamped out without regard to cost, human factors or technical skills that would be forever lost to the defense effort.

As a practical matter, if private business cannot make enough profit from Government work, then it is fine for the Government to go ahead and perform it. Now I have another specific example in connection with the weapons plant, which, although a small one, illustrates perfectly what I have just said.

Last week, during an inspection of the weapons plant and its facilities, a prototype of a Polaris test missile was delivered to the plant. During a recent test run off the east coast in the New England area, this test vehicle was damaged. Attempts to find private industry in the area to make the necessary repairs proved to be of no avail. Thought was given to shipping the vehicle back to Lockheed on the west coast and at this point someone thought of the Naval Weapons Plant. As I have stated, during the inspection the vehicle arrived at the plant for repair.

In recent days, a statement was issued by the Under Secretary of the Navy concerning the reason for the weapons plant's dilemma. In effect, he said that the Navy is in the business of ships, planes, and missiles. The naval weapons plant is a job-order gun plant and there is no longer a need for guns. I think you can well imagine the effect a statement of this sort has upon the employees of the weapons plant who are engaged in the manufacture of numerous missiles and their component parts. I would now like to add at this point in the RECORD a listing of those projects from the January 1960 financial statement prepared by the U.S. Naval Weapons Plant, Washington, D.C., which I assume is made available routinely to the Secretary of the Navy and his staff. This list reveals direct application to the manufacture of ships, planes, and missiles:

Under the title of "Major Program Description," I will read only a sufficient number to indicate the great variety of programs that the weapons plant is now participating in or has participated in in recent times:

- Talos molds.
- Rangefinders.
- Radar antenna mounts.
- Computers.
- Rocket Launcher Mark 108.
- The Mine Mark 57, the 56, so necessary in ASW warfare capabilities today.
- Polaris flat pad launcher.
- Truck handling and lifting equipment for the Marine Corps.
- Mobile optical tracking unit for Patrick Air Force Base.
- Grind ceramic cylinders for RCA.
- Tiros satellite fabrication for NASA work, associated with missile tracking.
- Shipping containers for liquid explosives.

Mark 7 Missile Launcher; Mark 12 Missile Launcher; Depth Bomb Mark 101; Gun Director Mark 68 dual thrust rocket motors, which includes the Tartar rocket motor assembly; various telescopes produced by one of the most outstanding optical shops in the country, either private or government; Side-winder; various mine components; and propellant grain immobilizers.

How effective has the plant been in the manufacture of the items just mentioned? Let me read more letters of commendation and other official statements. Once these letters and bland assurances are considered, I think all will realize why each employee of the weapons plant has a right to know the reason for this incredible mismanagement of an installation that each man knows to be one of the finest of its type in our Nation's industrial establishment.

I wish to point out that this is not to be dismissed as a local situation, and I realize fully that many of you have experienced similar reductions in force in government installations in your home districts; but I must emphasize again that the Naval Weapons Plant is situated in Washington, D.C., and, hence, truly belongs to the entire Nation in every respect. Admittedly, approximately 40 percent of the employees of the plant are residents of the Fifth District of Maryland, primarily living in Prince Georges County. During the 4 to 5 years that I have been intimately associated with the problems of the Navy in connection with the administration and operation of the Naval Weapons Plant, I have come to know many of these individuals well and can assure you that I have taken the time to inspect the facility time and time again, and can state unqualifiedly that here we have men possessed with some of the finest skills anywhere in the world's labor market. These are men in some cases with 20, 30, 40 and even 50 years of dedicated service to our defense effort, who are now being told that their plant is obsolete and can no longer fulfill a useful function at the very time when they are working on crash project after crash project for programs necessary in arming the fleet or in providing materiel for our space test vehicles.

The following statements will clearly show that these fine workers have met every challenge. They should expect in return capable administration of the facility on the part of the Department of Defense. If this is not supplied, then Congress has a duty—yes a duty—to act.

On November 26, 1958, the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance wrote the following letter of commendation to the superintendent, signed by Rear Adm. W. F. Raborn, Director of Special Projects, which I insert at this point in the RECORD:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,  
BUREAU OF ORDNANCE,

Washington, D.C., November 26, 1958.

From: Chief, Bureau of Ordnance.

To: Superintendent, Naval Gun Factory, Washington, D.C.

Subject: FBM program (NGF project order No. 710); construction of flat pad launcher; commendation for.

1. In October of this year, an urgent need developed in the FBM program for a flat pad type missile launcher at the Navy complex,

Atlantic Missile Range, Cocoa Beach, Fla. Required delivery date for the launcher was December 1, 1958.

2. The initial contact by this Office with representatives of the gun factory was October 22; shop work started on October 24 and the launcher was shipped on November 18 with an estimated on-site arrival date of November 20.

3. It is requested that you extend my sincere appreciation to everyone who participated in the expeditious handling of this element of the Navy's top priority program.

W. F. RABORN,  
Director, Special Projects.

FIRST ENDORSEMENT

DECEMBER 16, 1958.

From: OOO.

To: NGF personnel.

1. I want to express my personal appreciation to all gun factory personnel whose efforts contributed to the success of this project. The completion of this vital project ahead of schedule demonstrates the capabilities of the gun factory. It shows teamwork from the engineering department, the supply department, shops C-6 and R-1 of the manufacturing department, and shop 11 of the Public Works Department.

2. I am certain that continued performance at this level will insure the future of the gun factory.

CHAS. E. BRINER.

Early in 1959, the gun factory very justly had every reason to be proud of the national recognition it had received for its expert technical competence in the welding research field, which is a major factor in the critical period of technological change and missiles development. Mr. Julian Kobler, a highly regarded engineer of the plant whose recommendations for the future of the weapons plant will appear at the close of my remarks, had this to say:

Coupled with engineering department progress in ultrahigh strength steels and related development projects, it is apparent that the Naval Gun Factory is the leading Bureau of Ordnance activity concerned with structural fabrication.

On January 23, 1959, a very interesting statement appeared in the Log. The statement was made by a representative of Radio Corp. of America. Previous to this statement, RCA asked the gun factory whether they had facilities to do grinding work on a very hard ceramic cylinder, and if they did would they be interested in doing some work for them. The answer, of course, was "Yes" to both questions. The fact that the job was done satisfactorily can best be expressed by the RCA representative who stated:

The Naval Gun Factory in 3 months has done with a 10-inch cylinder the grinding job which took RCA over a year to do with a 6-inch cylinder.

On February 27, 1959, Admiral Ahroon, in an address made to a group composed of Naval Gun Factory top management personnel, stated that there are good reasons for keeping the gun factory in operation. He said:

The Lubelsky report recommended your continuing \* \* \*. The fact remains that the decision was made long ago to keep the gun factory a going concern in the Naval Establishment.

The lead article appearing in the Log on February 27, 1959, went on to say that the reentry of the gun factory into major

fire control projects—subsequently reworked—"will place our engineers in dynamic new fields and lead to substantial shopwork. If we can succeed in redeveloping these capabilities, we will be truly versatile." The admiral also said that he could see then where "we would be in a position to branch out in the new supermissiles field and space operations."

Admiral Ahroon further stated in his article that not only did he expect the gun factory to regain its old competence in fire control, but he expected us to save the Navy money.

On March 4, 1960, a letter of commendation from the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations was read by the superintendent of the weapons plant. The letter complimented the plant for the fast, excellent work done on an important project called Project Piggyback. One of the most praising sentences in the letter is as follows:

It is now evident that without the close support and coordination of the Naval Weapons Plant, the project would have been delayed by at least 6 months.

Here again is another of many examples which emphasized the quick reaction capabilities of the plant.

On July 31, 1959, the industrial control officer of the Naval Weapons Plant issued a report which appeared in the Log on the workload for the plant for the next 18 months. I quote from this article:

The reaction of all hands to the heavy demands for overtime which has been needed to keep important programs on schedule has been gratifying and through your remarkable efforts we have been able to hold the line on deliveries and came through with outstanding success in our delivery of the first Mark 7 guided missile launcher last month.

Further quoting:

Therefore, my statement today: "The situation for the next 18 months looks excellent."

And now, as late as April 1, 1960, the Naval Weapons Plant was again praised in a letter of commendation from the Navy's Director of Special Projects, Rear Admiral Raborn. The praise was for the plant's expeditious handling of the Polaris handling device. In his letter, Admiral Raborn began by saying that during January 1960 an "urgent requirement developed within the launching and handling branch of the Office of Special Projects." He then gave the date on which the plant was contacted and the date on which the Polaris handling device was needed. The weapons plant proved its quick reaction capability by delivering the Polaris handling device on time and where it was needed. In concluding his letter, Admiral Raborn asked that his sincere appreciation be extended to "everyone who participated in the expeditious handling of this material required for the Navy's top priority program."

As many of you know, there is at the present time under consideration by the House Appropriations Committee a rider to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act. This rider was proposed by the metal trades department executive council in session at Miami Beach,

Fla., on February 5, 1960, and the subcommittee has been urged to give consideration to the inclusion of the rider on the appropriations bill for fiscal 1961. The effect of the rider, with which many of you are familiar, would be to force defense agencies to allocate enough workload moneys to existing activities to maintain the personnel "on board" in each Government-owned and operated defense facility at its January 1, 1960, manpower figure. I feel it appropriate for me to serve notice that what has been happening at the Naval Weapons Plant in Washington, D.C., has been happening throughout all defense installations and there will be, I trust, in the days ahead, an opportunity for each of you to consider this matter most carefully and to register your protest to the policy of the present administration—the all-out farm-out-at-any-cost policy that was put into effect in 1955.

The effect of this rider on the weapons plant is, of course, obvious. I have been informed that the plant can maintain its present work force with manufacturing orders totaling approximately \$40 million per year. This figure represents less than 1 percent of the amount spent each year by the Navy Department alone on aircraft, ships, guided missiles, electronics, and communications. It is impossible for me to ever be convinced that there are not sufficient component parts suitable for the Naval Weapons Plant to handle.

Once again, I wish to impress upon each Member of this body that my remarks are not to be construed as local in nature. What is happening here can happen and has been happening throughout the entire United States. It is, indeed, unfortunate that the District of Columbia does not have its own representation. If one of its representatives should happen to be a Republican, there is reason to believe that a little more consideration would be given to the Naval Weapons Plant than appears to be the case today. My reason for making this statement, as distasteful as it is to me personally, is an article appearing in the *Courier Post*, Camden, N.J., Tuesday, January 5, 1960, entitled "GOP Group To Supervise Military Base Closings." I am going to read one paragraph from this newspaper account, and under unanimous consent insert the entire article in the *RECORD*.

I quote:

Its purpose is to consult in advance with Republican Members of Congress regarding military and other Federal installations in their States and districts which are slated to be shutdown during this election year.

The entire article follows:

**GOP GROUP TO SUPERVISE MILITARY BASE CLOSINGS**

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—The White House is acquiring an unusual new adjunct—a so-called clearing committee.

Its purpose is to consult in advance with Republican Members of Congress regarding military and other Federal installations in their States and districts which are slated to be shut down during this election year.

Some 40 air and other military bases alone are due to be closed.

The special "clearing committee" that is to cope with this politically explosive prob-

lem consists of Vice President Nixon, Senator THURSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky, who is also GOP national chairman, one of President Eisenhower's White House assistants, and an official of the Defense Department and Budget Bureau.

This group will seek to avert shutdowns that might be embarrassing to Republican election prospects.

Authority for these 40 contemplated military closings is former Defense Secretary Neil McElroy. He disclosed them at a budget conference early in December before he quit. McElroy explained these installations would have to be axed because the \$41 billion ceiling the President had fixed for the defense budget would require funds being shifted from conventional weapons and units to missiles and rockets.

Although this was a private Pentagon meeting, Republican congressional leaders got wind of this political bad news in a few days.

Subsequently, the Democrats also not only heard about it but got hold of the list of 40 bases that are to be closed. It was leaked to Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democratic, of Illinois, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee.

The former marine, whose left hand was severely disabled in the Pacific fighting, plans to make this secret list public at forthcoming hearings of his committee.

The disturbed GOP congressional leaders immediately rushed to NIXON and MORTON. They lost no time in taking up the matter at both the White House and the Pentagon. MORTON also was outspoken in what he thought should be done.

His solution was setting up a "clearing committee" in the national headquarters that would "review" all military and other closings.

"If we have a committee to do that," the Kentuckian argued, "we can keep a lot of our people from being politically hurt. If some of these shutdowns can just as well wait until after the elections, why not do that? Why the rush if it's going to hurt us politically?"

To drive home his contention, MORTON related the following personal experience:

"In the last Congress, I spent a lot of time and effort trying to persuade two Republican Members of the House, who come from labor districts, to support the administration's labor legislation. One of them flatly refused saying it would be political suicide. The other finally reluctantly agreed to go along with us.

"The very next day the Pentagon announced without the slightest previous warning that a big base would be shut down in the district of the House Member I had laboriously won over. But that isn't all. In that same announcement, the Pentagon also said that a new installation would be built in the other Member's district; the one who had turned me down because he feared it would be political suicide for him to vote with us.

"I had a tough time straightening that 'snafu' out, and I don't want any more of them. That's why we simply must have a 'clearing committee' to keep a checkrein on these things."

President Eisenhower, while agreeing in theory with MORTON, turned thumbs down on the proposed committee being part of Republican national headquarters.

Instead he agreed to the "clearing committee" being under the White House.

It is unthinkable to me that political considerations of this nature are influencing decisions as to when, where and how to effectuate cuts in defense establishments.

In bringing this order to a close, I would like to read a letter from one of my constituents who has written me

concerning his own personal problems in connection with the deplorable conditions existing at the plant. Perhaps this may appear to be an appeal to emotions. For this I make no apology.

DEAR SIR: As one of your constituents, may I take a moment of your time to voice my fear and anxiety over the present workload situation at the U.S. Naval Weapons Plant.

Capt. Charles E. Briner today made the first layoff announcement affecting 119 employees by February 1960; this was bad news. But his statement that there would be other rifts (substantial ones) in the months to follow, Mr. LANKFORD, I don't know what to say at this point. It just makes me sick inside. I can't eat or sleep. I cannot even think straight. I come home in the evening from the Naval Weapons Plant to my wife and four lovely children. My dinner is on the table and the children are all happy because daddy is home. They are laughing and trying to tell me of the day's adventures; so what happens? Daddy is worried about his job and the future of his family. He snaps at the children and tells them to be quiet, he is not interested. (That's not like daddy.) So I hurt my four children; and if you have ever looked into the eyes of a child that you have hurt, you will know what an agonizing, unbelieving, hurt expression is there. They look at you as if to say, "Why, Daddy, why?" This question, "Why?" is what I do not understand; why is it that our U.S. Navy, one of the greatest powers in the world, with ships, guns, missiles, etc., can be kept up to the latest specifications, spare parts to be made and new weapons to be manufactured; why is a plant like the Naval Weapons Plant, that is capable of manufacturing anything from a nut and bolt to the present day missile and space machines, not given any contracts by the Navy? It is not because we do not have the machines; it is not because we do not have the knowledge and know-how; it is not because we don't have the facilities. Then why? Haven't we at the Naval Weapons Plant come through each and every time the Navy has given us a job to do? No matter how tough or complex the job was, the Naval Weapons Plant always came through. Our past performance record speaks for itself. Then why?

And that is exactly the question that I believe these employees, and indeed the taxpayers of the United States, are entitled to have answered. Why?

I have dwelt, I realize, at great length on the past and the present. I have raised questions which, I believe, demand an answer. But I do not intend to end my remarks with questions critical in nature.

Under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the *RECORD* a proposal for the reorientation of the Naval Weapons Plant. It was prepared under the supervision of one of the plant's most outstanding engineers. This proposal should be given every possible consideration and, for once, foolish pride and stubbornness should be abandoned in the interest of the common good of preserving an installation that has proven itself time and time again in the past. It is proving itself today, is turning down work needed by the Government, as well as private industry, and is there ready and willing to do a job. The charts referred to in the survey will be made available in my office for those interested in making a detailed study of the suggestions raised.

I submit that a complete clean sweep, a complete overhaul of the plant, both

internally and externally, is in order, and I realize in saying this that there are bound to be certain individuals and age-old customs that will suffer. This I fully recognize must be. Not only should there be a clean sweep and reorganization of the plant, but assurances should be given that the plant in trying to come out of its difficulties from an operational point of view will be given every possible bit of cooperation from the Defense Department and the Congress. It is my intention to keep up this fight until justice and fair play are obtained for the plant's employees and until this \$250 million investment of the taxpayers is economically utilized.

The above-mentioned material follows:

#### PROPOSAL FOR THE REORIENTATION OF THE NAVAL WEAPONS PLANT

##### I. INTRODUCTION

Management at the Naval Weapons Plant is increasingly concerned that this activity may be phased out of existence. Historically, this industrial and engineering complex was a lead organization in providing for Bureau of Ordnance primary support to the fleet. In recent years, however, the plant has apparently declined in prestige and stature to the extent that its contributions have diminished in importance.

Changing trends in weapons technology, accelerating through the past decade, have in general emphasized a decreasing importance of the position formerly held by "in-house" defense manufacturing establishments. As a result of these changes, it is imperative that the Bureau of Naval Weapons and the Naval Weapons Plant adopt a positive policy of action and establish definite spheres of operation in direct conformance with present and anticipated requirements of the Nation, the Navy Department, and the Bureau of Naval Weapons. This is the only approach which will permit a compelling justification for continued existence of the Naval Weapons Plant. To attain such an objective requires the concerted effort of all, the elimination of long-standing fetishes and slowly built-up empires, a hard and realistic look at what it is, a sincere desire to fill a need and a determination to reach the required objective.

The transition from what it has been to what it must be, is a major undertaking in which many realignments are necessary.

##### II. OBJECTIVES

To reiterate, defense establishments are no longer the prime sources for manufacture of weapons. Mounting costs of today's glamour weapons have skyrocketed defense spending to the point where overlapping functions must be obviated. This national problem accentuates the necessity for the Naval Weapons Plant to restrict its activities to those tasks which:

(a) Are not readily or willingly supplied by industry.

(b) Provide specialized in-house engineering and manufacturing capabilities in the areas of optics, fire control, light components and equipments, technical evaluation, environmental test, and field services.

In order to insure the proficient accomplishment of these tasks, the Naval Weapons Plant must respond as a flexible, integrated, well-balanced organization of skills and facilities capable of swift support to the fleet.

Thus, a searching review of manpower, facilities, and method of operation at the Naval Weapons Plant has been conducted.

In order that this activity continue as an essential organization providing vital support to the Bureau of Naval Weapons, a

positive program of action must be initiated to accomplish the following objectives:

- Improve management effectiveness.
- Improve liaison between the Naval Weapons Plant and the Bureau of Naval Weapons.
- Reduce costs.
- Improve schedule performance.
- Improve research and development and test and evaluation capabilities.

These objectives can only be achieved by a functional reorganization and consolidation of facilities as proposed herein.

##### III. PROPOSED FUNCTIONAL REORGANIZATION

The existing organizational structure of the Naval Weapons Plant must be drastically revised in order to accomplish the aforementioned objectives.

Proposed functional organization charts prepared for the Naval Weapons Plant, the research and engineering department and the manufacturing department are submitted herewith. Listed below are the basic recommendations relative to each chart.

Chart No. 1. Naval Weapons Plant organization—Recommendations:

Establish the position of executive director of the Naval Weapons Plant.

Establish the position of deputy director for the manufacturing department.

Redesignate the engineering department as the research and engineering department.

Establish the position of deputy director for the research and engineering department.

Establish an office of decentralized services in the administrative department.

Redesignate the inspection department as the quality control department with in-process inspection responsibility.

Disestablish the industrial control department.

Establish a customer relations staff.

Transfer the planning functions formerly under the industrial control department to the industrial management department.

Establish a separate activity under the supervision of an officer in charge responsible for Gage and ASRO to report directly to the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

Creation of the positions of executive director, deputy director for manufacturing, and deputy director for research and engineering clearly establishes definite lines of responsibility. Candidates for these positions should not be selected from within the Naval Weapons Plant. The deputy director for manufacturing should have an engineering or science education in addition to a manufacturing background.

Chart No. 2. Manufacturing department organization—Recommendations:

Establish the position of deputy director for the manufacturing department.

Disestablish the production engineering division and transfer its responsibilities to a manufacturing engineering division and a production planning and control division.

Establish a manufacturing engineering division.

Establish a production planning and control division.

Disestablish the metal processing division, the light machining and assembly division and the heavy machining assembly division and transfer their functions to the manufacturing division.

Establish a manufacturing division.

It should be noted that the revised organizational structure provides for one production manager instead of three, and three master mechanics instead of six, thereby further strengthening the lines of managerial responsibility.

These recommendations also deemphasize the heavy machining and assembly operations which are so traditional at the Naval Weapons Plant, and recognize the fact that Northern Ordnance Inc. is the lead organization in the field of missile launchers and other heavy equipment.

Chart No. 3. Research and engineering department organization—recommendations:

Establish the position of deputy director for research and engineering.

Establish a technical advisory council composed of consultants on a retainer basis.

Disestablish the engineering administration division.

Disestablish the engineering research and evaluation division.

Disestablish the functional design division.

Establish the applied research division.

Establish the technical evaluation division.

Transfer the fabrication engineering functions to the manufacturing department.

##### IV. PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION OF FACILITIES

The recommendations contained herein for consolidation and relocation of facilities are designed to centralize the entire industrial effort west of Isaac Hull Avenue. This rearrangement will simplify operations, effect economies and provide a facility that meets the needs of the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

A chart denoting consolidation of facilities is submitted herewith. Recommendations relative to the consolidation are listed below.

Chart No. 4. Consolidation of facilities—recommendations:

Move all optical equipment from buildings 157 and 210 to building 159 and dispose of machine tools.

Move selected heavy machine tools from buildings 22, 33, 36, 76 to building 202.

Convert building 160 into an electric, electronic, and plastic facility.

Move all electric and electronic equipment from building 196 to building 160.

Move all plastic and rubber molding equipment from building 105 to building 160.

Establish a limited press facility in building 159.

Establish a limited forge and heat treat facility in building 294.

Convert building 158 to a transportation center for the public works department.

Convert building 137 into a storage area for use by the supply department.

Convert building 153 to a complete fabrication facility.

Move machining and welding equipment from building 175 to building 153.

Establish a limited plating facility in building 153.

Establish a sheet metal facility in building 153.

Move sheet metal equipment from buildings 113 and 119 to building 153.

Move fabrication equipment from buildings 73 and 104 to building 153.

Establish a light instrument assembly facility in the annex of building 157.

A number of these recommendations have already been formally submitted to the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

##### V. DISPOSITION AND UTILIZATION OF VACATED BUILDINGS

Recommendations: Raze buildings 21, 22, 33, 36, 37, 39, 41, 44, 46, 57, 67, 68, 70, 73, 76, 102, 103, 105, 108, 109, 111, 112, 154, 174, 177, 187, 211, 227, 288, 315, 316, 317, and 318.

Buildings 157, 175, and the upper floors of buildings 196 and 210 are available for conversion to administrative office space.

##### VI. UTILIZATION OF VACANT LAND CREATED AS A RESULT OF RAZING BUILDINGS

Recommendations: Establish parks and parking areas as indicated on chart No. 4.

The need for adequate parking is a growing one and is a situation that must be provided for regardless of the ultimate use of the Naval Weapons Plant buildings.

##### VII. PROPOSED LEVEL OF OPERATION

The proposed reorganization and consolidation of facilities functioning with a total manpower complement of 3,000 in all departments, excluding tenant and tenant-related activities, will permit a proficient,

effective, quick reacting capability for the Naval Weapons Plant, thus resulting in increased operational efficiency; decreased operating costs; and improved schedule performance.

#### VIII. SUMMARY

A positive program to reorient the personnel and facilities of the Naval Weapons Plant to meet the requirements of the Bureau of Naval Weapons has been proposed.

The program recommends that—

The Naval Weapons Plant perform those tasks for the Bureau of Naval Weapons that are not readily or willingly supplied by industry.

The Naval Weapons Plant provide in-house engineering and manufacturing capabilities in the fields of: Optics, fire control, light components and equipment, technical evaluation, environmental test, and field service.

To enable the Naval Weapons Plant to perform these functions, it is proposed that—

The functional organization of the Naval Weapons Plant be significantly reoriented.

The facilities of the Naval Weapons Plant be consolidated.

It is further recommended that the Chief of the Bureau of Naval Weapons direct the Assistant Chief of the Bureau for Fleet Readiness and the Assistant Chief of the Bureau for R.D.T. & E. to provide adequate support for the Research and Engineering Department of the Naval Weapons Plant in the areas of systems, concepts, feasibility studies; laboratory programs; environmental test and evaluation; product and value engineering; documentation; standardization; monitoring technical publications; fleet liaison; and technical coordination for Bureau of Naval Weapons.

Mandatory implementation of all the proposals contained herein will achieve the mutual objectives of the Bureau of Naval Weapons and the Naval Weapons Plant; namely, improve management effectiveness; increase efficiency; significantly reduce costs; improve schedule performance; improve liaison between the Naval Weapons Plant and the Bureau of Naval Weapons; and improve research development, test, and evaluation capabilities.

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

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

Mr. STRATTON. I would like to commend the gentleman from Maryland for the fine statement he is making on this subject and particularly with reference to the statement he just made that this is a problem that applies not only to the local area of the District of Columbia but in many areas throughout the country.

In my district in upstate New York we have had exactly the same kind of situation; there has been a cutback in valuable naval facilities which is not only impairing, in my judgment, the capacity of the Navy to execute its mission but has also caused severe economic dislocation to the area.

This is the kind of thing which is happening in many other sections of the country, and I think the gentleman has revealed the details of a situation which should be of concern to all of us.

As a colleague of his on the Armed Services Committee, I have respected and admired the fine effort that he has made, and I would simply like to endorse the remarks he has made in this instance.

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

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

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

There was no objection.

#### "PIE IN THE SKY," OR A REAL PROGRAM OF HEALTH BENEFITS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDAY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 13, I addressed the House on the very urgent question of health benefits for the aged. I pointed out in those remarks that a new proposal called the Javits bill was being peddled which was designed to stop the tremendous demand for legislation along the lines of H.R. 4700, the Forand bill. That bill, I stressed, could best be described as "pie in the sky." I have been encouraged during the past week to find that there is growing awareness of the "pie-in-the sky" nature of this proposal.

The so-called health insurance for the aged bill was introduced a couple of weeks ago by some Republican Members in both Houses of Congress because they just could not wait any longer for their administration leaders to come through with any proposals at all to meet the crucial problem of high health costs for our aged population. The pressure was too great. The Forand bill was getting too great public support. And the constituents back home were waiting to see what their respective Congressmen were going to do. Consequently, a bill got written which was supposed to reflect the basic criteria which the administration was using to develop its own program.

As I pointed out last week, the benefits ascribed to this bill sound great. But a reading of the bill—rather than the Madison Avenue press release that accompanied it—demonstrates that none of these benefits are included in the bill. Then, it must be kept in mind, any benefits—no matter how small or inadequate—would be available to our people only if a whole series of hurdles were overcome.

The Congress itself—out of general revenues—would have to appropriate \$480 million. This is quite a hurdle.

The States would have to appropriate, collectively, \$640 million. This is quite a hurdle.

Before any benefits could be paid, the States would have to pass enabling legislation, set up complex administrative machinery, and negotiate contracts with a multitude of insurance companies. This is quite a series of hurdles.

Then, the beneficiary himself would have to make substantial contribution unless he is totally or almost totally without income, with rates as high as \$26 per month per couple for undetermined benefits. This is quite a hurdle.

And if all these moneys can be raised—from the Federal Government, the State

government, and the beneficiary himself—they are used to purchase private insurance. And from experience in the workmen's compensation field, a good part of all the moneys will be retained by the insurance companies. This is quite a hurdle.

To all of these hurdles, Mr. Speaker, it now appears there is still another. It is more than 2 weeks since the plan was first released. But as yet, neither the White House nor the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have endorsed it. This is certainly quite a hurdle.

But frankly, Mr. Speaker, I cannot pretend to be disappointed in the fact that the administration has not endorsed this bill, even though their rejection of it, to date, is motivated by considerations quite different from my own.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to comment in some detail on one aspect of this "pie in the sky" proposal which has received much attention. Unlike the Forand bill, which would make health benefits available to all persons eligible for social security benefits, the "pie in the sky" bill would cover all persons over 65 years of age. Thus, it is argued, whereas the Forand bill would cover only approximately 12 million persons, the Republican bill would cover 16 million persons. Superficially, a 16-million-person program certainly sounds better than a 12-million-person program. I urge my colleagues, however, not to be satisfied with this superficial comparison.

This is the clearest case of political "one-upmanship" I have seen in a long time. It is as phony as any kind of social "one-upmanship" I have come across. Embarrassed by the failure of the administration to come through with a meaningful program for the great bulk of our older persons, these Republican Members now try to make their program look even better than the one we Democrats have been urging. A full examination of the issue will show, however, that this argument is not founded on the facts.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to state most frankly and bluntly that if I had to choose between a proposal which would do a lot for almost all of our older people and a program that did practically nothing—except to offer "pie in the sky"—for all of our older people, I would choose the former.

Second, those of us who have been supporting the Forand bill or legislation along the lines of the Forand bill are precisely the ones who over the years have promoted and helped to enact improvements in our public assistance program so that those of our older citizens who did not have the opportunity to become part of the social security system would at least be provided with the minimum decencies of life, including medical care. And we are not satisfied with the present program. While the administration is urging cutbacks in public assistance, we are advocating greater Federal participation and a broader assistance program. The author of the Forand bill is also the principal sponsor of a bill which would mean substantial improvements in public assistance.



Third, Mr. Speaker, the Forand bill was specifically designed—and properly so—to broaden the OASDI benefits to include health insurance. It comes with ill grace for those who do not even want to go this far to criticize us for not going further.

Fourth, it simply is not true that there are 4 million older and neediest people who would be totally ignored if the Forand bill were enacted. This figure has been used because it represents the difference between the approximately 16 million persons who are over 65 years of age and the 12 million who are in the OASDI program. However, among these 4 million are to be found 500,000 persons in the Railroad Retirement Program, 500,000 veterans who are receiving compensation and pensions of some kind, and 1,600,000 who are receiving old age public assistance under our Federal-State programs. There are several hundred thousand additional persons who are to be found in Federal, State, and local government retirement systems. It is therefore clearly a gross overstatement to assert glibly that the Forand bill fails to do anything for the 4 million older persons with the lowest incomes.

All of the above notwithstanding, however, I want to make it just as clear as possible that I share with my Republican colleagues the concern for every senior citizen of this country, regardless of whether he is in the social security system or not. Some way will be found, I am sure, to provide adequate health benefits for older persons.

We must not for a minute, however, lose sight of the principal objective—the providing of health benefits for the great bulk of our older citizens—the 12 million who have already experienced the dignity and security that comes from receiving benefits as a matter of earned entitlement, under the social security system.

On another occasion, I will address the House on the reasons for the use of the social security system as the only proper mechanism for meeting the problems of health for the aged. I have taken the floor today to set the record straight on this one point; namely, that those of us who support the extension of social security benefits to include health insurance are no less interested than others in seeking proper remedies for those who unfortunately did not have the opportunity to become part of the social security system, and we will support any reasonable proposal to accomplish this end. But we see no logical reason why, in the meantime, the Forand bill or some other bill of that type, should not be adopted to give relief to the 12 million people over 65 years of age under the OASDI program.

#### NO CUTBACKS IN URBAN INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, last year when it was discovered that the trust fund was exhausted and there were

not sufficient funds available to keep the highway program at the construction levels provided by the 1956 act, many people both in and out of the Congress charged that the reason for the shortage resulted from excessively wide rights-of-way, overdesigning, frills, excessive engineering costs, and so forth.

Even if these things were true, and no doubt in a program of this magnitude we will find some instances in which they are true, the deficiency in the trust fund was not caused by these things. I have in the past discussed and enumerated the various reasons for the trust-fund deficiency. I will not do so here today.

These charges of overdesign, excessively wide rights-of-way, and so forth, had considerable impact and were far reaching. A study was commenced at the White House level last fall in order to determine what, if anything, should be done to cut the costs of this program, particularly since Congress had adjourned without providing sufficient funds to keep the highway program at the construction levels provided by the 1956 act. There were those who advocated that the geometric standards of this program be cut back, that the Interstate System, particularly in urban areas, be deemphasized.

Now there is no one who believes more than I that we must eliminate waste and cut costs wherever possible, but in doing so we must not make mistakes that will come back to haunt us a few years from now.

Remember we are building these roads so that, when they are completed about 1975, they will be able to handle 1975 traffic. Traffic, like our population, is now increasing at a rate far exceeding that predicted by the experts just 4 years ago. We need to build permanence into the new highways to protect this multi-billion-dollar investment from becoming obsolete at the very moment it is completed.

In the years past the most crucial failure in highway construction has been to underestimate traffic, the potential of the automobile, and the urgent need for sufficient highway capacity. We must realize that, if we cannot buy rights-of-way adequate for future widening, we do not have the correct location. As Charles Noble, Ohio's former highway director, said:

We must not allow today's desires and pressures to blind us to tomorrow's needs.

In a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal, we find this quote which pretty well answers the question as to what constitutes real waste:

Some of these plans may look too big for their britches in 1959, but they will fit just right in 1979. It does not make sense to build something new and then have to rebuild it in 10 years. That is real waste.

I became greatly concerned last October when I learned that there was serious consideration being given to deemphasize or cut back the Interstate System in the urban areas. There is no question but that the cost of building this Interstate System in and through the cities of this country is extremely costly. However, in passing the mam-

moth 1956 Highway Act, we decided to build roads where the need exists; where the traffic congestion was the greatest. All of the studies indicated that unless we got rid of the strangling bottlenecks in this country our economy would be irreparably impaired.

The evidence is conclusive that it is on the urban sections of the Interstate System where the traffic density is greatest; where the accident rate is highest; and where our economy is being most adversely affected.

It is obvious, therefore, that if we cut back on the urban sections of the Interstate System, we would be cutting the heart out of the highway program; we would be defeating the very purpose for which it was created.

The fact is, that if we are building roads to eliminate traffic, then we must determine the cost of these roads on the basis of the vehicle miles traveled thereon. This is the only true test for evaluating both need and cost. If we use this formula, then the urban sections of the Interstate System will be less costly than the rural sections.

The necessity of preserving the integrity of the urban sections of the Interstate System is even greater when we realize that in a few short years, about the time this system is completed, the need for adequate urban sections of the Interstate System will even be greater, because 75 percent of the people will be then living in urban areas.

Today, even with the high dollar cost of the urban sections of the Interstate System, the people in the cities are getting back in Federal road money a little less than they contribute to the trust fund.

During the 6 months that consideration was being given to cutting back or deemphasizing the Interstate System in urban areas, considerable uncertainty in the execution and future planning of the highway program has existed throughout the United States. This past week I have been tremendously pleased to learn that there will be no such cutback in the planning and construction of the urban sections of the Interstate System.

On April 12 I wrote the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Frederick H. Mueller, as follows:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know I have been greatly concerned since I spoke to the American Association of State Highway Officials last October about the possibility of the administration recommending cutbacks or deemphasizing of the Interstate System in urban areas.

I will not restate in this letter why I feel that the adoption of such a policy would be a serious mistake since I have discussed this matter on many occasions with Under Secretary Allen and Highway Administrator Talamy. The fact that such a cutback and other proposed changes in highway construction standards have been under consideration has caused much uncertainty throughout the country with reference to future highway planning.

In order to eliminate this uncertainty, I am wondering whether or not you are able to advise me if any conclusions have been reached with respect to this matter and, if so, the nature thereof.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON H. SCHERER.

On April 15, 1960, the Secretary replied to me as follows:

DEAR MR. SCHERER: Thank you for your letter of April 13, 1960, about the Interstate Highway System as it relates to urban areas.

Let me assure you at the outset of this letter that the administration has no intention whatever of abandoning any of the routes presently designated as general corridors of traffic—in urban or in rural areas. Consistent with this intention, we are continuing, as you realize, to make every effort, in cooperation with the States, to achieve a basic interconnected system at the earliest possible date.

We all appreciate, of course, that the Interstate System cannot, nor is it intended to, provide the solution to the rush hour traffic problems of our metropolitan areas. That rests in the coordination of many elements, such as the Federal-aid urban arterial highways and other major city and State thoroughfares, combined with both rail and rubber mass transportation and, to a considerable degree, with both air and water facilities. The Interstate System, however, will be a part of this overall approach to the problem and will facilitate the movement of interstate highway traffic within the many metropolitan areas in which this system has been designated.

I know you are aware that current revenue estimates for the highway trust fund are about \$11 billion less than the amount required to build this projected system on present costs. In our report to the Congress next January we will present revised cost estimates along with a suggested program designed to raise sufficient funds to pay for this program. You also know that the President has proposed an immediate one-half cent increase in the gas tax with extension of a 4½-cent rate through fiscal 1964. This tax would allow increased apportionments in the next several years, which are necessary if the program, including the urban routes of particular interest to you, is to get back on schedule.

I should like to say in conclusion that we are constantly seeking ways to achieve the basic objectives of the program with maximum economy.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK H. MUELLER,  
Secretary of Commerce.

#### FOOD—PUBLIC PROTECTION

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GLENN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, the public has the right to know the source of the foods it is consuming in packaged form. The law now requires that the package bear a label containing the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor. An increasing number of packaged foods, fresh, frozen, and canned, are being manufactured or packaged by one concern and distributed by another. Under such circumstances, it is only necessary to bear the name of the distributor, and hence the public is not given the safeguard of knowing who manufactured or packed the food.

I have today introduced a bill that would do two things: One, require that where a packaged food is manufactured

or packed by one other than the distributor, the label must also state the name and place of business of the manufacturer or packer; and two, if the package contains a single fresh, frozen, or canned fruit or vegetable, it must recite the name of the State where grown.

There is hardly a State in the Union that is not identified with one or more fruits or vegetables, because of the uniformity of the good quality of its product. The public has a right to be assured it is getting the fruit or vegetable grown in any given State when it asks and pays for it. In the recent cranberry dilemma, no New Jersey-grown cranberries were condemned or taken off the market. If these cranberries had been labeled as having been grown in New Jersey, the public would have had assurance of safety, and the growers and distributors would have benefited by the identification of the product. Also, a practice has come about of fruit and vegetables of inferior quality being grown in one State and shipped into another State for packaging and distribution as the product of the second State, which State has a known uniformity of good quality of the specific fruit or vegetable. The public is intentionally deceived by this practice, even in some instances by false labeling as the product of the second State. The public will be protected from such practice by this bill and every State will be benefited by the identification of its product.

#### FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, 14 bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives which would amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act thereby providing protection for miners who work in mines employing 14 men or less.

In August 1959 the subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor held extensive hearings which I believe showed conclusively that this legislation is necessary.

Since then many men have lost their lives in these small mines due to inadequate safety measures.

Mr. Speaker, how much blood of innocent men must be shed before Congress acts on this important and urgent legislation?

#### OASI BENEFITS TO PERSONS AGE 72

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legis-

lation amending the Social Security Act to provide OASI benefits to persons aged 72 and over who are not presently eligible for such benefits.

Under my proposal, these aged individuals would receive as a matter of statutory right the minimum OASI benefit which is presently \$33 per month.

The cost of "blanketing-in" this group within the protection of the program would be defrayed under a formula reimbursing the OASI trust fund by the Treasury general fund. As I will develop at a later point in my remarks the impact of such reimbursement from the general fund will be more than offset in the next several years by savings in the cost of public assistance expenditures.

No dependents' or survivors' benefits would be payable under this new category, and stricter provisions would be applicable to suspension of benefits than applies under present law to regular beneficiaries.

It is estimated approximately 2 million persons would be included in the blanketed-in category. Approximately 1.5 million of these people would be women including 1 million widows.

Generally speaking the group to be benefited under this suggested change in the social security law are workers who attained retirement age before the social security program reached its present status of virtual universal coverage or are widows whose husbands died prior to this expansion of coverage. The effect of present law with respect to these people is that retirement age or death of the wage earner occurred too soon for benefit eligibility.

Mr. Speaker, these deserving Americans should be given the opportunity to participate in the OASI program as a matter of right and they should not be penalized by the failure to extend timely coverage to their former occupational groups. It is estimated that 1.25 million persons included in this category are presently forced to rely on old-age assistance on a need basis for their livelihood. These people are in their present plight because Congress acted too late to broaden coverage of the Social Security System. Congress should act now to correct the neglect of these worthy people by giving them a benefit based on right instead of making poverty and need the criteria of eligibility.

My proposal represents a significant step in the direction of achieving equity and justice for these aged citizens. The people who will benefit under my bill are those who felt the full brunt of the inflation of the forties and early fifties which destroyed the purchasing power of their savings. That they were victimized by inflation is demonstrated by the fact that 1.25 million of them are now receiving public assistance. Furthermore, this proposal is totally consistent with the philosophy of achieving universal coverage under the system.

Mr. Speaker, when it is considered that no present beneficiary under the social security program has paid anything approaching the full actuarial value of his potential benefits, it is only fair that the discrimination against those not covered under the program be

removed. In demonstration of this point it should be noted that contributions from the Treasury general fund to the OASI trust fund under my bill will be relatively higher with respect to the persons blanketed in than the contributions paid by and with respect to persons now on the benefit rolls and those coming on the rolls in the near future.

For example, the current reimbursements of the OASI trust fund for persons in this special blanketed-in category would be 12 percent of the value of the benefit, which is relatively 150 percent as much as was contributed by the employer and the employee for a person who paid the maximum into the fund and is now receiving the maximum benefit. The special-category payment into the trust fund would be 10 times as much relatively as was paid into the fund with respect to the average present recipient of a minimum benefit. Thus the payment of contributions into the trust fund for these deserving people will be relatively greater, and the payment of benefits will be relatively less because eligibility for benefits is deferred until age 72.

The effect upon the OASI trust fund from blanketing-in will be minimal because the level-premium value of the Federal reimbursements will be 0.15 percent of payroll contrasted with the level-premium value of the benefits of 0.20 percent of payroll.

The cost to the Treasury General Fund for the first 10 years of blanketing-in will average \$100 million annually. This is expected to be totally offset by savings to the Federal Government with respect to present public assistance costs. In addition the long-range public assistance costs to the Federal and State Governments will be substantially lower than under present law.

Mr. Speaker, I have had an analysis made of the cost to the general fund of blanketing-in the present aged at 72 years and the savings that will result from the enactment of my bill. These figures are presented on an annual basis for the first 3 years and then cumulative data are presented covering a 10-year period. It is important to remember in evaluating the significance of these figures that the blanketing-in benefits will be available to the aged citizens affected as a matter of statutory right and not conditioned on proof of poverty and need as is the case with respect to public assistance. The analysis to which I have referred is set forth in the following table:

TABLE.—Cost of blanketing-in compared with Federal-State savings on public assistance  
(In millions)

	Cost to general fund	Public assistance savings		
		Federal	State	Total
1 year.....	\$600	\$265	\$185	\$450
2 years.....	35	260	180	440
3 years.....	37	255	175	430
10 years (cumulative).....	1,000	2,400	1,600	4,000

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has never hesitated in the past to make available

to the then retired individuals benefit increases that have been enacted from time to time. Meritorious as these increases may have been, they have had no relationship to prior tax contributions. Some individuals have become eligible for benefits and have received benefit increases based on a combined total employer-employee contribution of as little as \$6. Since the inception of the act, Congress has increased benefits on five different occasions.

At this time while the Committee on Ways and Means is considering benefit increases, it is only simple justice that these forgotten and neglected people who would be benefited under my bill should receive some measure of consideration. It is inconceivable to think of providing further benefits and increases in present benefits without considering the plight of the aged people who are presently denied any protection under the act.

In introducing this bill it is my intention to seek favorable consideration of the suggested change in connection with any social security legislation approved by the Committee on Ways and Means this year.

#### SECRETARY OF STATE CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago on this date one of our most distinguished former colleagues, who served in this Chamber from 1943 until 1953, then served his State of Massachusetts as its Governor from 1953 until 1957, was appointed Secretary of State by our great President.

The quiet dignity, unselfish devotion and dedication with which he has discharged the duties of his office have fully demonstrated the wisdom of the President's choice of Christian A. Herter as Secretary of State.

Faced with monumental problems of world crisis, fomented and complicated by ancient prejudices and hatreds, he has during this brief period earned the respect and admiration of all nations for his ability, honesty, and sense of fair play in dealing with the affairs of both nations and men.

The House will, I am sure, feel that it is both fitting and proper that it should express its heartiest congratulations to our Secretary of State on this occasion.

#### THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE MOHAWK ASSOCIATION OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS IN SCHENECTADY, N.Y., DISCUSSES THE PROPOSED BAN ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of the current discussion regarding a proposed ban on nuclear weapons testing, especially the hearings now being held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I am pleased to bring to the attention of Members of the House a very carefully reasoned analysis of the problem, because of their special technical competence in this field. It is, I believe, a fair and reasoned analysis and worth careful study.

The letter follows:

MOHAWK ASSOCIATION OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS,  
March 26, 1960.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to you on behalf of the executive committee of the Mohawk Association of Scientists and Engineers, an organization of scientists and engineers in Schenectady and Troy, N.Y.

We have been deeply interested in the progress of the negotiations between the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union for a treaty to ban the testing of nuclear weapons. In our opinion the successful conclusion of such a treaty with adequate inspection is of overriding urgency as an essential first step in seeking broader measures of arms control and in limiting the number of nations which obtain nuclear weapons. We gravely fear that as more and more nations acquire these weapons, the day draws nearer when some accident or act of irresponsibility will trigger a holocaust that will destroy us all.

We are impressed with the recent Russian proposal for a treaty banning all but small underground nuclear tests and for a temporary moratorium on the latter as a plan which the United States should accept in principle as a basis for further negotiation. This proposal leaves many important questions unanswered and may involve some risk of undetected violations of the moratorium on small tests. Nevertheless we feel these risks are preferable to the far graver risks of ultimate nuclear catastrophe if we have no treaty at all and nuclear weapons spread to many nations.

Our reasons for recommending favorable consideration of the Russian proposal are as follows:

1. If the United States agrees to the principle of a moratorium on small underground tests and achieves in return Russian acceptance of a permanent ban with inspection on those tests for which presently known inspection procedures are feasible, a very significant accomplishment will have been made. Of very great importance will be the penetration of the Iron Curtain by an international agency able to establish with high certainty that an agreement is observed. We believe that experience with the successful operation of an inspection system with the limited objective of policing nuclear tests will greatly facilitate the establishment of more far-reaching inspection arrangements needed to police other possible disarmament measures. Without such experience, agreement on other types of controlled disarmament seems unlikely.

2. Present capabilities of an inspection system seems adequate to prevent violations of a ban on large nuclear tests, and continued research promises to greatly improve our ability to inspect small tests. The Berkner Panel concluded that with known improvements in instrumentation and technique, the network of 180 stations originally

agreed upon at Geneva would be able to correctly identify roughly 90 percent of seismic events of 10 kilotons or more. It will undoubtedly take a year or two to get this inspection system into full operation once a treaty is ratified; vigorous research in seismology and instrumentation during a moratorium of similar duration will certainly permit reliable identification of events substantially below 10 kilotons by the end of that period. Indeed, at the present time use of additional stations, possibly including unmanned robot stations, could achieve this improvement. Muffling or decoupling nuclear explosions in caverns, while theoretically possible, does not appear to us to be a practical way to conceal significant nuclear testing. If nothing else, the tremendous mining operations involved would be difficult to hide.

3. We believe that there has been exaggeration from some quarters of the risks to the United States in possible undetected Russian testing of weapons below 20 kilotons, and also of the military advantages to us of renewed testing of weapons in this range. For the Russians to substantially alter the balance of military force by extensive development of small nuclear weapons would require many tests, and since there is a large probability that some tests of such a series would be detected, we doubt that the Russians would take this risk of discovery in view of the certain condemnation by world opinion which it would entail.

On the part of the United States, it seems probable that unrestricted testing of small weapons would lead to some improvement in their versatility and size but no change that would radically alter our military position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. Indeed, since the Russians are reportedly far behind us in the field of small nuclear weapons, it seems quite possible that with unrestricted testing they could make greater relative progress and thereby worsen our position.

4. If the United States rejects a moratorium on small nuclear tests and carries out a program of such tests in accordance with the desire of our military planners, many other nations will be unwilling to refrain from starting tests of their own. The probability of a nuclear catastrophe will increase as more and more nations acquire nuclear weapons.

In view of these factors, we believe that the risks of no agreement are far greater than the risks inherent in a temporary uninspected moratorium on small weapons tests.

Many details remain to be settled before a satisfactory agreement can be concluded. For example, the Soviet Union has not yet accepted a sufficient number of on-site inspections to insure that suspicious seismic events above the magnitude of a 20 kiloton explosion will stand a good probability of identification, nor has it satisfied us on other questions such as the staffing of the control posts. However, we believe that if the United States accepts the principle of the limited ban plus the temporary moratorium, negotiation on these other points can proceed with substantial hope of success. We strongly urge the U.S. Government to adopt this position.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANK S. HAM,  
President.

#### MEDICAL INSURANCE FOR OUR SENIOR CITIZENS SHOULD BE PROVIDED WITHOUT DELAY

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TELLER] may extend his

remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the prompt enactment of the Congress of the Forand bill which provides a system of medical insurance for our senior citizens, geared to our social security program. My bill H.R. 5216 is identical with the Forand bill, which I have long advocated, and I was one of the first to sign the pending discharge petition, in which the Congress is being asked to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from further consideration of the Forand bill, and to pass the bill without delay.

We are the only country in the world which lacks a system of medical insurance. Our isolation in this regard is wholly indefensible. The time has come when immediate action is necessary.

Those of us who have, for some years, been in favor of providing hospitalization and nursing home care for our senior citizens through our social security plan find some satisfaction in the fact that this problem is, at long last, beginning to receive the attention it deserves. I, for one, have been concerned, however, with the fact that the issue has too often been presented in the form of labels. It has been called a "hot political issue." It has been described as the "entering wedge for socialized medicine." We have been told that voluntary insurance can do the job, or that the doctors will take care of the situation by lowering their fees. But it has seldom been presented in terms of those facts of our time which require such legislation.

It is refreshing, therefore, to find that a hard-headed conservative publication such as *Business Week* has recently concluded:

One thing about the issue is clear: Although plenty of politicians may see it as a vote-catching device, there is nothing synthetic or phony about the problem. Everyone who has seriously studied the situation has concluded that the provision of better health care for the aged is a serious—and growing—problem.

The problem basically is that the aged are high-cost, high-risk, low-income customers. Their health needs can be met only by themselves when they are young or by other younger people who are still working. The only way to handle their health problem, therefore, is to spread the risks and costs widely. And that can best be done through the social security system to which employers and employees contribute regularly.

We do not pretend to know all the answers to the problem of enlarging the social security system to include a health insurance program for the aged.

Nevertheless no democratic government can refuse to grapple with a problem of such demonstrated urgency and importance.

Contrary to some impressions I have encountered, this important addition to our social security plan is not an idea conceived on the spur of the moment. I am proud of the fact that I introduced a bill, H.R. 5216, well over a year ago, on

March 3, 1959, which provides this kind of protection. Like the Forand bill, my proposal would provide for the cost of 60 days of hospital care, including surgical services, together with nursing home services up to 120 days, if required. Hospital services would include medical care generally furnished as an essential part of hospital care for bed patients. Such items as bed and board, nursing, laboratory, ambulance, operating room, staff, and such other services as are customarily furnished either through hospital staff or persons with whom the hospital has arrangements would be included.

The proposal represents the combined wisdom of many experts in the field of health care and social security. It was presented during the hearings conducted by the Ways and Means Committee on the 1958 amendments to the Social Security Act and aroused so much interest that the report of the committee stated:

Your committee is very much aware of the problems faced by the aged in paying for hospital services and nursing home services. . . . In the recent public hearings . . . There was considerable testimony to the effect that, under existing arrangements, insurance against the cost of needed hospital and nursing home services is out of reach of many older people.

Accordingly the committee asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct a study on the practicability and the costs of providing this kind of protection through various methods. This study was completed about a year ago and, although it contains no recommendations, it does contain much valuable information indicating the nature and extent of the problem. One important result, in my estimation, is the fact that the data assembled therein seems to have convinced the present administration that the problem cannot "be swept under the rug" but is one which requires some kind of answer. Their answer has not yet arrived although the press has reported a number of abortive attempts.

During the last session of the Congress, my proposal along with others were the subject of a full week of hearings before the Ways and Means Committee. Clearly, the time for study and deliberation has been ample, and the time for action has arrived.

We are, then, here concerned with a carefully worked out and carefully considered proposal using our time tested social security mechanism which, as I will try to show, recognizes that the essential problem grows out of the fact that "our senior citizens are high-cost, high-risk, low-income customers."

One of the most important features of this plan, in my estimation, is that it will enable most Americans during their working life to provide a paid-up health insurance protection which will take effect when their income is reduced by retirement.

Those who argue that voluntary insurance can do the job completely ignore the fact that the voluntary plans which attempt to provide the kind of

protection contained in my bill cost so much that they are prohibitive for most of our elderly people. The stark fact is that three out of five of the people 65 and over in our country today have less than \$1,000 a year in money income from all sources. The average social security benefit today is just \$73 per month. Subtract from this the \$15 to \$20 a month charges for reasonably adequate hospital and surgical insurance and it does not take much arithmetic to understand why only the most fortunate of our senior citizens can afford to buy such protection through voluntary means.

Rosy estimates which anticipate that 70 percent of our older people in 1970 will have some form of prepaid private health insurance necessarily avoid the elementary mathematics of this situation. A brief glance at some of the plans now being offered for older people suggests why this is so. For example, the plan now being offered by the American Association of Retired Persons costs a couple \$144 a year if partial insurance for doctors' visits outside the hospital are included. Other plans for the 65 plus pay only \$10 a day for hospital care which can be compared with typical hospital charges of \$20 a day. Wisconsin's State Blue Shield plans providing this kind of protection costs \$9 a month per person, or \$216 a year for a couple. Cleveland's Blue Cross plan, which is considered an outstanding one because it makes no extra charge for age and provides relatively generous benefits—120 days of hospital care—costs \$69.60 a year, or \$140 for a family for care in a hospital ward.

The elementary mathematics which create the present problem of voluntary plans are not going to change. A small premium—which is the only kind of premium which most people living in retirement can afford—is going to continue to buy very limited protection. And this limited protection will be in effect at a time when they are more susceptible to infirmities and the infirmities themselves are often of longer duration.

Statistics developed in the National Health Survey illustrate these points. As to the frequency of occurrence of particular health conditions and utilization of services they show the rate of 1,630 bed disability days per 100 persons per year including hospital days for people 65 and over as against well under half of this figure—or 697 bed disability days for people under age 65. The same study showed that, as to days in short-stay hospitals the rate per 100 persons per year for people 65 and over was 178, whereas it was only 76 for persons under 65. The report of the Department, "Hospitalization Insurance for OASDI Beneficiaries," already noted, comments on this point:

These figures corroborate the findings of earlier studies that the aged spend at least twice as many days per capita in general hospitals as the population as a whole, that acute conditions occur less frequently among the aged and chronic conditions more frequently than among younger persons.

Moreover, I believe the advantage of using the well-established social security plan as the mechanism for providing these services is one of the most important aspects of my bill. The money to finance the covered costs will be collected in the same way, and at the same time, as other social security taxes are paid, so no new administrative setup will be required for this phase of the program. The plan will be operated out of Social Security offices already established throughout the country to serve the entire population with regard to the other aspects of our social security plan. Care will be furnished on a national basis, thus overcoming the objection to some existing plans under which benefits accrue only within a particular State.

The fact that our social security plan is designed for practically all Americans who are dependent upon earnings, emphasizes another advantage which will be of growing importance. Increasingly, as the years pass, the beneficiary population of social security will be synonymous, for all practical purposes, with the total aged population. It is estimated that over three-fourths of the aged population will be eligible for benefits in 1970, and over 80 percent in 1980. This is, then, a plan from which all of us can benefit in the same way that we can now look forward to a social security benefit when the time comes for us to retire.

Moreover, the fact that the proposal applies to people now eligible for benefits not only means that they will be spared the haunting fear of a long and expensive illness which could wipe out savings or force upon them the ignominy of accepting public charity. For this haunting fear is also shared by their children who, with growing families of their own, are too often faced with the hard choice of whether they shall assist their ailing parents in the way they wish to do at the expense of their own children's further education.

Of one thing we can be reasonably sure—the cost of providing the kind of care envisioned in my bill is rising and will continue to rise. The medical care component of the Bureau of Labor Statistic's Consumer Price Index shows that the price of medical care began to climb in 1941 and has increased over the last decade nearly twice as much as the average for all goods and services. For example, in the 10-year period 1948 to 1958, food costs increased by 16 percent while medical care rose by a whopping 43 percent. In part this increase stands for the great improvements which have occurred in modern medicine which enable it to save lives. These are costs added by such modern miracles as the laboratory and radiographic procedures now available for diagnostic purposes; for such necessities as the oxygen tent, the blood bank, and the modern operating room. No one would argue, I am sure, that we should cut down on costs such as these.

But increasingly, I believe, we shall have to experiment with other means of caring for some of the ills of the aged—and that is the reason my bill contains

the provision for care in skilled nursing homes as an adjunct to hospital care. It is gratifying to see that, in a few communities, nursing homes have been made an integral part of a hospital, thus facilitating the interchange of patients and coordinating the services provided by both personnel and equipment.

I believe that we must look forward to the development of thousands of well-equipped nursing homes of this type throughout the country. Nursing home care has grown phenomenally in our land within a short span of years. But too often the kind of care provided therein is severely limited because they are not adequately financed—again a direct result of lowered-income in declining years. By providing adequately for the cost of good nursing home care for those of our older citizens who require limited medical attention, we will be encouraging, as well, the healthy development of these important accessory medical care institutions.

Finally, let us examine the charge that my proposal represents "nose-under-the-tent socialism"—a charge, by the way, which appeared when the Social Security Act was first passed back in 1935, and has reappeared with practically every major improvement made in the plan since that time. First of all, let us be clear about the fact that, under the bill, payments are limited to the type now used in nonprofit voluntary plans like Blue Cross. Because the medical profession is generally opposed to the idea of being "on the Government payroll" their charges are not included. The claims that the medical profession would be "socialized" if such legislation is adopted are, therefore, misleading at best.

Mr. Speaker, this is not "socialized medicine." In a recent and very perceptive editorial, the Washington Post commented on this point:

The one practical way to provide insurance against the health hazards of retirement years is to let people pay the premiums in the form of social security taxes while they are earning wages and are able to do so. This is precisely how they now provide retirement income for themselves under the social security program—and this kind of protection is made compulsory because the lack of it would have a disastrous social impact. Those who denounce this proposal as "socialistic" without proposing any workable alternative are foolishly doctrinaire.

They might just as sensibly oppose as socialistic the Nation's public schools, fire departments, and parks, because these represent communal efforts financed through taxation. One of the fundamental purposes for which the U.S. Government was established was to promote the general welfare.

The facts are before us. I am confident that this Congress will face up to them. This matter has been studied repeatedly, and the conclusion is always the same—something must be done. I urge the enactment of the Forand bill, or my bill H.R. 5216 which is identical to the Forand bill, this well-considered and necessary legislation on behalf of our older men and women and on behalf of all of us.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

Mr. HORAN, at the request of Mr. HALLECK, on account of illness.

Mr. JOHNSON of California, at the request of Mr. JACKSON, for period, April 20 to May 10, on account of official business.

Mr. ROONEY, at the request of Mr. CELLER, for balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. LIPSCOMB, at the request of Mr. HALLECK, for the remainder of this week, on account of illness in his family.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, at the request of Mr. CANFIELD, for today and balance of the week, on account of illness.

## SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. BAILEY, for 10 minutes, on Monday, April 25.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(At the request of Mr. MICHEL, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

(At the request of Mr. WOLF, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. ANFUSO.

Mr. McDOWELL.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLERSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 8601. An act to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 25, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2080. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report concerning agreements concluded during March 1960 under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of

1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.), as amended, pursuant to Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2081. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of General Services Administration contract DMP-131 with National Lead Co., New York, N.Y.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON  
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 113. A bill to prohibit the severance of a service-connected disability which has been in effect for 10 or more years, except when based on fraud; with amendment (Rept. No. 1529). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 276. A bill to amend section 3011 of title 38, United States Code, to establish a new effective date for payment of additional compensation for dependents; with amendment (Rept. No. 1530). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 641. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10 to provide that the widow of a peacetime veteran who married the veteran within 15 years after his last discharge or release from the service may be entitled to death compensation in case of the service-connected death of the veteran; with amendment (Rept. No. 1531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 7502. A bill to amend the basis for certifications with respect to basic pay for dependency and indemnity compensation award purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 7965. A bill to amend section 612 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize outpatient treatment incident to authorized hospital care for certain veterans; with amendment (Rept. No. 1533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 9786. A bill to amend sections 511 and 512 of title 38, United States Code, to permit Indian war and Spanish-American War veterans to elect to receive pension at the rates applicable to veterans of World War I; without amendment (Rept. No. 1534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 10596. A bill to change the method of payment of Federal aid to State or territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1535). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 8098. A bill to specify certain creditable service for pension purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 9785. A bill to provide for equitable adjustment of the insurance status of certain members of the

Armed Forces; with amendment (Rept. No. 1537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 9788. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the furnishing of benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to any child on account of the death of more than one parent in the same parental line; without amendment (Rept. No. 1538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 9792. A bill to amend section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of managers of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliarys, and centers; with amendment (Rept. No. 1539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 10108. A bill to authorize reimbursement of certain Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants for ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls; without amendment (Rept. No. 1540). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 10898. A bill to amend section 315 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional compensation for seriously disabled veterans having four or more children; without amendment (Rept. No. 1541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 10703. A bill to grant a waiver of national service life insurance premiums to certain veterans who became totally disabled in line of duty between the date of application and the effective date of their insurance; without amendment (Rept. No. 1542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 11045. A bill to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8226. A bill to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida; with amendment (Rept. No. 1544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 506. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 11318, a bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; without amendment (Rept. No. 1545). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 10495. A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1546). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 7947. A bill relating to the income tax

treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association (Rept. No. 1547). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 8684. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for deferral of taxation of amounts withheld by a bank or finance company from a dealer in personal property to secure obligations of the dealer, until such time as such amounts are paid to or made available to the dealer (Rept. No. 1548). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 9660. A bill to amend section 6659(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax (Rept. No. 1549). Ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 11856. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide minimum benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program for certain individuals at age 72; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 11857. A bill to provide that section 352(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the loss of nationality by a naturalized national of the United States through residence in a foreign state, shall not apply with respect to certain veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H.R. 11858. A bill to extend the veterans' home loan program to February 1, 1965; to provide for direct loans to veterans in areas where housing credit is otherwise not generally available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 11859. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that packages of fruits and vegetables be labeled to show the State where such fruits and vegetables were grown; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11860. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to expand research, extend State and interstate water pollution control program grants, and strengthen enforcement procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 11861. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 30 percent increase in benefits thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 11862. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to terminate the tax on long-distance telephone service simultaneously with the termination (presently provided for) of the tax on local telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 11863. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish space and facilities, if available, to State veteran agencies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 11864. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that small-business concerns displaced from an urban renewal area by an urban renewal project

shall be eligible for loans to assist them in their relocation, under the same terms and conditions as those applicable to loans under section 7(b) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 11865. A bill to provide additional lands at, and change the name of, the Fort Necessity National Battlefield Site, Pa., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 11866. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as to deductibility of lawful expenditures for legislative purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.R. 11867. A bill to supplement the national policy against unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce by requiring full disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 11868. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 11869. A bill to reduce the cost to the U.S. Treasury of farm price and income stabilization programs, to provide means by which producers may balance supply with demand at a fair price, to reduce the volume and costs of maintaining Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, to provide for distribution to needy people and public institutions of additional needed high protein foods, to preserve and improve the status of the family farm through greater bargaining power, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 11870. A bill to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 11871. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act, as amended, to enlarge the site within which the National Cultural Center may be built; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 11872. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the founding of Vassar College; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 11873. A bill to provide for the construction of a shellfisheries research center at Milford, Conn.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 11874. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 11875. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 11876. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Fort Bowie National Historic

Site in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 11877. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to control of the erection, establishment, or continued existence of antennas used for the purpose of receiving radio signals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 11878. A bill for the relief of Horace Ambrose Didot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 11879. A bill for the relief of Pietro DiGregorio Bruno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 11880. A bill for the relief of Anna Catania Puglisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 11881. A bill for the relief of Rosario Saporito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 11882. A bill to clarify the ownership of certain church properties located in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H.R. 11883. A bill for the relief of Arthur Bibo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. Res. 507. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Estelle A. Waller; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

430. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of 198 residents of Charles City, Iowa, and vicinity in support of H.R. 4488, a bill to raise the Federal minimum wage and to extend minimum wage coverage to include retail and service employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

431. By Mr. STRATTON: Petition of the common council for the city of Gloversville and the common council for the city of Johnstown protesting the recent decision of the U.S. Tariff Commission denying relief to the domestic glove industry from foreign imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

432. Also, petition of the board of supervisors of Fulton County, N.Y., protesting the decision of the U.S. Tariff Commission denying relief to the domestic glove industry from foreign imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

433. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Robert H. Smaltz, New York, N.Y., relative to a redress of grievance relating to and requesting the curbing of Moscow sympathizers, and to stop their propaganda outlets and freedom to poison our youth's minds, and to stop all attempts to curb our military preparedness program and our nuclear tests, which is a direct threat to the peace and security of our people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

434. Also, petition of Clifford Crall, Cincinnati, Ohio, relative to a redress of grievance, and including a copy of the title page of his book entitled "Error of Destiny"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.