beginning June 15 to test civil defense operational procedures.

If a rapid mass evacuation of only 50,000 people in the Naugatuck Valley was undertaken, a terrible traffic jam would result. But a "dry run" of this nature would certainly highlight the essential need of defense highways in the valley.

I will support the proposed Federal superhighway program if all Federal automotive and motor-fuel taxes collected in Connecticut are earmarked for highway use in the State. Comptroller General Campbell's questioning the legality of earmarking these funds to retire the highway bonds calls for a reevaluation of the whole program.

Joe Campbell has the statutory authority to spike the very heart of the program, therefore my bill will release the Federal Government from the burden of collecting a gas tax it probably cannot use for highway building and allow the States to reimpose the tax where it can be legally earmarked to build drastically needed public highways.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 1, 1955

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 10, 1955)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, at this ancient altar of the unseen and eternal, we bow with thanksgiving that the faith of the Pilgrims who came to these shores is living still in this dear land for which they dared and died. In this agony of the world's black night make our spirits as candles of the Lord and make our America the beacon of freedom for the whole world.

In this age on ages telling, we hear Thy call to be partners with Thee in making a new heaven and a new earth. Forgetting the old, unhappy things that are behind, with all their cruelties and contentions, help us in this new day to count as colleagues all who will now add their might to the gathering armies of the free who challenge the tyrants who enslave and degrade humanity, whenever and wherever their evil system has its way. With deep repentance for our own sins, bring us at last to a united victory which shall make all men free. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 30, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On March 28, 1955:

S. 913. An act to eliminate the need for renewal of oaths of office upon change of status of employees of the Senate or House of Representatives.

On March 31, 1955:

S. 632. An act for the relief of Jan R. Cwiklinski; and

S. 691. An act to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 877 at Baytown, Tex., and certain tank cars.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Under the authority of the order of Wednesday, March 30, 1955,

The Secretary of the Senate received the following message from the House of Representatives:

The House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4720) to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances.

That the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 85) authorizing the printing as a House document the pamphlet Our American Government, What Is It? How Does It Function?

That the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4436. An act relating to the use of storage space in the Clark Hill Reservoir for the purpose of providing the city of McCormick, S. C., a regulated water supply; and

H. R. 5240. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 4720. An act to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances;

H. R. 4941. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4951. An act directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955–56 marketing year, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5240) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 30, 1955,

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, on March 31, 1955, reported favorably, without amendment, Executive L, 83d Congress, 2d session, the protocol on the termination of the occupation regime in the Federal Republic of Germany, and Executive M, 83d Congress, 2d session, the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of the Federal Republic of Germany, both signed at Paris on October 23, 1954, and submitted a report (Executive Report No. 6) thereon.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS AND EXECUTIVE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches; and that at the conclusion of the morning hour the Senate go into executive session for the purpose of considering Executive Calendar Nos. 7 and 8, Executive L and Executive M, the protocols entered into during the 83d Congress, 2d session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At the request of the Vice President, the Chair announces his appointment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], as a member of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, under authority of Public Law 108, 83d Congress, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Hon. Homer Ferguson.

COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At the request of the Vice President, the Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], as members of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, to fill existing vacancies thereon.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 29)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1955, in the amount of $1,370,000, for the Department of Commerce (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. DOC. NO. 30)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations, for the Department of Agriculture, in the amount of $1,870,000, for the fiscal year 1956, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the quarter ended December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON MAINTENANCE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED RUBBER PRODUCING FACILITIES

A letter from the Deputy Executive Director, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Federal Facilities Corporation, the operating agency, with respect to expenditures for maintenance of the Government-owned rubber producing facilities, for the 8-month period ended February 28, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON VOLUNTARY HOME MORTGAGE CREDIT PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, and Chairman of the National Voluntary Mortgage Credit Extension Committee, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first annual report of the Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit Program, from the period of its inception on August 2, 1954, to March 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPEAL OF FEE-STAMP REQUIREMENT IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the fee-stamp requirement in the Foreign Service and amend section 1728 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a Report of Progress on General Accounting Office Recommendations To Improve the Financial Management of the Post Office Department, for the period April 25, 1953, through February 28, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT, OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK, WASH.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession permit within Olympic National Park, Wash. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INVOLUNTARY RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF COAST GUARD

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," for the purpose of providing involuntary retirement of certain officers, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMY AND AIR FORCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

A letter from the president and national executive director, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, New York, N. Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Girl Scouts, for the year ended September 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC POSITIONS, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 1, 1947 (ch. 433, 61 Stat. 715), as amended, to increase the number of professional and scientific positions authorized for the Department of Defense (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Whereas the New York State Barge Canal system was completed and made available for navigation in 1918; and

"Whereas the said facility provided water depth of 12 feet on the sills in its lock chambers; and

"Whereas on August 30, 1935, the Congress of the United States authorized the expenditure of $27 million for the improvement of certain navigational facilities in that portion of the said canal system identified as the Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway connecting Lake Ontario with the Hudson River; and

"Whereas on March 2, 1945, the Congress of the United States authorized the expenditure of $1,500,000 to lower the sills 1 foot in the lock chambers in the said waterway to provide a water depth of 13 feet instead of 12 feet; and

"Whereas the above combined authorizations aggregated a sum of $28,500,000 of which $22,776,496.19 was appropriated and expended as of June 1953, and no further appropriations or expenditures therefrom have since been made; and

"Whereas the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945, authorized the deepening of the locks subject to the condition that an agreement be entered into between the United States and the State of New York embodying certain limitations and provisions to safeguard the interests of general commerce and navigation, insure Federal control of the disposition of Federal funds, and provide for Federal supervision of the work performed and a supplemental agreement dated June 5, 1947, containing all provisions necessary for efficient prosecution of the improvement, was entered into by the Chief of Engineers and the department of public works, State of New York; and

"Whereas the sills of only 6 locks have been lowered and the sills on 26 locks are yet to be lowered to provide a controlling depth of 13 feet in lock chambers throughout the said waterway; and

"Whereas interested parties have submitted numerous petitions to the Congress of the United States requesting the appropriation of sufficient funds to complete this particular work, without avail; and

"Whereas the estimated cost to complete the said work is $1,500,000; and

"Whereas the lowering of the said lock sills will be of public benefit and economy by reason of the fact that modern cargo vessels now transporting shorter than capacity loads on the said waterway will carry additional tonnage in full loads to the extent of between 500,000 and 600,000 tons per canal season at the present cost of operation; and

"Whereas the total increased tonnage that would be carried by cargo units resultant from one additional foot of vessel draft is in the interest of national defense in that a considerable portion of commodities transported, particularly petroleum products, would serve war material and defense plants located within the State of New York and also those plants located at or adjacent to ports of call on the American and Canadian shores of the Great Lakes; and

"Whereas the said waterway, being an inland transportation route, would be of protective value in time of war to avoid the menace of submarine and other enemy operations affecting Atlantic coastwise traffic moving between the port of New York and the Great Lakes; and

"Whereas the completion of the improvement of said waterway would lessen unemployment and economic depression in various areas and industries in the State of New York: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved* (*if the assembly concur*), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully memorialized to appropriate the funds required from Federal funds heretofore authorized, to lower the said lock sills in the Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway to provide a controlling water depth of 13 feet in lock chambers, as authorized by the Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved* (*if the assembly concur*), That such Federal appropriation be made available at the earliest possible moment in order that the State of New York may proceed with and complete the work without further delay; and be it further

"*Resolved* (*if the assembly concur*), That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each United States Senator and Member of the House of Representatives elected from the State of New York."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 16

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress, the Department of Defense, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of the Navy, not to withdraw land in Saline Valley in Inyo County from the public domain for use as an aerial gunnery range

"Whereas an aerial gunnery range for use by Marine Corps pilots at the Navy Air Base at Mojave, Calif., is planned to be established on 879,360 acres of land in and near the Saline Valley in Inyo County, Calif.; and

"Whereas within the proposed area there are currently being developed rich deposits

of many strategic minerals vital to our national defense, which will be lost to the Nation if this area becomes a gunnery range, such as uranium, asbestos, lead, zinc, tungsten, manganese, and talc, including steatite talc which is used in the manufacture of high-frequency insulators for electronic equipment and of which this area is a major source; and

"Whereas equally rich deposits of minerals vital to our defense which are not in the area of the proposed gunnery range will also be lost to the Nation because the only access roads to these areas traverse the proposed gunnery range; and

"Whereas the establishment of this gunnery range will make nugatory the recent expenditure of $150,000 for the United States Geological Survey made of a portion of the Saline Valley which found the area to be a potential storehouse of strategic and critical materials; and

"Whereas the acquisition of 879,360 acres for such a gunnery range will most seriously affect the county of Inyo which already has 96 percent of the area in the county not subject to county taxation by taking still more lands off the tax rolls, by closing highways on which Inyo County has expended considerable public money for the purpose of opening the Saline Valley to the mining industry, and by seriously increasing unemployment due to the closing of the mines in the Saline Valley area; and

"Whereas there seems to be no reason why the large unused Air Force gunnery range near Tonopah, Nev., could not be used by the Marine Corps instead of taking over such a vital area as the Saline Valley: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California strongly disapproves of further withdrawals of lands from the public domain unless such action is absolutely necessary for valid Federal purposes; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States, the Department of Defense, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of the Navy be respectively memorialized not to give authorization for withdrawal of the proposed land in Saline Valley in Inyo County from the public domain for acquisition and use thereof for an aerial gunnery range; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Navy and the commander, Naval Air Base, 11th and 12th Naval Districts."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 13

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and the congressional delegation from the State of Nevada to forbear any action leading to the termination of the Federal trusteeship over American Indian wards and properties held in trust for American Indians

"Whereas the American Indians have not, as an ethnic group, attained even minimum standards of self-sufficiency in the United States; and

"Whereas any congressional action leading to the termination of Federal trusteeships over American Indian wards, or of properties held in trust for American Indians, would result in a severe deprivation of the small number of rights and privileges now enjoyed by American Indians in the State of Nevada and would lead to an intolerable, added burden to local and State government in Nevada in attempting to provide the necessities of life to American Indians in Nevada; and

"Whereas it would be extremely beneficial to the American Indians in the State of Nevada and to other citizens of the State of Nevada that the Bureau of Indian Affairs continue its commendable work in providing aid to American Indians in the States of Nevada: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to forbear any action leading to the termination of the Federal trusteeship over American Indian wards and over properties held in trust for American Indians in the State of Nevada; and be it further

"Resolved, That the congressional delegation from the State of Nevada be, and it hereby is, memoralized to take such positive action as it may deem proper and necessary for the carrying out of the intents and purposes of this resolution; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Nevada be authorized and directed to transmit properly certified copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate and to our United States Senators and the Congressman from the State of Nevada."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 37

"Joint resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to facilitate national centennial celebrations in commemoration of the 1857 act of Congress allowing the creation of the Pacific Overland Mail route; urging local agencies and groups to cooperate therein; commending the American Association for State and Local History; and other matters properly relating thereto

"Whereas by act of Congress of the United States, dated March 3, 1857, the Postmaster General of the United States was, for the first time, authorized to contract for the conveyance overland from the Mississippi River to San Francisco, Calif., of all letter mails; and

"Whereas prior to the passage of this act, letter mail was carried to the Pacific coast by the long, slow, and arduous ocean route fraught with danger from storm and sea and totally dependent upon the vagaries of the wind and weather; and

"Whereas the opening of this Overland Mail Service route was the culminating event of a series of events of prime importance, not only to the development of the West and the State of Nevada, but also to the development of the entire United States, and it enabled the word to be spread of the richness of this region and hailed the outstanding discovery of the Comstock Lode in Nevada during the year 1859; and

"Whereas centennial celebrations of these events should be fittingly observed throughout the length and breadth of this Nation in order to memorialize this historical event and to show the developments from the 'four-horse coaches, or spring wagons suitable for the conveyance of passengers, as well as the safety and security of the mails,' as specified in the original 1857 act, to 1957; and

"Whereas the modern development of mail transportation and our systems of communication have greatly aided the binding together of the East and the West into one great Nation; and

"Whereas the American Association for State and Local History has undertaken the national sponsorship of centennials and has established regional committees to plan centennial celebrations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of Nevada respectfully memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to insure the cooperation of the Federal Government in the celebration of the centennials commemorating the opening of the Pacific Overland Mail; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Nevada respectfully urges that all State and local governmental units, public schools, civic, patriotic, and historical societies, and all agencies of communication in this State participate wholeheartedly in the observance of the celebration of the various centennials along the route of the Pacific Overland Mail by cooperation with the committees now organizing the Pacific Overland Mail Centennials in 1957–58 in commemoration of the accomplishment, efforts, and achievements of those sturdy pioneers who engineered the beginnings of the overland communication; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Nevada does hereby congratulate and pledge its support to the American Association for State and Local History for its action in undertaking on a national scale the sponsorship for the centennial observances of the opening of the Pacific Overland Mail; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Nevada be, and hereby is, directed to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the Governor of this State, the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President pro tempore of the Senate, the Nevada Historical Society, and the board of directors of the Nevada State Museum, to the Senators and Representative of this State in the Congress of the United States and to the governing head of the American Association for State and Local History."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; ordered to lie on the table:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 14

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to increase compensation of postal employees commensurate with existing costs of living

"Whereas employees of the United States Post Office Department have received but one wage increase since 1949, which increase failed to compensate them for the great increase in the cost of living that has occurred since 1949; and

"Whereas most other public and private employees have received wage increases which more nearly enable them to meet the increased living costs; and

"Whereas any increase in the cost of living particularly affects postal employees because of their relatively low wages;

"Whereas postal employees should receive an increase in wages not only because such an increase would be equitable but also because the efficiency of the postal system would be enhanced thereby: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to enact legislation for an increase in the compensation of postal employees commensurate with existing costs of living.

"SEC. 2. That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Postmaster General, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Oklahoma in in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate the 15th day of March 1955.

"CLEM MCSPADDEN,
"Acting President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 23d day of March 1955.

"B. E. HARKEY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 28

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to repeal the Federal taxes on the transportation of persons and property as each affects interisland transportation in Hawaii and transportation between Hawaii and the mainland United States

"Whereas air and sea transportation are necessary to the Territory of Hawaii because of its peculiar geographical composition and location; and

"Whereas the United States now levies a tax of 10 percent of the amount paid for the transportation of persons, and a similar tax of 3 percent on the amount paid for the transportation of property between the Territory and the continental United States and between the several islands of the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas, due to the said unusual geographic composition and location of the Territory, virtually all shipments of food and other goods, as well as transportation of persons by air and sea, must be on commercial facilities and are therefore subject to the payment of these taxes, a condition not true on the mainland with regard to either intrastate or interstate transportation; and

"Whereas in addition thereto the tourist trade is the third ranking and most rapidly increasing industry of Hawaii and therefore constitutes an important element of the economy of the Territory; and

"Whereas these taxes relegate Hawaii to a very unfavorable position in its competition for tourist business with Europe, South America, the Caribbean area and other resort places inasmuch as transportation to and from these other resort places are not subject to these taxes; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 28th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully requested to repeal the Federal tax on the transportation of persons and the tax on the transportation of property as each applies to air and sea transportation within the Territory of Hawaii and as each applies to air and sea transportation between the mainland United States and the Territory of Hawaii; be it further

"Resolved, That the President of the United States, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Civil Aeronautics Administration are requested to adopt and maintain such policies best designed to foster, encourage, and develop air and sea transportation to and within the Territory of Hawaii which will permit the people of these islands to enjoy the benefits of modern aircraft and ocean shipping and all related, recent, technological developments in the aircraft and shipping industries, all in the public interest of the people of this Territory; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Attorney General of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce, the Postmaster General, the Federal Maritime Board, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, in Washington, D. C."

Two resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Memorial 16

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable James Murray, Chairman of Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the United States Senate; the Honorable Clair Engle, chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives; the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska; and to the United States Congress:

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Alaska, in 22d session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas the original intent of the Congress of the United States in the matter of the Eklutna project was to furnish low-cost power to the people of the rail-belt area of Alaska, to stabilize electric power of the area, and to strengthen the military defense of the area; and

"Whereas the present high cost of power being supplied by the Eklutna project in no way carries out the original intent of Congress in the matter of the Eklutna project.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist respectfully requests that the Congress of the United States take appropriate action to provide for the sale of the Eklutna project to the people of Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house March 19, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

"House Memorial 15

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America; the United States Senate; the United States House of Representatives; the Secretary of the Interior; the Director, Bureau of the Budget; and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas upon survey of unappropriated public land in the Territory of Alaska sections numbered 16 and 36 of each township and section 33 in the townships of Tanana Valley have been reserved to the Territory for the support of the public-school system by the act of Congress of March 4, 1915 (48 U. S. C. 353); and

"Whereas less than 1 percent of the Territory's entitlement to such sections has been reserved to the Territory by reason of lack of Federal surveys; and

"Whereas the Territory is authorized to lease said lands for periods not in excess of 10 years' duration at any one time; and

"Whereas some of the reserved school sections are close to or within the corporate boundaries of cities and industrialized areas and there is a growing demand for long-term leases from the Territory in order that the lessee will be justified in constructing substantial and permanent improvements and be assured of the opportunity of amortizing the cost of improvements during the term lease period; and

"Whereas it will be possible to make a higher use of the land under a long-term lease than one of only 10 years duration and such higher use will return increased rentals to the Territory; and

"Whereas for the past several sessions of Congress, bills have been introduced to authorize the Territory to enter into leases for school land for longer terms than 10 years, and in no case have such bills been favorably acted upon, and the Territory is seriously handicapped in further waiting for favorable action.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in the 22d session assembled, respectfully urges that the act of March 4, 1915 (48 U. S. C. 353) be amended as provided for in H. R. 1570, 83d Congress, 2d session, to give the Territory authority for leasing said lands as it may deem proper for a maximum of 55 years at any one time.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house March 18, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 8

"Joint memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and make an appropriation for the construction of Buttes Dam

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"In the year 1895 the first recommendation to commence the building of the Buttes Dam project was made by the United States Geological Survey. Since that date and continuing to the present, the need for passage of the Buttes Dam project looms as one of the most important and necessary developments for the benefit of the San Carlos project farmers in Pinal County, State of Arizona. Passage of the Buttes Dam project would be beneficial for the economy of the State of Arizona and the United States.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States enact legislation authorizing construction of the Buttes Dam project in Pinal County, State of Arizona, and that the Congress of the United States make the necessary appropriation therefore."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Memorial 6

"Memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing that the State of Arizona and the United States share equally any income inuring to the United States Government from federally owned lands in the State of Arizona

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"That the United States Government owns approximately 75 percent of the land situated within the State of Arizona. Moreover, this land within Arizona, owned by the United States Government, is believed to contain oil, gases, hydrocarbon substances, uranium, thorium, and other minerals.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

"That the Congress of the United States enact legislation providing that any income from oil, gases, hydrocarbon substances, uranium, thorium, and other minerals of any kind derived from land owned by the United States Government within the State of Arizona shall be divided equally between the United States Government and the State of Arizona."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself and Mr. NEELY):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

"House Concurrent Resolution 19

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a national monument on Blennerhassett Island

"Whereas Blennerhassett Island in the Ohio River near Parkersburg, W. Va., is a place of historic interest in that it played an important part in the life and intrigues of Aaron Burr, former Vice President of the United States, and is a place of scenic beauty; and

"Whereas the island is now in private hands with little or nothing being done to preserve it as a permanent place of historic interest for future generations of Americans, but is in danger of losing its identity as a historic site: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of delegates (the senate concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to give favorable consideration to the passage of legislation that would establish Blennerhassett Island as a national monument, and which would include the reconstruction of the Blennerhassett Mansion and build an adequate approach to the island by bridge or ferry; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to forward attested copies of this concurrent resolution to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representative, and to each Member of the West Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States."

EXPANDED POSTAL FACILITIES FOR CITY OF MOORHEAD, MINN.—RESOLUTION OF MOORHEAD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the chamber of commerce of the city of Moorhead, Minn., relating to the expansion of postal facilities for that city.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Moorhead, Minn., is a city of approximately 20,000 people, the largest and most rapidly growing city in northwestern Minnesota, and the Ninth Congressional District; and

Whereas a study was made by the Post Office Department in 1938, and it was at that time determined that Moorhead was then definitely in need of additional postal facilities with a population of less than 9,000 people; and

Whereas the employees and personnel of the Moorhead Post Office Department are being continually subjected to an ever-increasing burden of work thrust upon them and this work being made more difficult through the lack of proper facilities and space; and

Whereas the city of Moorhead in order to continue to grow in either residential or commercial proportions must receive immediate relief and assistance through the expansion of the postal facilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Moorhead Chamber of Commerce petition the Post Office Department to resurvey the facilities and needs of the businesses and people of Moorhead and that a recommendation be made to the Congress of the United States requesting the appropriation of the funds necessary to correct this very serious condition and to enable the city and the people of Moorhead to continue to grow and prosper; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our Representatives in Congress and our Senators from the State of Minnesota and to any other individuals or offices of the Government to whom attention should be directed to this acute situation.

GORDON S. MANTERNACH,
President, Moorhead Chamber of Commerce, Moorhead, Minn.

FUNDS FOR BUREAU OF HOME ECONOMICS—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the very important jobs which has been performed by the Bureau of Home Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture has been in connection with food, nutrition, household equipment, clothing, and similar research.

I may say that for the expenditure of comparatively small sums this research has paid handsome dividends to millions of Americans throughout our land in enabling them to make better use of the family's budget dollar.

I was sorry to note, therefore, the prospective slashing of funds for research in clothing, textiles, housing, home equipment, family economics, and home management.

I, for one, certainly want to see adequate research in food and nutrition as such; but, at the same time, I do not want to see other essential research sacrificed.

I present a letter and enclosed resolution from Mrs. Grace B. Barrett, secretary of the Wisconsin Home Economics Association, protesting against the proposed fund slash in the areas which I have mentioned. I ask unanimous consent that these messages be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred, so that remedial action may be taken in time.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN HOME ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION,
March 28, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Attached is a copy of the resolution which was passed by the Wisconsin Home Economics Association at their meeting held in Madison on March 26, 1955. Signatures are those of the council members, the governing body of the association, which has a membership of almost 600.

As you will notice we are very concerned about the directive that Dr. Byron T. Shaw issued February 25 in which he reduced, and in some cases eliminated, funds for research in areas of home economics other than food and nutrition. We feel that it is of utmost importance that we have good basic research in all areas of home economics, since we have a responsibility to the homemakers of our State in assisting them with their family living problems, and more than two-thirds of the personal consumer expenditures go for items other than food.

Here in Wisconsin we have no facilities for doing any equipment research. Families need unbiased information which will help them make wise use of their funds in order to get the greatest satisfaction from their dollars spent for family living. We, therefore, urge you to consult with Dr. Shaw, Secretary Benson, and Assistant Secretary Peterson regarding the reinstatement of the present program. We would also urge you to consider increasing funds for home economics research so that we not only will be strengthening foods and nutrition, but other areas, particularly those where no research is being conducted.

Very sincerely yours,
Mrs. GRACE B. BARRETT,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE WISCONSIN HOME ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION, MADISON, WIS., MARCH 26, 1955

SECTION I

On February 25, 1955, Dr. Byron T. Shaw, Administrator, Agricultural Research Services, issued an administrative order which changes drastically the emphasis on research in the home-economics field on the Federal level.

Practical application of this directive will result in allocation of 87 percent of available funds to the area of food and nutrition research. Only 13 percent will remain available for research in clothing and textiles, housing, household equipment, family economics, and home management.

By July 1, 1956, under the terms of this directive, research will be discontinued in household equipment; selection, design, construction, and maintenance of clothing and household textiles; clothing economics and farm family living studies.

Also discontinued are the popular and semipopular bulletins in all areas of home economics.

SECTION II

While increased emphasis on research on food and nutrition is a commendable goal, it must be recognized that this is now the strongest area in home-economics research, both on the Federal and State level. It would be most unfortunate if this area is further strengthened at the expense of the many other valuable activities which have contributed so much to the guidance of the American housewife and the improvement of family living in the United States.

Research in these areas, much of it basic to our home-economics teaching at the high school, college, and adult levels, has been carried on since 1923. It would be most deplorable if research were discontinued by arbitrary action, especially since the family centered approach is being emphasized to such a great extent in our teaching.

SECTION III

The substantial portion of the family budget that is spent for clothing, fabrics, housing, and household equipment fully justifies the research in these areas. In fact, rapid development and changes in these areas demand more, not less research.

SECTION IV

In light of these facts, we respectfully urge the Administrator to rescind his order of February 25, 1955, and authorize continuation of the current program of home-economics research, pending an objective appraisal by qualified persons in close contact with the homemakers of the Nation, preferably a committee appointed by the American Home Economics Association.

SECTION V

We urge the Administrator of Agricultural Research Service, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Members of Congress, to give consideration to proper and justifiable appropriations for research in home economics which will allow expansion of research in food and human nutrition, and at the same time permit further development of research, and the diffusion of fruits of such research, in all areas of family living which, in the rapidly changing patterns of American life, demand more information and assistance.

Respectfully submitted.

Wisconsin Home Economics Association: Grace H. Robertson, Grace B. Barrett, Ethelyn C. Robinson, Anita Gundlach, Margaret P. McCordic, Myrtle H. Webb, Janet C. Wiren, Christine Nickel, Lucille W. Cormican, Elfriede F. Brown, Ada B. Lothe, Sister M. Claudine, O. S. F., May S. Reynolds, Jane Comings, Gertrude Berg, Ellen F. Nelson, Lillian Jeter, Louise A. Young.

RESTORATION OF FUNDS FOR UNITED NATIONS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM—LETTER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from Rev. R. B. Gutmann, executive director of Neighborhood House in Milwaukee, an important message on the significance of restoring the appropriations requested by the administration for the United Nations technical assistance program. I heartily endorse the views which have been expressed by the Reverend Gutmann.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE,
Milwaukee, Wis., March 25, 1955.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It is my understanding that the Senate Appropriations Committee is considering at this time the American appropriation for the technical assistance program of the U. N. I am sure that you feel strongly the need for adequate support of technical assistance. We are all united in the resolve to prevent the spread of communism, both at home and abroad. We also know that those countries which are economically and socially backward are most susceptible to the Marxist germ.

While the technical assistance program of the U. N. is not our only means of helping these backward countries in their development and thus lay the groundwork for a peaceful and just world, we will certainly want to do all we can to make the program a success. This is our privilege as the leading country of the free world and our duty as a minimum contribution to peace.

I am greatly disturbed by the fact that the House of Representatives has cut the appropriation asked for by 50 percent. May I, as one of your constituents, urge upon you the restoration of the full appropriation asked for by the administration? The fight against communism surely transcends party lines and party considerations. Please use your influence and your vote in this cause.

Sincerely yours,

R. B. GUTMANN,
Executive Director.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, typical of the strong sentiment for a change in Government policy on the matter of Panama Canal tolls, are the attached resolutions passed recently by the Western Traffic Conference, Inc., the Traffic Managers Conference of Southern California, and the Board of Supervisors of Alameda County, Calif.

I present the resolutions, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN TRAFFIC CONFERENCE, INC.,
San Gabriel, Calif., March 16, 1955.

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The board of directors of the Western Traffic Conference, Inc. (an organization representing over 1,200 retail stores located on the Pacific coast), at their meeting held in San Francisco, Calif., on March 4 and 5, 1955, discussed the subject of Panama Canal Tolls, which affect the shippers as well as the shipping interests, resulting in the approval of the following resolution, and ask that you support same.

"Whereas it is the specific policy of Western Traffic Conference, Inc., to recognize and promote the necessity for continued development of maritime commerce to and from the Pacific coast; and

"Whereas tolls on commercial cargoes transiting the Panama Canal are a very important factor in the development of this commerce; and

"Whereas present tolls are carrying more than their fair share of the cost of operating the Panama Canal: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Western Traffic Conference, Inc., does hereby go on record urging the administration and the Congress of the United States to recognize, through proper legislation, the national defense value of the Canal, the need for altering present financial and fiscal policies at the Canal and the fairness in limiting the annuity payment chargeable to tolls to its present level; be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be communicated to the congressional delegation from California, Oregon, and Washington, to all members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee urging immediate action for corrective legislation on this subject."

Respectfully yours,

FRED W. ASHTON,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION OF TRAFFIC MANAGERS' CONFERENCE OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

This conference has unanimously adopted the following resolution at their general meeting, February 24, 1955:

"Whereas the Traffic Managers' Conference of Southern California recognizes the vital contribution to our national economy and defense made by Intercoastal Water Carriers using the Panama Canal; and

"Whereas commercial cargoes transiting the Panama Canal are now carrying an unfair portion of the cost of operating the Panama Canal through the payment of tolls: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this conference supports corrective legislation designed to recognize the national defense value of the Panama Canal, so that commercial cargoes will not be required to pay more than their fair share of tolls for the commercial use of the Canal; further be it

"*Resolved*, That fiscal and financial policies of the Canal be corrected to prevent the placing of an inequitable tolls burden on commercial shipping and that increases in the annuity payments to the Republic of Panama be paid for by the United States Government and not by commercial tolls; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to each and every Member of the congressional delegation of California, the members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the President of the United States, urging them to take the necessary action to insure the passage of corrective legislation."

We respectfully recommend and urge that the Congress of the United States arrange to undertake a study, as a whole, or through a commission representing all interests to enact certain laws for adjustment of the amount of capital investment, for which tolls should earn interest and depreciation, along with the manner in which the United States Government would pay a reasonable share of the costs for operating and maintaining the Panama Canal.

F. Z. WAKEFIELD,
President.

Resolution 15289

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to recognize the national defense value of the Panama Canal, and the necessity for altering present financial and fiscal policies in connection therewith

Whereas it is the specific policy of this board of supervisors to recognize and promote the necessity for continued development of maritime commerce on the Pacific coast; and

Whereas tolls on commercial cargoes transiting the Panama Canal are a very important factor in the development of this commerce; and

Whereas present tolls are carrying more than their fair share of the cost of operating the Panama Canal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco does hereby go on record urging the administration and the Congress of the United States to recognize, through proper legislation, the national defense value of the canal, the need for altering present financial and fiscal policies at the canal and the fairness in limiting the annuity payment chargeable to tolls to its present level; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the board of supervisors be, and he is hereby, directed to submit copies of this resolution to his honor, the mayor, for transmittal by him to the Federal legislative representative, for presentation to Senators KNOWLAND and KUCHEL and Representatives from the State of California with the request that they exert their every influence to effectuate the purposes of this resolution.

Whereas this Board of Supervisors of Alameda County, State of California, is vitally interested in the maintenance of a strong and adequate American merchant marine; and

Whereas intercoastal shipping is a vital part of such merchant marine: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board of supervisors supports corrective legislation designed to recognize the national defense value of the Panama Canal so that commercial cargoes will not be required to pay more than their

fair share of tolls for the commercial transiting of the canal; and be it further

Resolved, That fiscal and financial policies of the canal be corrected to prevent the placing of an inequitable tolls burden on commercial shipping and that increases in the annuity payments to the Republic of Panama be paid for by the United States Government and not by commercial tolls; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives from the State of California, members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, urging them to take the necessary action to insure the passage of corrective legislation.

THE ASIAN-AFRICAN CONFERENCE—RESOLUTION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, at the recent annual convention of the Americans for Democratic Action, a fine anti-Communist organization to which I have belonged for many years, a resolution was adopted bearing on the impending Asian-African conference shortly to begin, where decisions of grave world import will be made.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted at the ADA convention on this subject be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASIAN-AFRICAN CONFERENCE

The Asian-African conference presents an opportunity to give encouragement to the uncommitted nations which have taken the initiative in convening the meeting, and to other democratic forces which will be represented there. In addition to the friendly greetings already dispatched by the SEATO powers, our Government should, before the meeting convenes, make clear its position on the vital issues to be considered there.

The United States should reiterate its firm opposition to the continuation of colonialism and imperialism; its intention to assist the new nations to make rapid economic and political progress; and its endorsement of their right to play their part in the solution of world problems. The United States should make clear that it not only opposes communism but also fights for progressive goals, that it is not wedded to the support of reactionary elements in Asia, Africa, or any other part of the world, and that it seeks no dominion for itself.

By so doing the United States will recognize the intensity of the feelings of the masses of people in Asia and Africa, to whom anti-colonialism and opposition to "Apartheid" and other forms of racial discrimination are vital principles, and to whom anti-communism and the democratic way of life are still slogans without significance in their struggle for freedom and justice. It should help them to understand that international communism is the most menacing new thrust of colonialism, and endangers the national aspirations of all free peoples. Thereby it can strengthen the democratic elements at the conference, and limit the power of the Communist representatives to distort its position and to influence the conference toward alinement with the Communist world.

TREATMENT OF ADVANCE NEWSPAPER-SUBSCRIPTION PAYMENTS AS PREPAID INCOME—EDITORIAL OF THE SOUTH DAKOTA PRESS ASSOCIATION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there is pending a proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code, which would repeal the 1954 provisions permitting newspapers to treat advance subscription payments as prepaid income.

Mr. Alan C. McIntosh, who is publisher of the Rock County Herald, at Luverne, Minn., and a former president of the National Editorial Association, has called my attention to the fact that such repeal, on a retroactive basis, would be a hardship to many weekly and small daily newspapers, the vast majority of which have utilized the provisions on the reasonable and justifiable basis that Congress intended.

A resolution adopted by the South Dakota Press Association at its annual meeting on March 26, sets forth the views of these publishers as to effect of the proposed change in the code. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH DAKOTA PRESS ASSOCIATION, MARCH 26, 1955

The revision of the Federal tax laws in 1954 contained a provision that authorized newspapers to treat subscription payments as prepaid income, as they properly are, and permitted them to set up reserves in proportion to this obligation. This was in accord with good business principles and sound accounting practices.

Now it is proposed that this provision be repealed and that the repeal be made retroactive to January 1, 1954.

The South Dakota Press Association strongly opposes the proposed repeal of this section and urges Congress to respect the sound sense of the 1954 provision in respect to newspaper subscription revenues. Furthermore, it considers the proposal that the section be repealed on a retroactive basis to be sharply in violation of good faith. Many newspapers have adjusted their books to conform to the 1954 provision and they would be subjected to a considerable hardship to be compelled to go back now and make changes in records that they had every reason to believe were past history.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 800. A bill to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay"; without amendment (Rept. No. 130).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 35. A bill to permit the transportation in the mails of live scorpions; without amendment (Rept. No. 131).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. WELKER), from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1137. A bill to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 132); and

S. 1139. A bill to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France; without amendment (Rept. No. 133).

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1600. A bill to provide that leave accrued by members of the Armed Forces while held as prisoners of war in Korea shall not be counted in determining the maximum amount of leave which they may accumulate or have to their credit; with an amendment (Rept. No. 134).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to study aspects of the common system of air navigation in the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 135); and the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on March 31, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 465) for the relief of Ernest Ludwig Bamford and Mrs. Nadine Bamford.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1616. A bill for the relief of Sumiko Ariumi Bilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1617. A bill to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1618. A bill to permit weekly newspapers to suspend publication for not more than 2 issues in any 1 calendar year without loss of second-class mail privileges; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1619. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Ventura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 1620. A bill to provide for the control of noxious weeds on land under the control or jurisdiction of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 1621. A bill to authorize adjustment by the Secretary of Agriculture of certain obligations of settlers on projects developed or subject to the act of August 11, 1939, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1622. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1623. A bill for the relief of Julio de Assis Martiniano; and

S. 1624. A bill for the relief of Manuel Bentes Robalo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 1625. A bill to discontinue the Postal Savings System, established by the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 1626. A bill for the relief of Rachid Abdallah; and

S. 1627. A bill for the relief of Alexander Orlov and his wife, Maria Orlov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1628. A bill to provide relief to farmers and farm workers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. RUSSELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 1629. A bill for the relief of Peter B. Vardy and his wife, Lilian M. Vardy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1630. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in recognition of the founding of the first kindergarten in the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1631. A bill for the relief of Pearson F. Marsh; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1632. A bill to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1633. A bill relating to a constitutional convention in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 1634. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. MALONE, Mr. THYE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. LONG, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KERR, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. WELKER, Mr. POTTER, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. BENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 1635. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1636. A bill to require the use of humane methods in the slaughter of livestock and poultry in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG:

S. 1637. A bill to extend the time limit within which recommendations for and awards of certain military decorations may be made; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1638. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of child's insurance benefits to certain individuals who are over the age of 18 but who are unable to engage in any regular employment by reason of permanent physical or mental disability; and

S. 1639. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to provide for the payment of disability-insurance benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 1640. A bill to provide that one floating ocean station shall be maintained at all times in the Gulf of Mexico to provide storm warnings for States bordering on the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1641. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; and

S. 1642. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1643. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed services who suffer disability or death incident to active duty, active duty for training, or inactive-duty training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the last two above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for Mr. KILGORE, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1644. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1645. A bill to permit certain holders of mortgage purchase contracts with the Federal National Mortgage Association to exercise their rights under such contracts for additional periods of not to exceed 90 days; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1646. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide increased benefits in cases of disabling injuries and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1647. A bill to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

S. 1648. A bill to amend section 309 of the Communications Act of 1934, in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization without hearing; and

S. 1649. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 1650. A bill to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRICKER (by request):

S. 1651. A bill for the relief of Felisa Ho (nee Chang-Kuon); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1652. A bill to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase salaries for part-time and full-time referees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DANIEL (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. J. Res. 64. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the period August 21 to 27, 1955, as American Law Student Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THIRD ASSISTANT SECRETARY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in a letter to the President of the Senate under date of March 21, 1955, has advised the Congress of the need in the Department for a third assistant secretary. The Secretary has forwarded, as an enclosure to her letter, a draft bill which, if enacted into law, would authorize this additional assistant secretary. I am forwarding that bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the letter of March 21, 1955, addressed to the Vice President as President of the Senate, from Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, together with the enclosed draft bill, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. This letter clearly outlines the need for this new office.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, which was submitted to Congress on March 12, 1953, created the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Section 2 of that plan created the position of Secretary to head up the new Department. That section also created the position of Under Secretary and two Assistant Secretaries. Section 3 created the position of special assistant to the Secretary for health and medical affairs. This bill which I am now introducing would permit the appointment of a third Assistant Secretary with responsibility for administration and management.

I introduce the bill and ask for its appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1617) to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary in the Department of Health, Education, and

Welfare, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in addition to the Assistant Secretaries now provided for by law, one additional Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The provisions of section 2 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 (67 Stat. 631) shall be applicable to such additional Assistant Secretary to the same extent as they are applicable to the Assistant Secretaries authorized by that section.

The letter presented by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am enclosing for your consideration a draft of a bill, "To authorize an additional Assistant Secretary in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

The draft bill would permit the appointment of a third Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. There are now two such Assistant Secretaries provided for by law. One of the present Assistant Secretaries is responsible for program analysis; the other, for Federal-State relations. It is proposed that the additional Assistant Secretary would be responsible for administration.

There is an urgent need in this Department for an Assistant Secretary to provide the major staff arm for formulation and development of policies for the general management of the Department. At present, there are approximately 36,000 employees in this Department administering an extremely wide range of activities through six major constituents which differ considerably in their size, internal organization structure, operating methods, and other management characteristics.

Ours is the newest of the departments in the executive branch and is responsible for major programs involving human needs for a constantly growing national population. Many management problems arise as the departmental level which involve subjects considered at the Cabinet level and involve factors cutting across constituent organization lines. The Secretary must be able to rely on an official of the level of an Assistant Secretary for the development of rapid but careful analyses of actions to be taken which will give full consideration to both program and management factors.

It is planned that the proposed Assistant Secretary will exercise administrative responsibility and supervision of the Office of Internal Security and the newly established Special Assistant for Inspection, in addition to the general management area. This will help reduce the number of separate offices reporting to the Secretary. It will also help materially in effecting the very important coordination of the internal security and inspection activities in the Department with the general management and personnel activities at all levels. It should be understood, however, that this coordinating and administrative responsibility of the Assistant Secretary is not intended to preclude or impede such direct communication between the Secretary and the Director of Security, and between the Secretary and the Special Assistant for Inspection as any of these three may find necessary to the proper discharge of their responsibilities.

A study of administrative management activities of the Department, conducted by a private management consulting firm, has already identified, among other points, the great need to give more attention to:

1. More extensive management guides to the constituents;
2. The establishment of administrative standards which will reduce costs in the procurement and utilization of equipment, space, supplies, forms, records, and printing; and
3. The expansion of common services offered to the constituents whenever desirable in the interest of economy and convenience.

The establishment of the new Assistant Secretary as provided in the enclosed draft bill will also help to effectuate these recommendations.

The area of general administration and management policies, standards, and service, including internal security and inspection, is so important to the efficient and effective functioning of the Department that direct supervision and attention to this area of activities should be provided by a high official at the level of an Assistant Secretary.

I shall appreciate it if you would be good enough to refer the enclosed draft bill to the proper committee for action.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it perceives no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,
OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary.

SUSPENSION OF PUBLICATION OF WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS FOR TWO WEEKS WITHOUT LOSS OF SECOND-CLASS MAIL PRIVILEGES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit weekly newspapers to suspend publication for not more than two issues in any one calendar year without loss of second-class mail privileges.

The bill would allow weekly newspapers which have been accorded the second-class mail privilege to suspend publication for vacation purposes for not more than two issues in any one calendar year without the necessity of applying for reentry as second-class matter on account of a change in frequency of issue. Under existing postal regulations, a weekly newspaper must publish an edition each week, 52 weeks a year, or it will lose its second-class postal privileges.

The weekly newspaper is the backbone of the journalistic world. These small newspapers play an important role in thousands of communities throughout the Nation. In most cases the staff of a weekly is composed of 3 or 4 persons; in many cases less. It is not unusual to find an editor-publisher putting in his time as a printer, linotype operator, pressman, reporter, and bookkeeper, all within the routine of 1 week.

Daily newspapers can afford, as a general rule, to give their employees a vacation, without causing an excessive burden on the remaining staff members. These larger organizations have access to part-time help, and can make allowances for vacations. If one person were to take 2 weeks off from his duties on a weekly newspaper, it would be impossible in many cases to publish the newspaper. There are no harder workers in the journalistic field than those who operate and work on a weekly. They are entitled to a vacation each year. If the publisher could afford to hire a substitute for several weeks, he would not be able to find one. As all of us know, there is not an excess of printers, linotype operators, and reporters in communities of a few thousand persons.

This bill would allow the weekly newspapers to suspend publication for 2 weeks without losing their second-class postal rate, which is so important to them. The bill will give the little fellow in the newspaper business a break; it will not cost the Government a cent; and it will recognize a situation which needs adjusting, and needs it now.

The passage of this bill by Congress will, when the States affected change their laws covering legal notices, be of inestimable value to the weekly publishers, and will give them a chance to take a much-needed vacation each year, which they are barred from doing now. I sincerely hope the bill will receive consideration from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1618) to permit weekly newspapers to suspend publication for not more than two issues in any one calendar year without loss of second-class mail privileges, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RELIEF TO FARMERS AND FARM WORKERS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senators from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. STENNIS], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide relief to farmers and farm workers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1628) to provide relief to farmers and farm workers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture

and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby finds (1) that crop losses due to drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes result in severe hardship, suffering, and economic loss, not only in the case of operators of farms but in the case of their tenants and employees as well; (2) that, by reason of acreage limitations or other production controls, farmers suffering such losses are often prevented from planting other crops to replace those lost or damaged; (3) that as a result thereof agricultural workers and other persons dependent on such crops for a livelihood are forced to seek other employment thus causing dislocation of populations and other trends which tend to unbalance existing ratios between rural and urban populations; (4) that the economies of the areas affected are thereby disrupted and the economy of the entire Nation adversely affected.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSES

SEC. 2. It is purpose of this act to alleviate hardship, suffering, and economic losses resulting from disastrous loss or damage to agricultural crops due to natural causes, and to prevent serious dislocation of populations, and other adverse effects on the economies of the areas affected and the Nation, by making possible the planting of additional acreage of other crops which will in part replace those destroyed or damaged and thus provide a livelihood for farm operators and workers who would otherwise be forced to seek other means of support for themselves and their families.

INCREASE IN ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines—

(1) that in any area any agricultural crop which is important to the economy of such area has been destroyed or severely damaged by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural cause; and

(2) that, except for acreage limitations or other production controls, other crops could be planted to replace or supplement the crop destroyed or damaged,

the Secretary, upon application by the operator of any farm within such area, shall cause to be allotted to such farm additional acreage for the planting of any such crop in such amount as the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, whenever he determines that the normal production from the acreage allotment for the principal crop produced on any farm, together with the normal production of other crops grown on such farm, is insufficient to provide a livelihood for the operator of such farm and his family, to increase such acreage allotment to the extent necessary to enable such operator to produce sufficient agricultural commodities to provide such livelihood.

(c) The aggregate of the additional acreage allotted for any crop year under this section for the planting of any agricultural commodity shall not exceed (1) 500,000 acres, or (2) 3 percent of the national acreage allotment for such commodity for such year, whichever is smaller.

ADDITIONAL ACREAGE NOT TO BE CONSIDERED FOR PURPOSE OF FUTURE ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 4. The additional acreage authorized to be allotted to farms under this act for any year shall be in addition to the county, State, and national acreage allotments for such year. Such additional acreage shall not be taken into account in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments.

DEFINITION OF AGRICULTURAL CROP

SEC. 5. As used in this act, the term "agricultural crop" means any crop of a product of the soil, including horticultural crops.

TERMINATION DATE

SEC. 6. This act shall cease to be in effect on June 1, 1958.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the bill undertakes to afford some measure of relief to the farmers who are suffering one of the greatest catastrophes that has befallen them in the last century. I refer to the major disaster of the great freeze, which has brought to a large area of the Nation the coldest weather that has been known since the records of the Weather Bureau have been kept. That freeze occurred in the latter part of March, and was very disastrous to many crops.

In the case of the peach crop in my State, and of other States, it has been the greatest loss that has been incurred. It killed the entire peach crop. Experts, who are familiar with the facts and who have examined into the situation by traveling over the entire area affected, say that the State of Georgia, the greatest peach-producing State in the Union, will not produce enough peaches this year to make one peach pie.

Mr. President, the growing of peaches is a very expensive business. It requires a great deal of labor. It requires labor that is well paid to do the work that is necessary in spraying, trimming, cutting back, plowing, and the placing of fertilizer. It is not the kind of crop that can be replanted immediately.

The corn crop was almost entirely killed by the freeze. However, the corn crop can be replanted, and the farmers can still raise a corn crop this year. In the case of peaches and other horticultural crops, it is manifestly impossible to do that.

The bill does not undertake to give any grants to these people, even though they have been completely wiped out from an economic standpoint. It provides what I believe to be the best and cheapest relief than can possibly be afforded the farmers in those circumstances.

We know that in these areas other crops can still be planted which will enable farmers to maintain their labor and still enjoy at least some income which perhaps will enable them to tide over to another year.

The crops which can be grown in this area are principally peanuts, cotton, and, in some small instances, tobacco. All those crops happen to be under limitations of acreage. The acreage has already been distributed and allocated among the farmers. The bill grants to the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to make modest allotments of acreage for crops which are under control, where such action will serve to provide a livelihood for the operator of a farm and enable him to take care of his family and exist until another crop year.

Very rigid limitations are set on the acreage which can be distributed. No commodity may be increased to more than 500,000 acres, or 3 percent of any commodity, whichever shall be lower. In the case of such crops as peanuts, for example, with respect to which the present allotment is in the neighborhood of 1,100,000 acres, the total the Secretary of Agriculture can distribute under the bill is not more than 33,000 acres.

The bill would not add greatly to any surplus. In some cases it would merely make up for the losses which have been incurred in these crops because of floods or drought or other disaster.

I wish to point out that the acreage, which is allotted on a purely relief basis, is not to be computed in arriving at future allotments to any farm or to any State or to any county.

In order to reassure anyone who might fear permanent legislation of this kind, the bill has a cutoff date of June 1, 1958.

I have spoken principally of the peach producers of my own State and the producers of horticultural products in Georgia and other States who have been adversely affected. However, the bill is not limited to those crops. It relates to any farmer or producer whose crop is destroyed by natural causes.

I read the caption of the bill:

To provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant diseases, or other natural causes.

The bill would afford relief to the producers of any crop in any part of the United States where this method might be available as a means of alleviating distress and privation suffered by those who are compelled to gamble with the elements and with nature as they produce the food we eat and the clothes we wear and enable all of us to exist on this earth.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the bill provide for incentive payments and crop insurance?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does not; it does not go that far. I have kept it as simple as I could, because time is of the very essence, as the Senator knows, and if we were thrown into lengthy hearings on those features, I fear relief would not be afforded to those who have seen their year's work wiped out overnight and who would be forced to contemplate this year as a year of distress. Unless relief is afforded they will be driven from their farms. For many years the great majority of our people lived on farms. Then the number was cut down to approximately 50 percent. When I came to the Congress it was about 29 percent. It is now only 15 percent. Unless we do something to permit those people to exist on the farms, they will be driven into the cities. They cannot stand idly by and see their children starve.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to compliment the Senator from Georgia, and I ask that I may be permitted to be a cosponsor of his bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be very glad to have the Senator as a cosponsor. I know the Senator's heart goes out to those in distress, wherever they may be.

Mr. THURMOND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent

to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me dealing with the bill, introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and cosponsored by me, to provide relief to farmers and farm workers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by natural disasters.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THURMOND

Two weeks ago, South Carolina's peach growers in several sections of the State suffered the loss, not only of this year's crop of peaches, but also of the loss of trees up to several years of age as a result of devastating hail from windstorms. I immediately consulted officials of the Department of Agriculture and requested that surveys be made in order that the effected areas might be declared eligible for emergency loans. That was done.

But this past weekend, another natural disaster struck the entire State of South Carolina. A killing freeze destroyed the entire peach crop of the State and damaged vegetable crops to an extent yet to be determined. At my request, Department of Agriculture officials have declared producers over the entire State eligible for emergency assistance.

But this is not enough. In 1953 South Carolina produced and marketed fruits and vegetables totaling $29,715,000. In 1954 South Carolina's total production of fruits and vegetables amounted to $24,771,000.

I should like to point out that the State of South Carolina produces and ships to market more fresh peaches than any other State in the Union according to official Department of Agriculture records. South Carolina's peach crop alone, which was destroyed by the freeze, was estimated to be worth $10 million, more than one-third of the total value of fruit and vegetable crops grown commercially in the State. This means, Mr. President, that more than one-third—nearly one-half of the income of growers from fresh fruits and vegetables was destroyed last weekend. Damage to other crops probably will increase this loss.

It should also be pointed out that while a normal crop of peaches in my State is valued at approximately $10 million, during recent years past growers have lost their entire crops several times. Consequently, this has greatly reduced the average income from this crop. This reduced average means that many growers have had to secure substantial loans during the bad years and, therefore, some are now faced with disaster unless additional assistance is given above that now provided by law.

This means, too, that thousands of farm and orchard workers will be thrown out of employment unless it is possible to provide compensating acreage to those who have suffered these disasters.

I want to urge that quick action be taken and this bill be given prompt passage. Only by such action can we provide the relief essential for those who have lost their crops and their jobs.

EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 47 of my colleagues, I introduce a bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks there may be printed in the RECORD an explanation of the bill.

I request that any other Senators who desire to join in cosponsoring the bill may do so up to 5 o'clock today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk for additional cosponsors, as requested by the Senator from Louisiana.

The bill (S. 1635) to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. ELLENDER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER

The proposed amendment to the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, would accomplish the following:

1. Make the following immediate increases in basic domestic-sugar quotas:

Domestic beet, 85,000 tons (to total of 1,885,000 tons).

Mainland cane 80,000 tons (to total of 580,000 tons).

Puerto Rico, 20,000 tons (to total of 1,100,000 tons).

Virgin Islands, 3,000 tons (to total of 15,000 tons).

(Hawaii has not asked for an immediate increase in her basic quota of 1,052,000 tons.)

2. Apply a growth formula on all increases in annual consumption above 8,388,000 tons (the increase in basic domestic quotas plus 8,200,000 tons, the Department of Agriculture's initial consumption estimate for 1955).

The formula: Prorate among domestic producers, according to their basic quotas, 55 percent of the increase in annual consumption and 45 percent among foreign suppliers. (This is approximately the historic division of the market before the 1948 act.)

3. Provide that if any domestic area cannot meet its quota under the growth formula, other domestic areas will have first chance at making up the deficit. If they cannot, the unfilled amount would be allocated to Cuba.

4. Increase direct consumption quotas for Hawaii and Puerto Rico proportionately with their participation in the growth formula.

5. Extend the act to December 31, 1962.

Why the action is urgent now:

Present fixed quotas, accepted on a temporary basis under the 1948 act to help Cuba make her adjustment to reasonable postwar production levels a gradual process, are now causing a severe hardship on the domestic-sugar industry. Improved farming methods and applied research have increased per acre domestic yields to such an extent that production last year exceeded rigid ceilings in spite of reduced planting. Further drastic cuts in beet and cane acreages are impractical. Many veterans in new Government-sponsored irrigation projects can get no sugar-beet acreage allotments at all. Producers are burdened with large inventories.

In 1948, when the present rigid quotas became effective, our total annual sugar consumption amounted to 7,200,000 tons. The Department of Agriculture has announced an initial estimate of requirements for 1955 of 8,200,000 tons, with a forecast that our final requirements this year will amount to 8,500,000 tons. All the growth in the United States market will continue to go to foreign nations (96 percent of it to Cuba) unless the law is changed. The proposed amendment would not, however, reduce the present volume of sugar imports from any foreign country, including Cuba, but would assure their imports to continue growing as United States consumption grows.

WHY DOMESTIC SUGAR PRODUCERS NEED LARGER QUOTAS NOW

1. Domestic sugar industry now does not share in the growth of our country.

For 7 years, United States sugar-beet farmers and mainland sugarcane farmers have been denied any share in the growth of our country. The Sugar Act of 1948, under which United States sugar marketing quotas are still determined, put fixed ceilings on the amount of sugar American producers can market in their own country. Beet-sugar producers can market no more than 1,800,000 tons and mainland cane producers can market no more than 500,000 tons of sugar in 1 year.

In 1948, when these quotas become effective, our total annual sugar requirements amounted to 7,200,000 tons. The Department of Agriculture has announced an initial estimate of requirements for 1955 of 8,200,000 tons, with a forecast that our final requirements this year will amount to 8,500,000 tons. Despite this increase of at least a million tons in our annual sugar requirements, domestic beet-sugar producers and mainland cane-sugar producers still can market no more than their 1948 quotas.

Effective in 1953, 2 domestic cane areas—Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands—had their quotas increased by 176,000 tons. Other than that, all the increase in the growth of the United States sugar market since 1947 has gone to foreign countries, and virtually all of it to 1 country—Cuba. (The United States last year imported from Cuba more than 2,700,000 tons, about one-third of our total needs.)

All the increase in the growing United States sugar market will continue to go to foreign countries unless the present law is changed.

2. Temporary concessions to help Cuba made by Congress in 1948 law.

From the beginning of American sugar quota legislation in 1934 until the 1948 act went into effect, the law provided for domestic sugar-producing areas to share in the growth of the United States sugar market. Domestic sugar producers temporarily relinquished this historic and just right in 1948 in order to help Cuba make a gradual adjustment downward from high wartime levels of production.

Congress also made other important temporary concessions to Cuba in the 1948 act so her adjustment to the inevitable postwar situation of reduced demand for her sugar could be gradual. Cuba was authorized to market 95 percent of the amount by which the Philippine industry, almost completely destroyed by the war, would fall short of its quota while it was rebuilding. Cuba was given the right to continue to share with domestic areas in making up deficits that might occur in any domestic areas. Cuba has marketed some 5,250,000 extra tons of sugar in the United States—almost 30 percent more than her basic quota—as the direct result of the special provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948.

Instead of using the opportunity thus afforded to adjust her production downward, Cuba increased her production. In 1952 she let production soar to 8,000,000 tons—1,500,000 tons more than she produced in 1947, and 2,000,000 tons more than anyone could see a market for anywhere in the world. This 2,000,000-ton surplus has plagued all sugar-producing countries in the world ever since.

3. Higher yields and rigid quotas create acute situation for domestic industry.

The present critical situation of the domestic beet and mainland cane areas has resulted from a combination of the increasing yields per acre, brought about by technological advances, and the temporary waiver for Cuba's benefit of the domestic areas' historic right to share in the growth of the American market.

Improved technology, more efficient farming methods, and the application of research findings have increased sugarcane tonnage per acre more than 16 percent, and sugar beet tonnage per acre 20 percent, since 1948.

Under the Sugar Act, domestic areas have always been subject to acreage restrictions and marketing controls, and during the last 2 years these restrictive measures have been sharply applied in a strenuous effort to keep production down to the rigid marketing quotas.

Last year, sugar beet acreage was 10 percent less than the year before the first Sugar Act went into effect, but production was 14 percent more—nearly 2 million tons. The fixed quota of 1,800,000 tons is forcing a further acreage cut of 10 to 15 percent this year by established growers in most of the 22 beet-producing States. Practically no other farmers will be permitted to plant any sugar beets at all. Many of the latter are war veterans on newly opened reclamation projects of the West, where sugar beets are vitally needed in the crop rotation.

In the mainland cane area, the situation is fully as acute. Despite acreage cuts of 8 and 10 percent, respectively, imposed in the last 2 years, sugar production in 1954 was 615,000 tons, or 115,000 tons more than the 500,000-ton fixed marketing quota for this area. This production was on fewer acres than produced 477,000 tons in 1948. Unless the law is changed, a further cut of 30 percent would be required to bring stocks in line with normal carryover. This, of course, is unthinkable and as a practical matter is impossible.

With production exceeding marketing quotas in spite of acreage cuts, the mainland cane and beet industries are saddled with large inventories, costly to carry. Final returns to farmers depend upon the cost of marketing sugar, and storage costs are marketing costs which directly reduce the net income of farmers, particularly in the beet area.

Acreage reductions are in effect on many of our export crops, which we produce in surplus, and it certainly seems contrary to the national interest to order drastic cuts in the acreage of a crop of which we import nearly half our annual needs.

4. Action now is imperative.

The action which the domestic sugar industry so urgently needs this year to relieve its critical situation can be obtained only by amending the Sugar Act now to increase 1955 marketing quotas for the domestic beet and mainland cane areas, and to restore to all domestic areas their historic and just right to share with foreign countries in the growth of the United States sugar market.

On the basis of the Department of Agriculture's estimate of our probable sugar needs for this year, the proposed bill will not reduce Cuba's present quota, and will permit Cuba and other foreign countries to continue to enjoy a fair share of future increases in the United States sugar market.

USE OF HUMANE METHODS IN SLAUGHTERING OF LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require the use of humane methods in the slaughter of livestock and poultry in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill, prepared by me, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1636) to require the use of humane methods in the slaughter of livestock and poultry in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

I have introduced today a bill to require the use of humane methods in the slaughter of livestock and poultry in interstate or foreign commerce.

European nations all immobilize and make insensible to pain all animals and poultry before slaughter. Most American nations still kill animals and poultry without benefit of unconsciousness, often while in great fear and pain. Our slaughter industry should at once start to reach European standards, and eventually lead the nations of the world in humane, noncruel slaughtering.

The slaughter industry of Britain, the Scandinavian countries, and in fact all nations of Europe have for some time immobilized and made insensible to pain all animals and poultry before bleeding and slaughter.

The methods used are the Captive Bolt Pistol, which drives a short bolt into the brain with the bolt stopped from going further by contact with a collar set in oil at the end of the pistol, or by the use of electricity, applied with electrodes to the upper part of the head, which suddenly stops the activity of all parts of the brain and nervous system and permanently immobilizes the whole body. Both methods put the animals to sleep until the knife is applied, and produces death before they awake.

Europe is far advanced over the United States in such humane methods of slaughter. The practices of our slaughterhouses of shackling animals and hanging them up by one leg before the knife is used to kill them, and with hogs sometimes being run through the scalding tank before they are entirely dead, represent unfortunate cruelty to which the slaughter industry often seems callously insensible.

Now is an opportune time to bring the slaughter industry in our country up to the European standards of humanity. We not only have the European methods to consider, but I am proud to say another humane method has been developed by Hormel Packing Co., of Austin, Minn. The Hormel Co. in my State uses carbon dioxide gas, making the hogs unconscious within seconds of exposure. The Hormel Co. has used this carbon dioxide method successfully in its own plant since they perfected it, the hogs never awakening through easy shackling, sticking, and scalding by the operators.

Some other firms in our country have also pioneered in this field. The European captive-bolt method has been voluntarily adopted by the Oscar Mayer Co., at Madison, Wis., and other plants are now beginning with this method.

Experiments are now being conducted at Iowa State Experimental Station and by the United States Department of Agriculture in Iowa and California toward making the Hormel method applicable to poultry and other animals.

We propose or require no specific method in this bill and provide ample time for the slaughterhouses to work out satisfactory methods. The enforcement provisions would not take effect for 5 years.

However, the American Humane Association feels that this bill and an educational campaign running parallel with it is a much-needed beginning of efforts to bring our slaughter industry to leadership in humane slaughtering of livestock and poultry.

The bill provides for a four-man committee, including a representative of the Department of Agriculture, of the slaughterers, of the organized trade-union movement engaged in packinghouse work, and of the American Humane Association to work out any problems connected with developing more humane practices.

I am hopeful it can be given early consideration and will be accepted by slaughterhouse operators of the country. Veteran meat-inspection officials of the Department of Agriculture have indicated they are in full accord with its objectives.

FLOATING WEATHER STATION IN GULF OF MEXICO

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide that one floating ocean station shall be maintained at all times in the Gulf of Mexico to provide storm warnings for States bordering on the Gulf of Mexico. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, together with a letter from the Rotary Club of Golden Meadow, La., signed by James D. King, secretary, and a resolution adopted by the police jury of Jefferson Parish, La., be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement, letter, and resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1640) to provide that one floating ocean station shall be maintained at all times in the Gulf of Mexico to provide storm warnings for States bordering on the Gulf of Mexico, introduced by Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement, letter, and resolution, presented by Mr. LONG, are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LONG

I am introducing today a bill in behalf of Senator ELLENDER and myself which would provide a floating ocean weather station in the Gulf of Mexico to furnish storm warnings to States bordering on that body of water.

A need for such an installation exists because past experience has demonstrated that the facilities now available for the prediction of hurricanes and severe storms are not adequate.

These factors merit consideration in connection with this proposed legislation:

Annually, the gulf coast is susceptible to hurricanes of severe intensity. While a number of these disturbances recurve northward and either strike the east coast of the United States or dissipate themselves at sea, the gulf coast is a likely target for each one. The calendar on major hurricanes occurring in the past 4 years shows this tabulation:

Year	Storms reaching hurricane velocity	Casualties	Property loss
1954	4	311	$1,000,000,000
1953	6	1	6,000,000
1952	6	3	2,750,000
1951	8	250	80,000,000

While the great portion of these casualties and property losses occurred in areas other than the Gulf Coast States, this list could be augmented by countless losses sustained by persons in the Gulf Coast States due to unnecessary evacuations.

The gulf coast is the only coast without a weather station offshore. It is accordingly a generally accepted concept that the coverage of tropical storms in the Gulf of

Mexico is inadequate and that this lack leads to property loss, inconvenience and anxiety, and could easily lead to serious loss of life in connection with each major disturbance.

Some of the gulf-coast industries vitally need the assistance of a weather station that will give ample, accurate, and timely information.

Fishing has long been one of the chief means of livelihood for people living in the gulf-coast area. Fishing fleets operating off the gulf coast now range far beyond the scope of radar stations and are subject to serious loss of life and property during the hurricane season because of the inadequacy of existing land-based facilities. The Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission for this reason urged the establishment of a floating weather station.

The advent of offshore oil operations makes adequate weather forecasting even more necessary than heretofore. The oil business is growing by leaps and bounds in the gulf area, and the men and expensive equipment they use need all the protection that modern invention can afford. The lack of completely accurate forecasts of the movements of possible gales causes untold confusion and is a constant source of possible mishap.

Finally the residents of gulf cities and towns need protection. The longest possible time must be given for the evacuation of people and the disposition of plant and equipment if we are to hold down casualties and losses. Also more accurate information can save many unnecessary, expensive, and inconvenient moves of the people and their property.

The weather ship proposed by this bill would afford a degree of protection that does not exist at this time, for the lives of the residents of the States bordering the Gulf of Mexico and for property evaluated at approximately $2 billion.

It is the intention of the sponsors of this bill, Mr. President, to urge its speedy enactment as a means of guarding against a repetition of the severe losses that attended the hurricane of 1947 which caused 34 fatalities in the States of Louisiana and Mississippi, destroyed 1,642 homes on the gulf coast, and damaged 25,000 homes in its path.

ROTARY CLUB OF GOLDEN MEADOW,
Golden Meadow, La.

Hon. RUSSELL LONG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: According to the latest newspaper reports, a bill will soon be introduced into the Congress relative to a weather station to be located deep in the Gulf of Mexico.

Accurate and speedy weather forecasting is imperative because of the nature of peoples' livelihoods along the gulf coast. Perhaps the two greatest industries in this general area are fishing and the oil business. Both can be adversely affected by insufficient forecasts. The advent of offshore oil operations makes it more necessary for adequate weather forecasting.

In view of the magnitude of good results that may be obtained by such a location of a weather station, we members of the Golden Meadow Rotary Club strongly urge that you support the passage of this measure.

Yours very truly,

JAMES D. KING,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF POLICE JURY OF JEFFERSON PARISH, LA.

Whereas tropical storms that generate within the Gulf of Mexico endanger the gulf coast; and

Whereas, there is no provision for an adequate means of forecasts or storm warnings; and

Whereas the Louisiana coast has suffered damage from such storms which were not adequately forecast by the United States Weather Service; and

Whereas residents of Grand Isle and other coastal areas have frequently evacuated their homes with considerable unnecessary expense, anxiety, and inconvenience because of insufficient coverage of tropical storms in the Gulf of Mexico by the United States Weather Service; and

Whereas such storm warnings without adequate coverage in the Gulf of Mexico has also involved, unnecessarily, considerable expense and loss of man-hours in coastal and offshore industrial activities: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Police Jury of the Parish of Jefferson does hereby call on our Representatives in the Congress to give wholehearted support to House bill 198 introduced in the House of Representatives by the Honorable T. A. THOMPSON, of Ville Platte, La., providing for a weather ship in the Gulf of Mexico; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable T. A. THOMPSON, Hon. HALE BOGGS, Hon. EDWIN WILLIS and Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Members of the United States Congress in Washington and United States Senators ALLEN ELLENDER and RUSSELL B. LONG, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

HOUSING FOR CERTAIN ELDERLY PERSONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1642) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. SPARKMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

HOUSING FOR THE AGING

Throughout the debate on housing a year ago, efforts multiplied to destroy the low-rent public housing program which must of necessity be the foundation of any slum clearance, or urban redevelopment and renewal program. Time is proving what many of us contended in 1954; that public housing was practically killed by the Housing Act of 1954.

Yet, when we rebuild our cities, our first concern must be: What happens to the people who are dispossessed? At least half of them have incomes so low that they require public assistance to obtain proper shelter. Our practice in the past has been to crowd such families into rat-infested slums. But now we would destroy them. We would also rehabilitate those structures that can be salvaged for future use. But we can't cram all families of low income into the rehabilitated homes. If we mean what we so piously resolve, we need a vast new housing supply for families of low and lower middle income. If the Housing Act of 1954 does nothing else, it will prove that single point, a point which public spirited advocates of Federal aid for low-rent housing have pointed out to committees of the Congress for many years.

Today, I am introducing a bill designed to solve one of our most totally neglected housing problems—that of decent housing for our senior citizens, the increasing number of aging couples and individuals.

This bill is very similar to the one introduced by Representative BARRETT O'HARA, of Illinois, a few weeks ago. I am advised that 12 other members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency associated themselves with him in support of the measure.

Briefly, the bill would authorize the Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration, with the approval of the President, to enter into contracts for annual contributions aggregating not more than $3 million per year, in addition to present authorizations under the Housing Act of 1937, as amended, in fiscal year 1956 and in each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years. The President may also authorize the commencement of construction of not to exceed 50,000 dwelling units in fiscal year 1956 and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years, for the purpose of supplying homes for elderly persons of low incomes.

I have made one basic change in the O'Hara bill. I would delete reference to "housing projects" and would confine the provisions of the bill to "housing" for the elderly. I feel strongly that we should not be in the position of recommending housing projects for elderly persons of low income in the sense of typical low-rent public housing projects that form total communities. We do not wish to create entire communities devoted solely to the occupancy of our senior citizens. The crying need today is for them to be supplied with homes within the total community, close to their loved ones, but as part of a normal community.

Aging couples and single persons in good or adequate health want desperately to belong to the whole community. If they live within a normal environment they are able to augment their incomes which they receive from modest pensions, social security payments, or from whatever source, by securing part-time employment within their capacities. We definitely do not want to create projects in the sense that they can be labeled "old people's homes." We do want to make provision for these most respected of our population, in homes of their own, as part of the communities they love. Their homes would be added to existing projects, included in new developments for families of all ages, a part of the normal community pattern.

Provisions that are presently available for the housing of elderly persons of low income are totally inadequate. Yet for many reasons the average life span is being constantly lengthened. Our systems of pensions and social security, and other aids to the aged make it possible, with a minimum of additional help, for more and more older people to maintain their independence.

While total facts concerning problems of the aged are not available, we are aware of countless elderly persons living out their lives as unhappy burdens to their children. Many attempt to carry on in oversized homes that rapidly fall into disrepair, or are long since dilapidated. A special study by the Bureau of the Census in 1950 showed that only 66.4 percent of the aged were living in housing which had private toilet, bath, and hot running water. By contrast 72 percent of those persons under 65 years of age live in houses having private toilet, bath, and hot running water.

Communities throughout the Nation are becoming increasingly aware of this problem, and urge that low-rent public housing be expanded to help meet the needs of the elderly. In the States of New York and Massachusetts special attention is being given to the needs of elderly persons in State-aided public-housing programs.

I raise this question now as an important part of the total housing problem with which we are faced. It is important to make sure that it is included in any overall recommendations that may be made to this Congress. It is sufficiently important to stand alone, and to receive the affirmative action of this Congress, if it is not included in a more comprehensive program.

For the record I must say that the objective we seek could be carried out also by amending the Housing Act of 1937 to permit local housing authorities to house single elderly persons, and by authorizing additional funds beyond the normal program recommendations of the Congress to be used for that designated purpose.

Whatever the final approach may be, proper housing for our senior citizens of low and middle income is a problem we can no longer ignore. I express deep appreciation to Mr. O'HARA and his colleagues in the other body, who have so forcefully brought this vital need to the attention of the Congress. It is a privilege to join with them by urging affirmative action at the proper time by the United States Senate.

BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed services who suffer disability or death incident to active duty, active duty for training, or inactive-duty training, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1643) to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed services who suffer disability or death incident to active duty, active duty for training, or inactive-duty training, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The explanation presented by Mr. SPARKMAN is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF EQUALIZATION OF BENEFITS BILL OF 1955

1. Preamble: (a) The proposed legislation cited as "The Equalization of Benefits Bill of 1955" has for its objective, as the title imports, the equalization of benefits received by members of the Armed Forces of the United States and particularly the elimination of adverse interpretations of the intent and policy of the Congress expressed in existing laws which it consolidates. Except where noted herein, it should not materially increase the administrative cost originally anticipated by the Congress when it enacted those laws.

(b) This bill is a composite of S. 1174, S. 1914, the Senate Committee Print of February 25, 1954, H. R. 546, H. R. 1223, H. R. 5778, all of the 83d Congress, and the draft (DOD 83-39) of a similar bill prepared by the Department of Defense. In this explanation, the principal source or sources, in whole or in part, of each section of the bill is given in parenthetical notes. Also, reference is made to the Sectional Analysis prepared by the Department of Defense to accompany its draft of DOD 83-39.

DEFINITION

2. Section 1: The provisions of this bill do not apply to any one of the uniformed services separately or exclusively. This section unifies them all under the generic name of "The Armed Forces of the United States," and it is intended that all members of the uniformed services, without distinction or discrimination, who belong to the components listed in the definition be given the benefit of those provisions which are applicable to their circumstances and qualifications. (Source: Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, sec. 101 (e) and sec. 202.)

CORRESPONDENCE COURSES

3. Section 2 relieves the Government of liability for any physical mishap which may befall a member of the Armed Forces of the United States while he or she is working on a correspondence course sponsored by any of the components of the Department of Defense. Ordinarily such work is done at home, that is to say—on private property not subject to Government jurisdiction or control. Obviously, no liability should be fastened on the Government in such cases. [Source: Senate committee print. See also Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, sec. 101 (d).]

INJURY, ETC.

4. (a) Section 3 and section 4. These two sections consolidate under the Armed Forces of the United States the existing laws on these same subjects which now apply separately to the several services.

(b) Section 3 deals with injury and disease, and section 4 with disability and death. A clear conception of the composition of these sections can be readily had by noting the following related grouping:

As to physical condition: Injury, disease, disability, death.

As to kind of duty: Active, active duty for training, and inactive-duty training.

As to duration: Indefinite or more than 30 days, 30 days or less, periodic (i. e., weekly drills at armories, etc.).

These two sections make appropriate groupings of these several categories and fix the benefits accordingly. The terminology defining the three kinds of duty is the same as that used in the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, sec. 101.

(c) Travel which is directly connected with the three kinds of duty is more adequately covered in this bill than in existing laws.

(d) Section 3 (b). The 6 months limitation on pay and allowances now contained in the act of June 15, 1936, applies to this category of hospitalized Reserves. This section 3 (b) is somewhat broader than existing authority to hospitalize Reserves which, although permitting hospitalization for an unlimited period so long as improvement is possible, limits the payment of active duty pay and allowances to a period of 6 months after termination of the prescribed tour of active duty or training. Authority to hospitalize naval and Marine Corps Reserves under section 304 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended (34 U. S. C. 855c) is considerably more limited.

(e) Section 3 (d) provides general authority which is similar to that contained at the present time in the act of July 15, 1939, as amended (10 U. S. C. 455e), with respect to the Army and Air Force, to furnish hospitalization and medical treatment to all members of the Armed Forces of the United States without reference to line-of-duty status.

(f) The practical effect of section 3 (f) is to permit hospitalization of reserves for diseases contracted, or the aggravation thereof, resulting from service subsequent to August 14, 1945, and prior to the enactment of this bill.

(g) Section 3 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) consolidate 10 U. S. C. 455 (a), (b), (c), (e), (f); 10 U. S. C. 456-1; 32 U. S. C. 160 (b); 32 U. S. C. 164 (a), (b); 34 U. S. C. 855c 3d and 4th Provisos; 34 U. S. C. 855c-3; to which has been added the aggravation of a preexisting injury or disease, and travel time incident to the kind of duty in which engaged. (Source: S. 1914; Senate Committee Print; H. R. 1223; H. R. 5778; DOD 83-39.)

5. (a) Section 4 (a) reenacts and extends the benefits of Public Law 108, 81st Congress, to members of the Coast Guard Reserve and extends the periods of coverage provided by that act to include authorized travel to and from the prescribed types of duty, except inactive-duty training unless transportation to and from this type of training is by Government vehicle or aircraft, or by other authorized mode of transportation. This section 4 (a) also specifically authorizes such benefits for Reserves called or ordered to active duty for training in excess of 30 days. The reasons for reenacting the authority contained in Public Law 108 are to eliminate ambiguities which result from the later enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and to clarify and simplify the language of the act.

(b) Section 4 (a) consolidates 10 U. S. C. 456; 32 U. S. C. 160 (a); 34 U. S. C. 855c-1; to which has been added the aggravation of a preexisting injury or disease, and travel incident to the kind of duty in which engaged. Retirement for physical disability under section 4 (a) ties in with the provisions of title IV of the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

(c) Section 4 (b) makes the effective date of Public Law 108, 81st Congress, applicable to the section, and reenacts the limitations of Public Law 108 relating to back pay, allowances, etc.

(d) Section 4 (b) is substantially the same as and consolidates title 10, United States Code, section 456-1; title 32, United States Code, section 160 (b); and title 34, United States Code, section 855c-3.

(Source: S. 1914, Senate committee print, H. R. 1223, H. R. 5778, DOD 83-39.) (Note: This paragraph is reworded from DOD "Sectional Analysis.")

6. Section 5 strikes out misconduct of a deceased member of the Armed Forces of the United States as a penalty imposed by the several acts mentioned on the beneficiary of the death gratuity. This change is desirable for two reasons:

(i) Whether death of a member was actually due to misconduct is often a borderline question which cannot be answered with finality. It is estimated that the cost to the Government to investigate and attempt to make a determination exceeds the death gratuity. Hence, the Government will save money by disregarding this contingency and paying the death gratuity.

(ii) It is most inequitable to penalize the dependent beneficiaries of the death gratuity for a cause of death beyond their control.

(Source: Senate committee print.)

CAREER COMPENSATION ACT

7. (a) Subsection 6 (a) amends the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to include within the basic provisions of title II of that act members of the Reserve components called or ordered to active duty, full-time training duty, or other full-time duty in excess of 30 days during the time required to travel from home to first duty station and from last duty station to home.

(b) Subsection 6 (b), (c), (d) extend the disability benefit provisions of subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 402 in title IV of that act to include Reserves called or ordered to active duty for training in excess of 30 days and to include within the periods of coverage authorized travel to and from active duty, full-time training duty, or other full-time duty.

(c) Subsection 7 (a) amends section 303 (a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (37 U. S. C. 253 (a)) to authorize members of the Armed Forces of the United States per diem allowances when away from their homes on temporary active duty for special purposes. Again, a hardship exists with re-

spect to this relatively small group of Reserves who at the present time receive no per diem allowance when called to temporary active duty for short periods. An example of the type of inequitable situation which this provision is intended to rectify is the case of a Reserve member of the Reserve Forces Policy Board of the Department of Defense who is ordered to active duty in Washington where the board meets. Such a person is authorized no per diem allowance, whereas a member of the board who is a Regular is authorized such an allowance when ordered to Washington for the same temporary duty away from his permanent station.

(d) Subsection 7 (b) amends section 302 (b) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (37 U. S. C. 252 (b)) to permit payment of quarters allowance to members of the Armed Forces of the United States without dependents on active duty or training duty periods of not less than 14 days or more than 3 months. Because the training station of such a person is considered to be his permanent station, such persons are not now entitled to basic allowance for quarters. Thus, they are placed in a position of having to maintain two living establishments—the military one and the civilian one—during this relatively short period of time. It is the purpose of this provision to rectify this situation which exists with respect to this single group of Reserves.

(e) Subsection 6 (e) amends section 402 (i) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 by adding the words "or discharged." This amendment will, in accordance with current policies, more nearly equalize the benefits for disabled enlisted personnel of the Reserve components. At present, the benefits accuring to enlisted personnel, discharged for physical disability and subsequently retired are restricted to disability compensation and hospitalization at veterans' hospitals with no Army hospital or medical service for themselves and none for their dependents. Officers retired for physical disability are entitled to such benefits at Army or Navy hospitals. It is believed that the Congress intends to require medical service for all retired personnel who have been disabled in line of duty alike. Unless this amendment is adopted, further discrimination will continue between discharged enlisted members of the Reserve components and officers and enlisted members of the Reserve components and officers and enlisted men of the Regular services separated for physical disability. This actually is only clarifying language but experience has indicated that it should be written into law to prevent misinterpretation. (Source: S. 1914; Senate committee print; H. R. 1223; H. R. 5778; DOD 83-39.) (NOTE.—Much of this paragraph is taken practically verbatim from DOD Section Analysis.)

PAY READJUSTMENT ACT

8. (a) Section 8 is paragraph 4, section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 359, 368) reworded to accord with the terminology of this bill and to state in unmistakable language the intent which the Congress expressed in 1942 and reiterated in 1949. It does not enlarge the scope of the 1942 or 1949 acts with respect to Reserve officers with World War I service. It does enlarge the scope of the 1942 act with respect to a few Regular Navy, Marine Corps, and possibly Coast Guard officers with World War I service who retired under the 1938 act (58 Stat. 944) between 1938 and 1942 with less than 30 years' service. A review of the hearings on S. 2025 before the House Committee on Military Affairs, April 15, 1942, shows conclusively that these few Regular officers were inadvertently left out by striking the words "heretofore or" from the provision as originally offered by Commander Hopwood, United States Navy. They are unquestionably entitled to be included and its enactment will correct a longstanding inequity.

(b) A full legal justification for the enactment of this section 8 is contained in appendix "A" attached hereto, pages A-1 to A-11. (Source: Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 and the Career Compensation Act of 1949.)

SERVICE SCHOOL TIME

9. (a) The purpose of section 9 is to remove the last known existing inequity in the retired pay of graduates of the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy who, by date of appointment, are entitled to service school time but who are now denied it by administrative ruling and court decision.

(b) The history of this section and its legal justification are contained in Appendix "B" attached hereto, pages B-1 to B-8.

(c) Section 9 has no bearing whatever on the general restoration of credit for service school time which has been the subject of several bills in Congress during the last decade. The sole purpose of section 9 is to affirm a vested right of which the possessor has been illegally divested. (Source: S. 1174; H. R. 540.

SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITY ACT

10. Section 10 amends section 2 of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 (pt. 1, Public Law 23, 82d Cong.) to extend its benefits to Reserve members actually engaged in active duty and active-duty training. Safeguards are provided in the case of persons engaged in inactive-duty training in order to insure that payment will be made only when the death would not have occurred but for such training. Periods of travel to and from active duty and active training duty are also included within the coverage, as is travel to and from inactive-duty training when such travel is by Government or other authorized mode of transportation. The Servicemen's Indemnity Act now covers most Reserves on active duty or active training duty but members of the National Guard or the Air National Guard are covered when performing such duty for 14 days or more. It also covers Reserve flyers performing weekend flying training. Other Reserves performing short periods of training duty who are not flyers, such as members of the Naval and Coast Guard Reserve on weekend cruises, are not similarly covered in the event of their death while actually engaged in training activities. This condition under which one group of Reserves receives a benefit which the balance do not will be corrected by this amendment to the Servicemen's Indemnity Act.

(Source: Senate committee print; H. R. 1223; H. R. 5778; DOD 83-89). (NOTE.—Par. 10 of this Explanation is taken almost verbatim from the DOD "Sectional Analysis.")

MISSING PERSONS ACT

11. Section 11 amends section 2 of the Missing Persons Act (50 U. S. C. App. 1002) to the extent that its provisions will cover Reserve members performing full-time training duty, other full-time duty, or inactive-duty training. The conditions which prevails here is similar to that which prevails with respect to the Servicemen's Indemnity Act, and Reserves performing inactive-duty training, such as weekend training cruises, do not receive the benefits of the Missing Persons Act. This inequitable situation will be remedied by the enactment of section 11. (Source: Senate Committee Print; H. R. 1223; H. R. 5778; DOD 83-39.) (Note: Par. 11 of this explanation is taken almost verbatim from the DOD "Sectional Analysis.")

SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF ACT

12. Section 12 amends section 106 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act (50 U. S. C. App. 516) to extend relief granted therein to all Reserves from the date of receipt of orders to active duty but not to exceed 60 days prior to the reporting date. Section 106 now extends to persons entering the Armed Forces of the United States under the Universal Military Training and Service Act and to members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army the benefits of articles I, II, and III thereof from the date of receipt of orders. Thus these persons receive a benefit to which other Reserves are not now entitled. The enactment of section 12 will correct the existing unbalanced situation. (Source: Senate Committee Print; H. R. 1223; H. R. 5778; DOD 83-39.) (Note: Par. 12 of this explanation is taken almost verbatim from the DOD "Sectional Analysis.")

REPEALS

13. Section 13 repeals the laws consolidated in the equalization of benefits bill of 1955.

(Source: Senate Committee Print; DOD 83-39.)

SAVING PROVISION

14. Section 14 is the usual provision saving existing legal rights. It consolidates title 10, United States Code, sections 456-2; title 32, United States Code, section 160c; and title 34, United States Code, section 855c-4.

(Source: Senate Committee Print: DOD 83-39.)

APPROPRIATION

15. Section 15 provides for payments of the benefits provided for by the equalization of benefits bill of 1955.

(Source: Senate committee print; H. R. 1223; H. R. 5778; DOD 83-39.)

CONCLUSION

16. In view of the critical international situation, which bids fair to continue well into the future, it is absolutely essential that the United States have a large well-trained Reserve and National Guard, and not depend on untrained draftees in an emergency. In order to have such an effective defense, its members, both active and retired, must know that they will not be at a personal disadvantage compared to the Regulars or subjected to discriminatory practices by the administrative agencies. The Congress has, from time to time, passed many laws with the expressed intent of putting Regulars and Reserves on a par, but the agencies executing these laws have not always carried out that intent. It is only through experience with adverse rulings that such deflections are exposed and remedial legislation can be drafted. The importance of this bill is attested by the fact that literally thousands of families throughout the country have one or more members either in the Reserve or National Guard, or eligible for membership. Its impact as law will have far-reaching effect.

POLICY AND PROCEDURE IN CONNECTION WITH CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS MADE BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes. The bill is cosponsored by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from

Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and myself. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1644) to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for Mr. KILGORE and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

The Federal Construction Contract bill which I introduced today is similar in principle to S. 848, which was pending in the last Congress. It is intended to accomplish the same purpose. In form, however, it is a drastic revision. It is greatly simplified, designed to eliminate controversy and to meet the wishes of the entire construction industry as well as the Federal agencies concerned.

The purpose of the bill is to improve the existing procedures and practices in connection with the letting of Federal construction contracts and put the Federal Government's operations in this regard on a more efficient basis.

Prudent private owners, in letting construction contracts, use one of several alternative methods to assure that there will be active competition for the mechanical subcontract work involved which accounts for nearly one-half of the total cost and to assure that the contract price to them reflects such competition and the final low subcontract costs. Many private companies do this by requiring the prime contractors to submit in their bids the names of the mechanical specialty subcontractors, if any, they intend to use. This is the procedure proscribed by the bill introduced.

Of course the bill relates only to Federal construction contracts. It simply provides that the prime contractor shall list subcontractors of his choice in his bid and the prime contractor is free to change these subcontractors at any time with the consent of the Government.

There are in the bill provisions permitting waiver of the procedure by the agency head in the event of an exigency which would warrant waiver and ample provisions to protect the Government from any involvement with the subcontractors. The bill does not affect vast development and reclamation projects with respect to which the agencies may wish to adopt a different procedure.

In addition to increasing competition for subcontractors, and giving the Government the benefit of the lower cost thereof, this system will tend to eliminate or curb the unfair trade practice of "bid-shopping" which plagues the entire construction industry, contractors and subcontractors alike.

The urgent necessity for this legislation is found in the present conditions in the contracting industry. Today the percentage of the cost of construction involved in mechanical work is very much higher and it is rapidly increasing. This work has become highly technical and complex and the prime contractors do not ordinarily perform this work and cannot ordinarily estimate it. Thus, they submit their bids to the Government based on subbids they receive. At present it is all too frequent that these subbids are not truly competitive. Too few bids are received and they are not the final low price. If the Government is to receive full value for its construction dollar it must let its contracts on a basis which will assure active competitive subbidding and the negotiation of final subcontractor prices prior to the award of contracts.

Among the prudent private owners that accomplish this result by the method proscribed for the Federal Government in this bill are such efficient concerns as General Electric, DuPont, Dow Chemical, Packard, United States Steel, Colgate-Palmolive-Peet, Public Service of New Jersey, and Celanese Corporation of America. The result has been a substantial savings in construction costs.

The savings on Federal construction could be as high as $300 million a year.

I feel very strongly that the Federal Government should adopt this modern businesslike procedure to keep its tremendous annual construction costs to a minimum.

EXTENSION OF RIGHTS OF CERTAIN HOLDERS OF MORTGAGE PURCHASE CONTRACTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit certain holders of mortgage purchase contracts with the Federal National Mortgage Association to exercise their rights under such contracts for additional periods of not to exceed 90 days. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Washington may proceed.

The bill (S. 1645) to permit certain holders of mortgage purchase contracts with the Federal National Mortgage Association to exercise their rights under such contracts for additional periods of not to exceed 90 days, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has introduced a similar bill.

Apparently realtors and home-construction companies in my State, as well as elsewhere, have purchased many certificates from "Fannie May" which have an expiration date of 1 year and are now expiring. I have received many communications with respect to the matter, and I am sure the committee also has received many communications. It is said that by reason of long delays in FHA, some delays being over 3 or 4 months, the companies holding the certificates will not be able to use them.

My bill proposes an extension of 90 days, because some of the certificates expire on the 1st of April, or shortly thereafter, in order that these people may take advantage of it. I understand that "Fannie May" has reluctantly granted this extra time. A survey now in progress on this point may develop some information.

Housing has had an extra spurt this year, and the companies engaged in this activity should certainly have an opportunity to use their certificates. I had hoped that the committee in charge of the matter would accept either the 90-day delay or a year's delay.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that on March 28 I introduced a bill, S. 1575, and at the same time made a short statement with reference to the need of the proposed legislation.

I fully agree with what the distinguished senior Senator from Washington has said. I wish to make one other suggestion to him, if I may.

In introducing the bill I provided for a 1-year duration, because I do not think any danger will accrue by allowing 1 year. It is really a period in which to redeem. This is what is called a one-for-one program.

In other words, when the original bill was passed, we said to the people interested in the building industry, "If you will buy mortgages now from Fannie May"—the Federal National Mortgage Association had the mortgages for sale—"then Fannie May will give you a commitment at a future time to buy back an identical amount from you."

It was an administrative matter as to how long the period for redemption would run, and the Administrator simply terminated the redemptions at the end of 1 year.

I think the period should be long enough to permit all who make purchases within 1 year to have an opportunity to redeem them. That is the reason why I introduced the bill providing for 1 year. I think it is a good measure.

I wrote a letter to the Administrator, the Honorable Albert Cole, calling his attention to the fact that he could correct the situation administratively, and that I hoped he would do so; but, if not, I certainly hoped the Senate would enact legislation, because I think not only would it be good, so far as the housing program is concerned, but would also be doing only what Congress promised to do, namely, to redeem its pledge.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

INCREASED EFFICIENCY OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation has been requested by the Department of Commerce. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter and a statement of purpose and need in support of the bill furnished to me by the Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1647) to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes, introduced

by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Department recommends to the Congress for its consideration the attached draft of a proposed bill to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes.

There is also attached a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to submission to the Congress of this proposed draft legislation.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO INCREASE THE EFFICIENCY OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The proposed legislation has two distinct purposes: First, to amend existing law to reflect current needs and practices, and second, to repeal several laws which are no longer valid or useful. The various proposals are set forth in detail in the following analysis by section:

ANALYSIS BY SECTION

Section 1 corrects a provision in present legislation (33 U. S. C. 862) by which commissioned officers and field employees are prohibited from making allotments from their pay while stationed in the District of Columbia. This prohibition causes inconvenience and occasions unnecessary clerical work in the case of officers and field personnel temporarily assigned to Washington, particularly as regards allotments for payment of National Service Life Insurance premiums.

Section 2 (a). The titles "Aid," "Junior Hydrographic and Geodetic Engineer," and "Hydrographic and Geodetic Engineer" are no longer used. Under section 2 of the act of June 3, 1948 (62 Stat. 297; 33 U. S. C. 853a) officers are commissioned in the Coast and Geodetic Survey in grades from ensign to captain and in relative rank with officers of the Navy. The requirement for proof of mental and physical fitness for appointment or promotion is retained. The proposed amendment contains no substantive change and conforms with present promotion policies.

Section 2(b) clears up an ambiguity occasioned by earlier legislation to the effect that officers transferred to the War or Navy Departments shall rank "with and after" officers of their equivalent grades in those services. The Judge Advocate General of the Army has found it necessary to construe this wording literally. As a result, an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey serving in the Armed Forces always remains at the bottom of his grade regardless of the date of his commission, and officers of the Army and Navy promoted to his grade subsequent to him immediately supersede him in precedence. The amendment will permit recognition of the qualifications and experience of an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey serving with the military forces, where assignments are predicated on seniority in grade and lineal list number. The War Department has suggested that remedial legislation be obtained. The titles of "hydrographic and geodetic engineer," "junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer," and "aid," used in the act of May 22, 1917, have been displaced by titles of rank relative with officers of the Navy in subsequent legislation. The pay stipulated in the act of May 22, 1917, has been changed by legislation affecting all commissioned services.

Section 3(a) authorizes the crediting to commissioned officers of service as deck officer and junior engineer for purposes of promotion. Present law authorizes the crediting of all such service for purposes of pay, allowances, retirement, and retirement pay, but only service in excess of 1 year as deck officer and junior engineer is creditable for promotion purposes. The practice of requiring a probationary period of 6 months as deck officer has been abandoned and newly-appointed officers are commissioned as ensigns immediately. Deck officer or junior engineer service is the equivalent of service as ensign in all respects. Officers in both grades receive the same assignments and perform the same type of duty.

Section 3(b): Under present law the assistant director is appointed without specification as to term of office. The proposed amendment would authorize a 4-year term of office and permit reappointment for further periods of 4 years each. This is in line with the law governing the appointment of the director of the bureau. Provision is also made for automatic termination of the assistant director's appointment at an earlier date in the event that a new director is appointed.

The second proviso of the section is further amended by deleting the clause "and the authorized number of ensigns shall be decreased accordingly." The maximum number of commissioned officers on the active list is fixed in the annual appropriation act. As presently written this section could be interpreted to force the discharge of an ensign when and if the director or assistant director reverted to a permanent grade, although this is not the intent of the law. Since the maximum number of active duty officers is fixed in other law, there appears to be no need for this restriction.

Section 4 (a) adds to the law a provision for promotion of ensigns after 2 years of service when vacancies exist in the next higher grade. This service has no provision for temporary promotions, as other commissioned services have, except in time of war when temporary promotions may be made to fill vacancies caused by transfer of officers to the military services. The competition for well-qualified graduate engineers is very keen. The necessity for some additional incentive to induce our ensigns to remain in the service is apparent. The law prohibits the promotion of ensigns until 3 years of creditable service have been completed. This prohibition is a severe deterrent to recruitment of junior officers.

Section 4 (b). The law contains no specific provision for original appointments as ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey. The proposed amendment inserts the words "appointment in and" before the word "promotions" at the beginning of the section. As amended, the law will conform with present practices.

Section 5 (1): This statute was enacted on June 17, 1844. At that time officers of the Navy were assigned to duty on hydrographic surveys and officers of the Army were employed on topographic surveys. Such assignments were made at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury. No Army officers have been assigned to such duty since 1861 and no Navy officer has been so assigned since 1898. While repeal of this act would cancel the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to request assignment of Army and Navy officers to survey duty, the act of July 10, 1832 (4 Stat. 571; 33 U. S. C. 884) gives the President the power to employ "all persons in the land and naval service of the United States" in the execution of the statutes relating to the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Section 5 (2). This act is a corollary to section 4687 R. S. and provides for payment of subsistence to officers of the Army or Navy when assigned to duty with the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Other law (the Career Compensation Act of 1949) provides an adequate legal basis for payment of such allowances.

Section 5 (3). The annual report of the Coast and Geodetic Survey has not been printed in quarto form since 1912. The report to Congress submitted annually by the Secretary of Commerce contains a full statement of all expenditures made under the direction of the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey (33 U. S. C. 883) and a brief summary of the work done by the bureau during the year covered by the report. Reference is made to the Comptroller General's decision No. B109771 dated October 17, 1952.

Section 5 (4): With the granting of independence to the Philippine Islands all responsibility for surveys in the islands was assumed by the new republic. Coast and Geodetic Survey officers are no longer assigned to duty in the Philippines; therefore, the law is no longer of use.

Section 5 (5): Section 5 of the Act of August 6, 1947 (61 Stat. 788; 33 U. S. C. 883e) contains sufficient authority for the Director to enter into cooperative agreements of this nature with any State. The surveys required under the Act of March 9, 1909, have been completed.

ESTIMATE OF COSTS

Section 4 (a): Pay and allowances for commissioned officers would be increased $549.12 for each ensign promoted to lieutenant (j. g.) at the end of 2 years.

All other sections of the bill are for the purpose of improving administrative procedures only, and no additional costs are involved. Some small savings will be realized through elimination of complications in accounting work on allotments of pay.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT, RELATING TO PROTESTS OF GRANTS OF INSTRUMENTS OF AUTHORIZATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Federal Communications Commission I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 309 of the Communications Act of 1934, in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization without hearing.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Commission explaining the purpose of the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1648) to amend section 309 of the Communications Act of 1934, in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization without hearing, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1955.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission wishes to recommend for the consideration of the Congress a proposed amendment to section 309 (c) of the Communications Act

of 1934, as amended. A proposed bill is attached as an appendix to this letter. The objective of the proposed legislation is to clarify the so-called protest rule contained in section 309 (c) which was incorporated into the Communications Act by the Communications Act Amendments, 1952, 66 Stat. 711, so as to obviate the use of the new procedure as a device for delaying radio station grants which are in the public interest while at the same time retaining the rule's primary objective of providing interested parties with a means by which they may bring to the Commission's attention bona fide questions concerning grants made without hearing. The Commission proposed a bill to amend section 309 (c) in the 83d Congress. It was introduced in that Congress as H. R. 7795, but no action on the bill was taken.

Section 309 (c) now provides that all authorizations granted without a hearing shall remain subject to protest by any "party in interest" for a 30-day period. The protest must show that the protestant is a party in interest and must specify with particularity the facts relied on to sustain the protest. Within 30 days from the date of filing of a protest, the Commission must determine whether the protest meets these requirements. If the Commission so finds, it is directed to set the application involved for hearing on the issues specified in the protest as well as such additional issues as the Commission may prescribe. The protestant has the burden of proof and the burden of proceeding with the evidence on issues set forth in his protest and not specifically adopted by the Commission. The Commission is directed to expedite protest hearing cases, and the effective date of the Commission's action protested is to be postponed until the Commission's decision after hearing, unless the particular authorization is necessary to the maintenance or conduct of an existing service.

The protest rule has resulted in substantial delays in the construction and operation of new television or radio stations authorized by the Commission without hearing. For any "party in interest" may file a protest and the term "party in interest" has been held by the courts to include existing stations in the same service as the grantee who might be adversely affected economically by the grant. In addition, relevant court decisions appear to indicate that stations in other services or other persons who might suffer economic injury as a result of competition afforded by the new stations would be parties in interest entitled to protest. Furthermore, if the protestant shows himself to be a party in interest and details his objections to the grant, one interpretation of the present statute is that the Commission is required to designate the application for hearing on the issues specified in the protest and cannot dispose of the protest, as on demurrer, on the pleadings. The Commission has taken the position that where it finds that the matters raised by the protest would not require the grant to be set aside, even if the factual allegations are assumed to be proven, the protest may be disposed of on the pleadings or, where substantial legal questions are involved, after oral argument on the legal issues, without designating the application for a full evidentiary hearing. However, it is recognized that the present language of section 309 (c) leaves in doubt the Commission's authority to dispose of a protest on the basis of the pleadings or after oral argument. It is believed that the statute would be amended so as to make clear that the Commission has authority to demur to the pleadings, in order to insure that it would not be necessary to hold evidentiary hearings which could serve no useful purpose and which would therefore be contrary to the public interest by delaying the initiation of a new or improved radio service. Such hearings, it should be indicated, not only delay the effectiveness of the particular authorization involved but also occupy the time and efforts of members of the Commission's limited staff who could otherwise be utilized in connection with other proceedings, including necessary hearings involving competitive television applications.

There is also some question under the present language of section 309 (c) as to whether the Commission must, in designating a protest for hearing, include the precise issues which the protestant has set forth regardless of the manner in which such issues have been drafted by the protestant. The Commission has held that where the protestant's issues are drawn too broadly or include matters not covered by the facts relied on, it has the authority to redraft the issues to reflect accurately the substantive matters raised in the protest. Here again, however, the Commission's authority is not entirely free from doubt, and a clarifying amendment to the statute is considered appropriate.

As indicated above, the final provision of section 309 (c) makes it mandatory for the Commission, once a protest has been granted, to postpone the effective date of the Commission's action to which protest is made until the effective date of the Commission's decision after the hearing on the protest. The only exception to this mandatory stay provision is when the authorization protested is necessary to the maintenance or conduct of an existing service, in which event the Commission may authorize the use of the facilities in question pending the Commission's decision after hearing. This has required staying the effectiveness of all authorizations for new facilities when protests have been granted, despite the fact that in some instances the public interest clearly required that the authorization remain in effect and the new series be inaugurated pending the outcome of the protest hearing. It is believed that an amendment is necessary which would give the Commission discretion to deny a stay in those cases where it can find on the record that the public interest clearly requires such action.

In order to obviate these difficulties the enclosed proposal would amend section 309 (c) to make clear that while any party in interest could protest a grant of a permit made without hearing, such protest would not automatically result in staying the effectiveness of the grant or require a hearing regardless of the merits of the claims advanced by the protestant. Instead, the proposed new language would provide that within 30 days of the filing of such a protest the Commission, upon consideration of the protest, and any reply thereto, would issue a decision as to the legal sufficiency of the protest as to standing and the particularity of the matters alleged as grounds for setting aside the grant. In the event the Commission finds in the affirmative as to these matters, it would be required to designate the application for hearing upon issues relating to all matters raised in the protest, except that the Commission could exclude such matters as to which it finds that, even if the facts alleged by the protestant were proven, they would not constitute grounds for setting aside the grant. The amendment further provides that if a protest is designated for hearing, the effective date of the grant shall be postponed, unless the authorization is necessary for the continuation of an existing service, or unless the Commission affirmatively finds, for specified reasons, that the public interest requires the grant to remain in effect. It is believed that the revised language would achieve the apparent objective of the protest rule in affording interested parties an opportunity to bring to the attention of the Commission questions about grants made without hearing and to obtain a determination thereon. At the same time, it would avoid the utilization of the protest rule as a device for delay on the part of competitors.

The Commission, therefore, recommends that section 309 (c) should be amended as set forth in the attached proposed bill. The submission of this proposal to the Congress has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. If there is any further information concerning this matter which the Commission can furnish, please do not hesitate to let us know. There are also attached the separate views of Commissioner Doerfer concerning this matter.

GEORGE C. MCCONNAUGHEY,
Chairman.

SEPARATE VIEWS OF COMMISSIONER JOHN C. DOERFER

Commissioner Doerfer believes that section 309 (c) of the Communications Act should be repealed in its entirety. It is inconsistent with the philosophy of the act which seeks to provide for the public interest within the framework of competition.

"Plainly it is not the purpose of the act to protect a licensee against competition, but to protect the public. Congress intended to leave competition in the business of broadcasting where it found it, to permit a licensee who was not interfering electrically with other broadcasters to survive or succumb according to his ability to make his programs attractive to the public." (The *Sanders* case (309 U. S. 470 (1940)).)

Experience has shown that section 309 (c) demands an undue amount of Commission time, is used primarily for delay by competitors, and accomplishes no useful purpose. In effect, it creates two attorneys general to protect the public interest, the FCC, and private parties. Governmental agencies are established upon the theory that they are competent and conscientious to protect the public interest. There is no more need for two attorneys general in such matters than for two district attorneys in a criminal case.

If the Commission, through inadvertence, illegality, or impropriety, makes a grant, all that is necessary to protect the public interest is to call the Commission's attention to the facts and to submit evidence or indicate a source of probative evidence to protect the public interest. Misfeasance, if any, on the part of the Commission should be dealt with directly, not by the creation of an official kibitzer. The idea that the public should be denied a service pending selfish and self-serving maneuvers by competitors is wholly foreign to the American concept of administrative agencies. These were created primarily to expedite matters. Section 309 (c) is an obstruction to the prompt expedition of many matters before the Federal Communications Commission. To illustrate: Recently out of 1,400 minutes of deliberation by 7 members of the Commission 397 minutes were spent considering protest matters, or a total of 28 percent of full Commission time. This constitutes a demand for an undue proportion of time on matters which eventually prove to contribute little, if anything, to the protection of the public interest.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938, RELATING TO IMPOSITION OF CIVIL PENALTIES IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases.

This proposed legislation is introduced at the request of the Civil Aeronautics Board. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter from Chairman Rizley transmitting a state-

ment of the purpose and need for the legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1649) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, March 21, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Civil Aeronautics Board recommends to the Congress for its consideration the attached draft of a proposed bill "To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases."

The Board has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ROSS RIZLEY,
Chairman.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, SO AS TO AUTHORIZE THE IMPOSITION OF CIVIL PENALTIES IN CERTAIN CASES

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to provide a statutory tool for the more effective enforcement of the provisions of title IV of the Civil Aeronautics Act and of the Board's economic orders and regulations issued thereunder and under section 1002 (i) of the act. At the present time violations of these provisions are subject to criminal prosecution under section 902 (a) of the act. This sanction is an effective deterrent in serious cases involving knowing and willful violations. With respect to many cases of minor infractions, violations of a less serious nature, and actions falling short of knowing and willful misconduct, the conventional criminal proceedings are either too drastic, too cumbersome, or altogether inappropriate. It is in acting upon these less serious but more numerous violations that the Board believes it could avail itself of the remedy of civil penalties in a constructive manner toward improving the enforcement program. The following will serve to illustrate some of the results which could be expected:

1. The right to compromise civil penalties would afford a flexible remedy enabling the Board to adapt the severity of the sanction to the offense.

2. Light civil penalties could be used effectively to discourage violations which individually are so minor as not to justify the time and effort involved in a formal proceeding or court action, but which in their cumulative effect hamper the exercise of the Board's regulatory functions. In the majority of cases, the defendant can be expected to pay the civil penalty or agree to an acceptable compromise of it, and the device would effectively serve its purpose. In the relatively few instances in which a refusal to compromise can be expected, court action would, of course, still be necessary.

3. The availability of the remedy of civil penalties would enable the Board to attack violations speedily and avoid situations such as have existed in the past where offenders have been able to persist in violations during the time required to prosecute a formal proceeding or court action. Of course, the same limitation on their effectiveness noted under item No. 2, above, with respect to cases in which there is a refusal to compromise would also apply here.

4. The availability of the remedy of civil penalties would afford an adequate remedy as a substitute for criminal action except in serious cases where willful and knowing violations involving the necessary degree of criminal responsibility may be established. Moreover, the imposition of civil penalties would, in many cases, have a salutary effect comparable to that of criminal penalties without subjecting the offender to the serious stigma which follows imposition of criminal penalties.

The modifications proposed in existing sections 901 (a) and 902 (a) of the act have been drafted primarily for the purpose of making available this additional sanction. The changes to section 901 (a), in addition, incorporate amendments effected by Reorganization Plans III and IV of 1940, and Reorganization Plan V of 1950. In regard to section 902 (a), only such changes have been made to retain the status quo with respect to criminal penalties as are made necessary in view of the amendment of section 901 (a).

The proposed legislation further authorizes the Board to compromise any civil penalties so imposed for violations of title IV or the regulations issued thereunder.

There would seem to be no doubt that the existence of the power in the Board to seek civil penalties and to compromise in the economic field much as is now done by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics in the safety field would be a substantial aid to the Board's economic enforcement activities.

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, when the bill dealing with the increase in judges' salaries and the salaries of Members of Congress was before the Committee on the Judiciary, there was some suggestion that there should be included an adjustment of the salaries of referees in bankruptcy. It was my feeling then, however, in the first place, that only the subject matters which were in the Segal Commission report should be considered in connection with the bill; and, secondly, that the Judicial Conference which has peculiar jurisdiction over salaries and other matters relating to referees in bankruptcy, should have an opportunity to consider that subject before any legislation was introduced.

The Judicial Conference has met, and has made some recommendations to the adjustment of salaries of referees in bankruptcy, and a bill has been introduced by the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York. In order to bring this subject before the Judiciary Committee and the Senate, I am introducing a similar bill, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1652) to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase salaries for part-time and full-time referees, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 13 ENTITLED "OUR CAPITOL"

Mr. CLEMENTS submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 300,000 copies of Senate Document No. 13, 84th Congress entitled "Our Capitol," of which 100,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 200,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

TRANSFER OF UNITED NATIONS NARCOTICS DIVISION FROM NEW YORK CITY TO GENEVA, SWITZERLAND

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, a great many people who are concerned about the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs are very much disturbed by the proposal of the Secretary General of the United Nations that the Narcotics Division of the United Nations be transferred from New York City to Geneva, Switzerland. The United States is the world's chief victim of illegal international traffic in narcotic drugs. The pressure of world public opinion is one of the major weapons which the United Nations has in its attempts to stamp out narcotic traffic. So long as the U. N. Narcotics Division remains in New York it is in the spotlight, with full publicity on all its work. If the U. N. Narcotics Division is moved to Geneva, away from other major U. N. activities, its effectiveness will be greatly reduced. Because of the seriousness of this matter, it is believed that the United States Senate should go on public record in strong opposition to the proposed transfer.

On behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and myself, I submit a resolution to express the opposition of the Senate to the proposed transfer of the United Nations Narcotics Division from New York City to Geneva, Switzerland, and request that the resolution be appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 87), submitted by Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. DANIEL, and Mr. KUCHEL) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Secretary General of the United Nations has indicated his intention to transfer the Narcotic Division of the United Nations from New York City to Geneva; and

Whereas many international narcotic treaties are being ably administered by the United Nations in New York City in a stupendous effort to halt the diabolical narcotic smuggling activities; and

Whereas it is of vital importance to retain the Narcotic Division at the New York City headquarters of the United Nations to maintain the full force of publicity and public opinion on this vile traffic: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Senate strongly oppose the transfer of the Narcotics Division of the United Nations from New

York City to Geneva, Switzerland. Copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the Secretary of State for transmission to the Secretary General of the United Nations.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON THE MISSOURI RIVER (S. DOC. NO. 31)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated July 27, 1954, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of a report on the Missouri River, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Extract from letter written by the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Representative from the 18th District of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. PAYNE:

Article on John F. Stevens and the Panama Canal.

By Mr. IVES:

A short summary of the accomplishments of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SO-CALLED BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I understand that unanimous consent was given for the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary to sit this afternoon while the Senate is in session. I wish to give notice that immediately following the Easter recess the same committee will start hearings on the so-called Bricker amendment. The subcommittee hopes to complete the hearings in a reasonably short time thereafter.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to thank the Senator from Tennessee for that statement. He assured me yesterday that that would be done.

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, 6 years ago next Monday, April 4, in our Capital City of Washington, 12 nations signed the North Atlantic Treaty, thus initiating one of the most successful experiments in collective defense and international cooperation ever undertaken by man.

Since that day in 1949, Greece and Turkey have acceded to the North Atlantic Treaty. And today it is especially fitting that the Senate of the United States should be about to consider the entrance of the Federal Republic of West Germany into the NATO family.

This sixth anniversary also marks a great milestone in the development of peaceful and cooperative relations between those two historic rivals of Europe, Germany and France. Thus the causes for celebration are especially great this year.

The dangers from the Communist East remain great. But with the progress over the last 6 years in building a strong and peaceful Atlantic and European community, we can truthfully say that at no time since the end of World War II has there been such confidence in our ability to meet those dangers.

And so as we commemorate the birth of NATO, I think it is altogether fitting that we rededicate ourselves to the principles set forth on April 4, 6 years ago, principles for which we will, if necessary, fight.

The great hope for all free men is that as a result of working together in the cause of peace and liberty, we may not have to take up arms and resort to war again.

We remain today firm believers in those words written 6 years ago when 12 great nations reaffirmed "their faith in the purposes and principles of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments," and when these same nations agreed "to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law."

IMMIGRATION AND WORLD FOOD PROBLEMS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, quite naturally many Christian people in this country are disturbed by the fact that we have unmanageable surpluses of food while some 800 million or more people in the world go to bed hungry every night.

The two solutions for this problem most frequently proposed are for us to let more people come to this country to share our resources, or to share our surplus food with them by giving it away or selling it abroad at reduced rates.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article prepared for publication in a British periodical by two scholarly American writers, Dr. Fairfield Osborn, president of the Conservation Foundation, and Dr. Kingsley Davis, professor of sociology at the University of Columbia.

In this article, titled "United States Immigration and Food Exports in Relation to World Population Problems," the authors explain clearly why there is no prospect that the United States will absorb enough immigrants or export enough food to really solve the problems of overpopulation or lack of food in the underdeveloped countries of the world.

They point out that this country has accepted more immigrants than any other nation in the world. From 1820 to 1947 we took in a number close to the present population of France. In the peak period of our immigration, from 1902 to 1914, we received around a million a year. Now, however, the world's population is growing at the rate of 30 million a year, and if we took one-fifth of the total, or 6 million a year, for the next 10 years, it would result in an increase of around 50 percent in our population without beginning to solve the problem of overcrowded countries.

With respect to feeding the world, the article points out that huge as our wheat surplus seems to us, if the entire surplus of our 1953 crop were donated to just one country, India, it would be absorbed there in a single year. Other figures are given which make it obvious that while we can help from time to time in preventing acute starvation in various parts of the world and in assisting in such emergencies as existed at the end of World War II, our best efforts would make only a small contribution to relief of undernourishment throughout the world.

I commend this article to Members of the Senate at this time, particularly in view of the fact that two resolutions were introduced this week proposing an international food and raw materials reserve plan. I am not prepared at this time to pass upon the merits of such a plan, but the facts cited by Dr. Osborn and Dr. Davis make it obvious that there are limitations on the effectiveness of these proposals, and many complications might result from the effort to transfer our surplus food to those who have no present means of paying for it.

I am convinced that setting up a world food bank, to which, as to the present International Monetary Fund, the United States would be expected to become the major contributor, is less urgent than perfecting the program we already have started of technical assistance to backward nations. We must teach them to supply larger proportions of their own needs for food and other essentials of life, and we must help them acquire means of earning dollars with which to pay for the surpluses which we can furnish.

Then we can deal with them as partners in a free world, and not in the role of a benevolent Pharoah passing out in lean years the substance accumulated in our granary in fat years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION AND FOOD EXPORTS IN RELATION TO WORLD POPULATION PROBLEMS

(By Fairfield Osborn, president of the Conservation Foundation; and Kingsley Davis, professor of sociology in the University of Columbia)

The blessings of wealth, economic strength, and general prosperity impose obligations upon a nation as they do upon an individual. Although critics of the United States would probably deny it, it seems fair to say that the American people as a whole not only are conscious of their good fortune, but realize that their extremely favorable position in the world places unique responsibilities upon them.

There is no question that the United States is widely looked upon as having an obligation to solve, or rather to help solve, many of the world's problems.

It is frequently thought, for instance, that the United States can and should contribute toward resolving the world's population problem in two ways: First, by accepting more immigrants, and secondly, by providing food to people living in great want in other parts of the world. These two ideas stem from an implied sense of justice in the light of certain assumed facts.

As to immigration, there is a common impression abroad that the United States is sparsely populated and in view of its tremendous resources should admit immigrants in large numbers from crowded lands. At the same time, it is also thought that the United States, because of its present surpluses of grain and other foodstuffs, should somehow make these surpluses available to the hungry peoples of the world.

Such judgments of moral obligations and of material conditions seem, at first glance, simple and straightforward. However, as soon as facts and assumed consequences are carefully considered many complications and obstacles become evident. It is therefore imperative to explore the two courses of action proposed for the United States, both of which involve basic policies and both of which, if adopted, would prove to a large degree irrevocable. For example, once immigration had occurred on a sizable scale, it would be most difficult to reverse the trend or to escape its unanticipated consequences. The same holds true of a foreign food-distribution policy if its practice should injure the productive resource base in some essential way. In considering these questions let us begin first with that of food export.

The pressing need of the world for more food is only too apparent. At least two-thirds of the world's people cannot obtain enough calories to maintain normal standards of health and efficiency and of this proportion extremely large numbers are perilously near actual starvation. There are various reasons for this widespread deficiency in food, but none of them is more significant than population growth itself. The capacity of people to multiply, even though they are inadequately nourished, is in many senses a regrettable fact, for such multiplication of human numbers directly results in perpetuating low levels of food supply. The greatest area of food deficiency, though far from being the only one, is Asia, containing over half the world's people. The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization's report for 1953 is unquestionably justified in stating that: "With its immense population the Far East remains the center of the world's food problem." It should not be thought, however, that the problem is peculiar to the Far East alone, because it is shared to a considerable extent by peoples in the Near East, by peoples in Africa, and even by people in the Western Hemisphere.

In economically advanced countries, however, the picture is different because in them the trend has long been toward a more balanced and healthful diet. In fact, even since World War II, the gap in agricultural production between the more and the less productive regions of the earth has tended to increase. In view of this, the question is raised, why not transfer the surpluses of the one to meet the deficiencies of the other?

Let us first take a specific case and consider the question in terms of magnitude. The United States in 1952 produced 35.2 million metric tons of wheat. Most of this was used domestically, but from July 1 of that year to July 1 of the following, 8.7 million tons were exported and at the end of that period, namely, July 1, 1953, there were still 15.2 million metric tons on hand. A principal reason for such a surplus, however, was the price support program of the Government, which had pegged wheat at 90 percent of parity. There is small doubt that without this support the price of wheat would have sagged considerably and that farmers would have reduced the area devoted to wheat crops. Indeed, the production allotments for the following year called for a 20-percent reduction in wheat acreage, precisely because of the large surpluses.

It must be commented here that this over-encouragement of wheat production contains a distinct threat to the sustained productivity of croplands in our country. Because of guaranteed high prices large amounts of marginal lands, more suitable for light grazing, have been converted to grain production which can only result ultimately in deterioration of the land, and even in its permanent injury.

Assuming, nevertheless, that contemporary wheat surpluses could be maintained over a long period of years, even these, despite their size, would make but a small dent in world food deficiencies. One Asian country alone, namely India, could absorb the entire 1953 surplus in a year. Its estimated deficit in food grains in 1956, according to the draft outline of the 5-year plan, was computed to be 7 million tons. However, this estimated deficit assumes a continuing consumption at the 1950 level, one far below any desirable standard. If its level of consumption were brought up to a satisfactory standard of 16 ounces per day per adult, the deficit for 1956 has been estimated at 15.8 million tons. This example illustrates the fact that the United States, even if it actually were feasible to transport and finance the movement of such large quantities of grain, could barely supply India alone with enough to raise its level of food consumption.

It is improbable that the United States in the face of increasing demands from its own rapidly growing population will continue to have wheat surpluses as large as those of recent years. Even though it should, it would merely indicate potential exports sufficient to maintain approximately 165 million people at a level of wheat consumption equivalent to that in this country today. In face of the fact that the world population is presently increasing by more than 30 million people a year, American wheat exports at best would prove immaterial as far as filling the world's needs for this grain is concerned.

It so happens that wheat exports have declined considerably since 1949, not so much because of decline in production, but because arrangements could not be concluded for foreign sales at satisfactory prices. In short, the principal limitation on the use of American wheat abroad is the inability of the countries that need it most to pay for it.

This problem of prices and payments involves fundamentals in the entire problem. Obviously, if the undernourished countries of the world were able to pay for enough food to give themselves good diets they would long since have done so. A number of proposals have been made to resolve the question. One of them envisages the establishment of international reserves of buffer stocks, using surpluses during particular years for this purpose, on the assumption that they could be acquired at low prices and could be parceled out to needy countries in subsequent years when there is scarcity and when current prices are high. The costs of carrying large stocks are, however, very great and if the storage and transport charges were not to be met by the needy which ultimately get the reserves, who then would carry them? Another suggestion is that "countries with surplus food stocks" make these available to other countries at reduced prices. This idea seems plausible in view of the fact that certain countries now fix minimum prices of food stocks on domestic markets, frequently as a subsidy to the farmers. The "surplus" therefore does not necessarily mean food unwanted or not needed by the home population but simply the food that cannot be sold for consumption at the minimum price. In other words, this proposal in effect would contemplate the dumping of food on the international market. It is probable, however, that such "surpluses" would not continue for long because they are uneconomical. Only if governments definitely plan to have surpluses which they could later send to other countries at reduced prices would this idea seem to have significance. However, it must be recognized that such planned surpluses would be costly to the country producing them because its people would not get an adequate return on the capital, land, and manpower used. If, for instance, American wheat farmers were deliberately encouraged to produce more wheat than could be sold profitably on domestic and foreign markets, and if they were guaranteed a fair price on all wheat produced, the rest of the population would obviously have to pay for the wheat sold abroad at a less-than-profitable price.

These two proposals, and others similar to them, if carried out on scales sufficient really to relieve needy countries, would in one way or another involve charity. This raises the question as to what extent, if any, the more productive countries have a moral obligation to furnish food to the less productive countries. Of course we are not speaking here of the desirability and indeed obligation of meeting a local starvation emergency or of relieving a special crisis of human suffering, but are referring to a long continuing program. Assuming that such a program were carried out, it is highly doubtful whether it would result in good in the end. Where population is too dense and growing rapidly, the cause is obviously that reproduction is being engaged in by people without regard to their own and their children's future. This happens, of course, in virtually every country, well-to-do and needy alike. This irresponsibility can be absorbed in a well-to-do country for a time at least, but in a needy country it only results in increased suffering. If people in such countries are relieved from the consequences of their irresponsibility, there is little reason to anticipate they would change their social and family habits regarding childbearing. In effect, the consequences of steadily furnishing food at less than cost of production is more likely to increase the problem rather than resolve it.

All the while, the productive nations themselves have expanding needs. As far as the United States is concerned, it is a striking fact that in the 4 years ending midyear 1954, the population has increased by nearly 11 million, or a rate of growth of 1.7 percent per year, which is faster than the world rate. There is no reason to expect that population growth will level off in the United States in the near future and there is certainly no positive assurance that two decades from now our country will actually have food surpluses for export.

These considerations have been based on the general assumption that future food supplies will be derived principally from agriculture. If this should not prove to be the case, and if large quantities of food should become available from such sources as algae or plankton or yeast, or through other processes, industrially produced, then the present discussion would lose point, for aside from its command of capital, and of scientific and engineering skill, the United States might have no particular advantage in production. Algae and yeast, for example, might be produced at lower costs in wetter and hotter climates, just as rice is more producible in such areas. Also, food might prove so abundant under such circumstances that the entire world population could be well fed for at least another century; and some check more acceptable than undernutrition and malnutrition would intervene to stop population growth. But until such radical departures are utilized, wheat and rice will continue to be the main food staples of the world, and countries with abundant land

resources in relation to human numbers will continue to be the main exporters of food. The other countries will then have to increase their productivity and control their populations in order to have enough to feed their people adequately. If they do neither of these things, they cannot hope to achieve a reasonable level of nourishment through the constant aid of countries like the United States, however much these countries may be willing to aid in particular crises.

IMMIGRATION AND POPULATION PRESSURE

If the world's population problems cannot be adequately solved by transferring food from countries of plenty to countries of scarcity, to what degree might they be ameliorated by migration—in this instance, to the United States?

It is well known that in the past the United States has received more immigrants than any other country in the world. From 1820 to 1947 the official records show that nearly 39 million people migrated to this country—a figure, by the way, close to the entire present population of France. Some of these migrants, it is true, went back to their former countries, but fewer did so than from any other immigrant-receiving country.

The greatest period of immigration did not come when the United States was expanding its agriculture across the continent. It came after the frontier was closed, when the Nation was approaching industrial maturity—that is, in the years 1902–14. During this 13-year period the average number of officially registered immigrants was approximately a million each year.

After World War I the immigrant stream, though substantial, was nevertheless smaller. During the 11 years from 1920 through 1930 the yearly average was 412,000. After that, with the depression and World War II, the figure dropped to a small number each year. Since World War II there has been some recovery, but not to the level known prior to 1930.

Why did immigration to the United States decline? It did so because of stricter laws and adverse economic conditions. If the quota laws had not been passed in the early 1920's the immigrant current during that decade might well have matched that which prevailed from 1902–1914. The depression of the 1930's and World War II later reduced the annual influx to much less than the quota laws would have permitted. The quota laws were passed primarily because the sources of immigration had changed, bringing in types of immigrants which the American public was not prepared to welcome. Further, the feeling grew that the country was full enough and could grow by its own population increase. A contributory cause also sprang from the belief that in wartime some of the foreign-born had shown themselves to be disloyal. Subsequent events have done little to alter these attitudes, nor is it likely that they will.

Yet it should be remembered that the United States is still one of the world's greatest receivers of migrants, the number coming into the country during the 4 years ending midyear of 1953 averaging 222,700 annually. These are not small numbers, especially when it is realized that they do not include a great influx of Puerto Ricans, who are not counted as immigrants, or a considerable number of Mexicans who come in illegally. In recent years the United States has been accommodating far more immigrants than Canada, Australia, Brazil, or Argentina. It can hardly be said that this country has cut off immigration.

COULD INCREASED IMMIGRATION AFFECT WORLD POPULATION PROBLEMS?

At no time has immigration to the United States been sufficient to retard population growth or to alleviate living conditions in other parts of the world. It may have had some such effect on Europe, but only slightly even there. We need to recall that the world's population is growing at a rate of at least 30 million per year, a figure destined to increase steadily during the next few decades, barring a catastrophic war. For purpose of illustration let us assume that the United States took only one-fifth of this increase—say 6 million per year for the next 10 years. Such a number, along with their natural increase, would bring an increment of approximately 80 million in a 10-year period, or a 50-percent increase. Such a tidal wave of people would produce impossible conditions in housing, utilities, sanitation, transportation, and every other aspect of the economy. It would produce intolerable social and educational conditions, for immigrants coming at that rate, presumably from countries where illiteracy is common, could not be assimilated. The United States has had its problems in absorbing waves of immigration in the past; such a tidal wave as presumed here would result in chaos for both resident and newcomer alike. And yet the number admitted would be only one-fifth of the current increase in the world's population.

Any immigration of less than such a large figure each year would hardly affect the world situation. It would minimize but fail to solve the problems of even the countries that furnished most of the migrants. Emigration, like the procurement of food from abroad, is a costly affair. Since it is usually young adults who migrate, the cost of rearing them is borne by the country of emigration, although their productive work is done abroad. In addition, emigrants generally wish to take with them their savings, if they possess any, as well as their skills. Finally, the costs of transporting large numbers of people have to be borne, and since the emigration is presumably for the benefit of the country of origin, that country might well be expected to meet this cost.

The Dutch Government, which has sponsored an "education for migration" program, estimates that every emigrant costs it about $8,000, whereas for the immigration country the same migrant represents working power valued at many times that figure. It has also been remarked that skilled Britishers, many of whom have finished courses in Government training schools and are aircraft and television engineers, readily get good jobs when they emigrate to Commonwealth countries. One writer believes that such emigration means the loss to Britain of one of her most valuable possessions; the cost of their education and training is a heavy charge for the community without any return, since their skills are being exported.

If migration offers little by way of a solution of the world's demographic problems, why is it so often mentioned Why is it thought, for instance, that the United States should admit immigrants on a large scale, even though the solution cannot really be found by such a program?

The answer probably lies in the realm of psychology more than in the realm of objective fact. Migration is much talked about because it is safe to talk about. There are few cultural or religious taboos against it. The most evident way of solving population problems—the reduction of fertility—is not so generally discussed because there still exist presumed moral objections to it. It is as if the regulation of fertility cannot be considered as a means to an end—i. e., a means to bettering the lot of man—because the customs governing man's familial and reproductive behavior are held by many to be ends in themselves, to be preserved even at the cost of poverty and human suffering.

The essence of the situation is clear. Even if all of the surpluses of grain and other foodstuffs of the United States were exported against payment or even gratuitously to the needy countries, such exports would provide but an insignificant portion of what these countries require in bringing their diet standards up to a satisfactory level. In turn, even if the United States should receive the substantial number of migrants cited above, the population pressures presently existing in so many densely populated countries would not be resolved. As a consequence, the only solution to this world problem can be found in a contemporaneous stepup of food production, together with limitation of population growth, region by region and country by country. Consequently, much as the United States may wish to help, its best contribution presumably is the continuance of and even expansion of its technical-assistance programs, either directly or through the United Nations, to less-developed and needy country. The great hope lies in each country developing its own resources and facing its own population problem.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCCUPATION OF HUNGARY BY SOVIET INVADERS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, next Monday, April 4, 1955, will mark the 10th anniversary of the occupation of Hungary by the Soviet invaders. I have prepared a statement pertinent to this significant occasion which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES ON THE OCCASION OF THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCCUPATION OF HUNGARY, APRIL 4, 1955

It is most appropriate for us to join our fellow Americans of Hungarian descent on this day in marking the 10th anniversary of the infamous occupation of Hungary by the Soviet invaders.

The free world will never permit the ruthless subjugation of these gallant people to go unpunished. The legacy of freedom bequeathed by the renowned Louis Kossuth and today carried forward by Cardinal Mindszenty gives renewed courage to those suffering under the domination of the Communist tyranny.

The bonds of friendship between the peoples of Hungary and the United States, fashioned over 100 years ago by Kossuth's visit to these shores, remain strong and enduring.

We stand together in the abiding battle against godless Communist imperialism. I join with all Americans in fervent prayer for the speedy liberation of the brave land of Hungary.

JOSEPH PULITZER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it was with deep regret and sorrow that I heard of the death of one of the great newspapermen of our time—Joseph Pulitzer.

Under his leadership the St. Louis Post-Dispatch became one of the world's great newspapers.

Those of us who believe in a free press know that the flag, now at half-mast on his building, mourns for one who always carried high in his mind and heart the priceless tradition he inherited from his father—that the people should always read the truth.

Those of us who cherished the friendship of Joe Pulitzer also knew that his life and his record of service can be summarized in one word—integrity.

The people of Missouri and the Nation have lost an outstanding citizen and I

have lost a friend who cannot be replaced.

To his family and his associates I extend deepest sympathy at this great loss.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Post and Times Herald, entitled "Joseph Pulitzer."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOSEPH PULITZER

Joseph Pulitzer, who died yesterday at the age of 70, created one of America's great newspapers. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch is one of the most brilliantly edited papers in the country and one of the most successful. It also is one of the most militant. The man primarily responsible for this journalistic achievement was Mr. Pulitzer, a quiet, modest person without show or bluster. At times he seemed out of place on a newspaper that is never quiet and usually is engaged in an impassioned crusade. His genius lay in his ability to pick extraordinary men and to allow them wide latitude in expressing their talents. He was never afraid of a fight or hesitant in printing the news. Near blindness never dulled his interest or his sense of responsibility.

It has been one of the ironies of American journalism that the Post-Dispatch flourished after the other Pulitzer paper, the New York World, died. The first Joseph Pulitzer lavished his attention and interest on the World. He sent Joseph, the second of his three sons, off to St. Louis to work on the Post-Dispatch, which he had purchased in 1878 for $2,500. Like his father, the young editor of the Post-Dispatch devoted the bulk of his attention to the news and editorial departments, and this attention paid rich dividends in the business office.

Likewise, it brought the paper a distinction which few American dailies have achieved. The newspaper itself won five Pulitzer prizes—prizes established by the senior Pulitzer and awarded under the auspices of Columbia University. In addition 4 members of the news staff, 1 editorial writer, and the cartoonist won Pulitzer prizes. But Joseph Pulitzer was never satisfied that the paper was as good as it ought to be, and he was constantly seeking ways to strengthen his staff and to expand the editorial and news coverage. He thus built a notable newspaper and made an impressive contribution to the strength of the American democracy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there may be printed an editorial from the New York Times entitled "Joseph Pulitzer."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOSEPH PULITZER

The death of Joseph Pulitzer yesterday at the age of 70 naturally recalls not only his own achievements but those of his famous father. Two quotations from the elder Pulitzer perhaps tell something about the younger. One is a brief introduction which the father sent to an editor who was about to employ the son. It ran as follows: "This is my son Joseph. Will you try to knock some newspaper sense into his head?" Somebody did knock some newspaper sense into young Joseph's head, for, as editor and publisher for a period of 43 years, he showed an instinct for the newspaper profession and a growing mastery of it.

But Joseph Pulitzer the younger was more than a successful newspaperman. He was a man of conscience and responsibility. He lived up to the words of his father that may still be read in the Post-Dispatch Building in St. Louis: "It (the Post-Dispatch) will always fight for progress and reform, never tolerate injustice or corruption, always fight demagogs of all parties and never belong to any party, always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers, never lack sympathy with the poor, always remain devoted to the public welfare, never be satisfied with merely printing the news, always be drastically independent, never be afraid to attack wrong whether by predatory plutocracy or predatory poverty."

Mr. Pulitzer operated under difficulties in his later years. His eyesight was so defective that, like his father before him, he had to have the news read to him. But this handicap did not diminish his energy and effectiveness. He was a bold and outstanding influence in American journalism. That his paper was a financial success was possibly a tribute to the public's appreciation of good journalistic qualities. Many of us who remembered the old Morning and Evening World of New York found a nostalgic pleasure in turning to the Post-Dispatch. We were never disappointed. We will now hope that the qualities of Joseph Pulitzer the younger will live on even though he is absent.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on the news we have received from St. Louis of the passing of Joseph Pulitzer, the distinguished publisher of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, under the editorship and guidance of Joseph Pulitzer, became a newspaper which was a voice of enlightenment and liberalism not only in Missouri and the Nation, but all over the world.

In my opinion, and I speak now more as a journalist than as a Senator, Joseph Pulitzer contributed to American journalism one of the most necessary requisites in a free press; namely, absolute courage, fearlessness, and integrity.

I think every single citizen of our country, whether he lives in Missouri or in any one of the other 47 States, owes a lasting debt to the distinguished editorship of Joseph Pulitzer, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I should like to read my telegraphic message of today to the journalist in charge of the editorial page of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mr. Irving Dillard. The message is as follows:

APRIL 1, 1955.

IRVING DILLARD,
St. Louis Post-Dispatch,
St. Louis, Mo.:

Joseph Pulitzer was a publisher whose passing will be mourned in Oregon as well as in his own State of Missouri. His interests were never local or provincial. He was a citizen of the whole Nation in the truest sense. He realized that what happened to people and to resources in Oregon or anywhere in the Nation was also of concern to Missouri. The crusades and causes which he directed helped to make all of America a better place. My heartfelt sympathy to his family and to his editorial associates.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

DEATH OF COL. ROBERT R. McCORMICK

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the death of Col. Robert R. McCormick is an inestimable loss to the world. It is a severe personal shock to me.

Colonel McCormick's guiding genius as publisher and businessman perhaps has been unequalled in journalistic history.

His genius was reflected always in the vigorously aggressive editorial policies of the newspapers which he directed. He held firmly, despite what sometimes appeared to be almost insurmountable opposition, to the principles which he sincerely believed to be in the interest of his beloved America.

He was a fighting American. History will record the vast contributions which he made to the growth of America and the stanch advocacy of the princples of America throughout the world.

The world can ill afford to lose men such as Robert R. McCormick.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, by the death of Col. Robert R. McCormick the Nation has lost one of its most outspoken and fearless journalists. I am certain that his influence in public life has been exercised over the years in favor of conservative and basic American traditions. I join Chicago and the Nation in expressing my sincere regret at his passing.

THE ISLANDS OF MATSU AND QUEMOY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as my colleagues know, I have many times, both on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere, publicly pointed out the dangerous situation into which we have permitted ourselves to be maneuvered in the Far East. The situation was brought about by many causes, notably, however, by two developments: (a) The unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek by President Eisenhower, which gave sanction to an attack by the Nationalist forces on the mainland, and (b) the Formosa resolution and the treaty into which we have recently entered with Chiang Kai-shek, whose interests are completely at variance with those of our own country.

There is no question of our moral, legal, and juridical right to defend Formosa; and we are committed to do so on both moral and strategic grounds. There is every reason to believe that many of our allies will support us in defending Formosa and the Pescadores, if they are attacked.

The situation, however, is vastly different with regard to the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. If we permit ourselves to become involved in military operations on these islands or on the Chinese mainland, I believe we shall find ourselves completely isolated, and without any strong allies, either among the European nations or the Asiatic nations. In those circumstances, we shall be compelled to fight an extremely dangerous war quite alone.

The situation in which we find ourselves was very clearly discussed in an excellent editorial published in the New York Times on Thursday, March 31. I ask unanimous consent to have this very interesting editorial printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks. The editorial merits the

most careful consideration of the President, the Congress, and the American people generally.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OFFSHORE ISLANDS

In pursuit of his long-standing policy of seeking peace, President Eisenhower has initiated a new effort to win some kind of settlement, or at least a modus vivendi, with the Communist bloc—a settlement that would banish the specter of nuclear war. This effort, now being organized in cooperation with other Western Powers, takes as its starting point the impending ratification of the Paris pacts. These agreements fortify both Western defenses and Western unity in a manner acceptable to the whole free world and enable us to undertake new negotiations from a position of strength which alone holds any promise of success.

But free-world unity is jeopardized today by growing division and confusion regarding a subsidiary problem of our far-eastern policy, involving the question of whether we shall or shall not defend the Chinese offshore islands of Matsu and Quemoy. There is no longer any question that we shall defend, as we are pledged by treaty to defend, both Formosa and the Pescadores, and that we shall do so with all the means at our disposal. In this policy we have won increasing support from all free nations. But these free nations, including our European allies and neighboring Canada, draw a clear line of distinction between Formosa and the Pescadores, on the one hand, and the offshore islands on the other. They not only decline to support our equivocal stand on the latter, but definitely reject any idea of joining in their defense.

The United States, which pursues a policy of peace in the Formosa Strait, and for that reason presses for a cease fire in that area, has announced that it will not fight for the offshore islands "as such." But, as indicated again by President Eisenhower yesterday, it continues its "flexible" policy regarding their defense in order "to keep the enemy guessing." This is a hazardous game, which may easily tempt the Chinese Communists to test our intentions. This, in turn, raises the danger that once we become involved in the defense of these wholly secondary positions we may be plunged into a major war o fstill unforeseeable consequences. The only thing probable about a war over these particular islands is that we would have to fight it alone.

In these circumstances it is high time to review our policy regarding these islands and clarify our position beyond any doubt or misrepresentation. We believe that such a review and clarification should lead to the decision to abandon the offshore islands and to evacuate the Nationalist troops and the local populations. This would be strictly in line with our treaty obligations, which do not extend to the offshore islands. It would preserve Western unity and assure us the moral support of the free world. It would demonstrate our willingness to preserve peace by putting a hundred miles of blue water between Formosa and the mainland.

There have been from the start only two arguments for the defense of the offshore islands. One, and not a very convincing one, has been their military utility as observation points and positions blockading Communist invasion ports. This argument carried greater weight when the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa stood alone. It does not apply now, when Formosa is protected by the American fleet and when any direct Communist attempt to invade Formosa itself would be met by counter-attacks on the ports and staging areas of the mainland.

The other argument is that an evacuation of the offshore islands would smack of appeasement and thereby impair free Asia's confidence in us and wreck morale on Formosa. There may be some danger of this, but that danger can be met by further aid and additional guarantees to Formosa, and any new declaration concerning the offshore islands should be accompanied by steps toward this end.

Increased aid is already being given and could be further enhanced by stationing American token troops in Formosa to demonstrate our determination to fight for it, if need be. New guarantees could also be sought both through the United Nations and through consultation with our allies, who have indicated that once the offshore island question is settled they would consider joining with us in the defense of Formosa. Aid and guarantees of this kind would do more to bolster Formosan and Asian morale than is now possible under the constant menace of war. To President Eisenhower we look confidently for leadership in this cause.

RESTORATION OF ARMY POST OFFICE PRIVILEGES FOR AMERICAN MISSIONARIES IN SOUTH KOREA

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, religious missionaries are performing an important and humanitarian role in the rehabilitation and reconstruction of war-ravaged South Korea. I have received numerous communications from people in my State protesting withdrawal of the Army post-office privileges from American missionaries working with the people of South Korea.

The cutting off of these postal privileges means an inevitable ending of much of the aid and encouragement given to the missionaries by their American families and friends for the peoples of Korea. Postal rates by international mail are prohibitively high.

Mr. President, I desire to place in the RECORD my appeal to the President of the United States to use his high office to bring about restoration and continuance of Army postal services for American missionnaries in South Korea, along with typical letters I have received from people in Oregon.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 30, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have received numerous communications from people in my State, protesting the withdrawal of Army post office privileges from American missionaries working with the people of South Korea.

Knowing your own sincere interest in the helpful role of these courageous religious leaders, I am appealing to you to use your high office to bring about restoration and continuance of these postal services.

Because the postage rates by international mail are so prohibitively high, termination of Army post office privileges for American missionaries in South Korea will mean an inevitable cutting-off of much of the communication between these self-sacrificing people and their families and friends in the United States.

I need not tell you, who is so familiar with the importance of religious missionaries to a distressed nation, of the valiant work being done by these American people among the destitute and war-ravaged citizens of South Korea.

I urge you, Mr. President, to do what you can to maintain Army post office service for our American missionaries in South Korea.

With every good wish, I am,

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

CORVALLIS, OREG., *March 21, 1955.*

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Am writing in reference to the removal of APO privileges for missionaries. I feel that this is unjust and even a detriment to our country for who are doing more to hold back the tide of communism than they? As you know Christ and communism are diametrically opposed. Since our country was founded on true Christian principles we would be opposing ourselves if we permit this hardship to the missionaries.

Trusting that you will give this your careful attention, I am,

Yours truly,

MABEL WHITNEY.

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 24, 1955.*

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: We are constrained to write to you relative to the APO which we are informed is being taken away from our missionaries in South Korea.

If the privilege under APO is taken away, it will work a hardship not only on the missionaries but also on many of the South Korean people to whom the missionaries are ministering. Clothing, medicine, and other articles have been sent APO without charge, and given to destitute and needy persons in South Korea, including many hospitalized South Korean soldiers.

Without the privilege of APO this ministry will be practically ended, as the postage by international mail is prohibitive.

We appeal to you to use your influence to restore or continue this APO service to South Korea.

Sincerely yours,

A. T. LINK.
MRS. A. T. LINK.

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 25, 1955.*

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Army post office is being taken away from missionaries in South Korea. This is a tragedy, for now clothing and supplies so desperately needed will be cut off because of the expense of shipping. Our country spends money for good will between nations and has been very generous in helping people around the world. It is the only Christian attitude we can take. There are many charitable agencies but not nearly enough. Individuals and small groups of people who are limited financially, through APO have sent much to Korea, even to the Army veterans who are hospitalized in South Korea.

Postage by international mail is prohibitive. I appeal to you, and strongly urge you to do what you can immediately to restore APO service. Thank you.

Respectfully,

MRS. HELEN MILES HALLETT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Iran, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Joseph S. Davis, of California, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers; and

Raymond J. Saulnier, of New York, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent agreement be modified to the extent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the noncontroversial nominations on the Executive Calendar, under the heading "New Reports."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar, under the heading "New Reports."

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John M. Allison, of Nebraska, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Japan, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America to the 11th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Joseph C. Satterthwaite, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plentipotentiary of the United States of America to Burma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Joseph E. Jacobs, of South Carolina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Poland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of J. Reuel Armstrong, of Wyoming, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Army nominations be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George A. Parkinson to be a rear admiral.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Marine Corps nominations be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the President will be notified forthwith.

NOMINATIONS OF JOSEPH S. DAVIS AND RAYMOND J. SAULNIER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination of Mr. Joseph S. Davis, of California, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the nomination of Mr. Raymond J. Saulnier, of New York, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers. These nominations have been reported favorably from the Committee on Banking and Currency by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. Let me state that we would like to have these nominations considered and confirmed before the Senate takes its recess today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none.

Without objection, the Senate will now consider, as in executive session, these two nominations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, let me say that I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and with various other members of the committee, as well as with the distinguished minority leader. He agrees with the making of this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to these nominations?

Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of these confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

PROTOCOL ON THE TERMINATION OF THE OCCUPATION REGIME IN THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, AND PROTOCOL TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ON THE ACCESSION OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, Executive L and Executive M, the German protocols, are now to be considered.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the protocol, Executive L (83d Cong., 2d sess.), the Protocol on the Termination of the Occupation Regime in the Federal Republic of Germany, signed at Paris on October 23, 1954; and the protocol, Executive M (83d Cong., 2d sess.), the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of the Federal Republic of Germany, signed at Paris on October 23, 1954, which were read the second time, as follows:

EXECUTIVE L, 83d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION—PROTOCOL ON THE TERMINATION OF THE OCCUPATION REGIME IN THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

The United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the French Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany agree as follows:

Article 1

The Convention on Relations between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany, the Convention on the Rights and Obligations of Foreign Forces and their Members in the Federal Republic of Germany, the Finance Convention, the Convention on the Settlement of Matters arising out of the War and the Occupation, signed at Bonn on 26 May 1952, the Protocol signed at Bonn on 27 June 1952 to correct certain textual errors in the aforementioned Conventions, and the Agreement on the Tax Treatment of the Forces and their Members signed at Bonn on 26 May 1952, as amended by the Protocol signed at Bonn on 26 July 1952, shall be amended in accordance with the five Schedules to the present Protocol and as so amended shall enter into force (together with subsidiary documents agreed by the Signatory States relating to any of the aforementioned instruments) simultaneously with it.

Article 2

Pending the entry into force of the arrangements for the German Defense Contribution, the following provisions shall apply:

(1) The rights heretofore held or exercised by the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the French Republic relating to the fields of disarmament and demilitarisation shall be retained and exercised by them, and nothing in any of the instruments mentioned in Article 1 of the present Protocol shall authorize the enactment, amendment, repeal or deprivation of effect of legislation or, subject to the provisions of paragraph (2) of this Article, executive action in those fields by any other authority.

(2) On the entry into force of the present Protocol, the Military Security Board shall be abolished (without prejudice to the validity of any action or decisions taken by it)

and the controls in the fields of disarmament and demilitarisation shall thereafter be applied by a Joint Four-Power Commission to which each of the Signatory States shall appoint one representative and which shall take its decisions by majority vote of the four members.

(3) The Governments of the Signatory States will conclude an administrative agreement which shall provide, in conformity with the provisions of this Article, for the establishment of the Joint Four-Power Commission and its staff and for the organisation of the work.

Article 3

1. The present Protocol shall be ratified or approved by the Signatory States in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures. The Instruments of Ratification or Approval shall be deposited by the Signatory States with the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

2. The present Protocol and subsidiary documents relating to it agreed between the Signatory States shall enter into force upon the deposit by all the Signatory States of the Instruments of Ratification or Approval as provided in paragraph 1 of this Article.

3. The present Protocol shall be deposited in the Archives of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, which will furnish each Signatory State with certified copies thereof and notify each State of the date of entry into force of the present Protocol.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the undersigned Representatives duly authorized thereto have signed the present Protocol.

Done at Paris this 23rd day of October, 1954, in three texts, in the English, French and German languages, all being equally authentic.

For the United States of America:
/s/ JOHN FOSTER DULLES

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Nortern Ireland:
/s/ ANTHONY EDEN

For the French Republic:
/s/ P. MENDÈS-FRANCE

For the Federal Republic of Germany:
/s/ ADENAUER

SCHEDULE I

Amendments to the Convention on Relations Between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany

Introductory words: Substitute: "The United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the French Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany have entered into the following Convention setting forth the basis for their new relationship:".

Preamble: Delete.

Article 1: Substitute:

"Article 1

1. On the entry into force of the present Convention the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the French Republic (hereinafter and in the related Conventions sometimes referred to as "the Three Powers") will terminate the Occupation regime in the Federal Republic, revoke the Occupation Statute and abolish the Allied High Commission and the Offices of the Land Commissioners in the Federal Republic.

2. The Federal Republic shall have accordingly the full authority of a sovereign State over its internal and external affairs."

Article 2: Substitute:

"Article 2

"In view of the international situation, which has so far prevented the reunification of Germany and the conclusion of a peace settlement, the Three Powers retain the rights and the responsibilities, heretofore exercised or held by them, relating to Berlin and to Germany as a whole, including the reunification of Germany and a peace settlement. The rights and responsibilities retained by the Three Powers relating to the stationing of armed forces in Germany and the protection of their security are dealt with in Articles 4 and 5 of the present Convention."

Article 4: Substitute:

"Article 4

"1. Pending the entry into force of the arrangements for the German Defence Contribution, the Three Powers retain the rights, heretofore exercised or held by them, relating to the stationing of armed forces in the Federal Republic. The mission of these forces will be the defense of the free world, of which Berlin and the Federal Republic form part. Subject to the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 5 of the present Convention, the rights and obligations of these forces shal. be governed by the Convention on the Rights and Obligations of Foreign Forces and their Members in the Federal Republic of Germany (hereinafter referred to as "the Forces Convention") referred to in paragraph 1 of Article 8 of the present Convention.

2. The rights of the Three Powers, heretofore exercised or held by them, which relate to the stationing of armed forces in Germany and which are retained, are not affected by the provisions of this Article insofar as they are required for the exercise of the rights referred to in the first sentence of Article 2 of the present Convention. The Federal Republic agrees that, from the entry into force of the arrangements for the German Defence Contribution, forces of the same nationality and effective strength as at that time may be stationed in the Federal Republic. In view of the status of the Federal Republic as defined in Article 1, paragraph 2 of the present Convention and in view of the fact that the Three Powers do not desire to exercise their rights regarding the stationing of armed forces in the Federal Republic, insofar as it is concerned, except in full accord with the Federal Republic, a separate Convention deals with this matter."

Article 5: Substitute:

"Article 5

"1. Pending the entry into force of the arrangements for the German Defence Contribution, the following provisions shall be applicable to the forces stationed in the Federal Republic:

"(a) The Three Powers will consult with the Federal Republic, insofar as the military situation permits, with regard to all questions concerning the stationing of these forces. The Federal Republic will, according to the present Convention and the related Conventions, co-operate, within the framework of its Basic Law, to facilitate the mission of these forces;

"(b) The Three Powers will obtain the consent of the Federal Republic before bringing into the Federal territory, as part of their forces, contingents of the armed forces of any nation not now providing such contingents. Such contingents may nevertheless be brought into the Federal territory without the consent of the Federal Republic in the event of external attack or imminent threat of such attack, but, after the elimination of the danger, may only remain with its consent.

"2. The rights of the Three Powers, heretofore held or exercised by them, which relate to the protection of the security of armed forces stationed in the Federal Republic and which are temporarily retained, shall lapse when the appropriate German authorities have obtained similar powers under German legislation enabling them to take effective action to protect the security of those forces, including the ability to deal with a serious disturbance of public security and order. To the extent that such rights continue to be exercisable they shall be exercised only after consultation insofar as the military situation does not preclude such consultation, with the Federal Government and with its agreement that the circumstances require such exercise. In all other respects the protection of the security of those forces shall be governed by the Forces Convention or by the provisions of the Agreement which replaces it, and, except as otherwise provided in any applicable agreement, by German law."

Article 6, paragraph 2, second sentence: Delete.

Article 7, paragraph 1: For the words "The Three Powers and the Federal Republic" substitute the words "The Signatory States."

Article 7, paragraph 2: Substitute:

"2. Pending the peace settlement, the Signatory States will co-operate to achieve, by peaceful means, their common aim of a reunified Germany enjoying a liberal-democratic constitution, like that of the Federal Republic, and integrated within the European Community."

Article 7, paragraph 3: Delete.

Article 7, paragraph 4: Delete the word "other".

Article 8: Substitute:

"1 (a) The Signatory States have concluded the following related Conventions:

"Convention on the Rights and Obligations of Foreign Forces and their Members in the Federal Republic of Germany;

"Finance Convention;

"Convention on the Settlement of Matters Arising out of the War and the Occupation.

"(b) The Convention on the Rights and Obligations of Foreign Forces and their Members in the Federal Republic of Germany and the Agreement on the Tax Treatment of the Forces and their Members signed at Bonn on 26 May 1952, as amended by the Protocol signed at Bonn on 26 July 1952 shall remain in force until the entry into force of new arrangements setting forth the rights and obligations of the forces of the Three Powers and other States having forces in the territory of the Federal Republic. The new arrangements will be based on the Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty Regarding the Status of Their Forces, signed at London on 19 June 1951, supplemented by such provisions as are necessary in view of the special conditions existing in regard to the forces stationed in the Federal Republic.

"(c) The Finance Convention shall remain in force until the entry into force of the new arrangements negotiated in pursuance of paragraph 4 of Article 4 of that Convention with other member Governments of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization who have forces stationed in the Federal territory.

"2. During the transitional period provided for in paragraph 4 of Article 6 of Chapter One of the Convention on the Settlement of Matters arising out of the War and the Occupation, the rights of the three Signatory States referred to in that paragraph shall be retained."

Article 9, paragraph 1: Substitute:

"1. There shall be established an Arbitration Tribunal which shall function in accordance with the provisions of the annexed Charter."

Article 9, paragraph 2: Substitute:

"2. The Arbitration Tribunal shall have exclusive jurisdiction over all disputes arising between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic under the provisions of the present Convention or the annexed Charter or any of the related Conventions which the parties are not able to settle by negotiation or by other means agreed between all the Signatory States, except as otherwise provided by paragraph 3 of this Article or in the annexed Charter or in the related Conventions."

Article 9, paragraph 3: For the words "or action taken thereunder, or involving the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 7 of Article 5" substitute the words "the first two sentences of paragraph 1 of Article 4, the first sentence

of paragraph 2 of Article 4 and the first two sentences of paragraph 2 of Article 5, or action taken thereunder,".

Article 10: Substitute:

"Article 10

"The Signatory States will review the terms of the present Convention and the related Conventions

"(a) upon request of any one of them, in the event of the reunification of Germany, or an international understanding being reached with the participation or consent of the States parties to the present Convention on steps towards bringing about the reunification of Germany, or the creation of a European Federation; or

"(b) in any situation which all of the Signatory States recognize has resulted from a change of a fundamental character in the conditions prevailing at the time of the entry into force of the present Convention.

"In either case they will, by mutual agreement, modify the present Convention and the related Conventions to the extent made necessary or advisable by the fundamental change in the situation."

Article 11, paragraphs 1 and 2, Delete.

Annex A: Delete.

Amendments to Annex B, Charter of the Arbitration Tribunal

Article 1, paragraph 2 (c): Substitute:

"(c) A President and two Vice-Presidents (hereinafter referred to also as "the neutral members") appointed by agreement between the Governments of the Three Powers and the Federal Government, none of whom shall be a national of any one of the Three Powers or a German national."

Article 1, paragraph 3, second sentence: Substitute:

"Within the same period the Governments of the Three Powers and the Federal Government shall agree upon the three neutral members, one of whom shall be nominated as President and the other two as Vice-Presidents."

Article 1, paragraph 3, third sentence: Substitute:

"If, after the expiry of such period, one or more of the neutral members shall not have been agreed upon, either the Governments of the Three Powers or the Federal Government may request the President of the International Court of Justice to nominate such neutral member or members."

Article 3: Delete.

Article 6: Add new paragraphs:

"3. The Registrar, upon receipt of the first petition filed pursuant to Article 14 of the present Charter, shall immediately notify the President, who shall thereupon call the first meeting of the Tribunal in plenary session at the seat of the Tribunal as soon as practicable, for the purpose of determining the Rules of Procedure and attending to other business. Thereafter the Tribunal shall meet as business requires.

"4. Paragraphs 3 and 4 of Article 2 of the present Charter shall not become effective until the first meeting in plenary session referred to in paragraph 3 of this Article."

Article 9, paragraph 1: After the word "negotiation" insert the words "or by other means agreed between all the Signatory States."

Article 9, paragraph 2 (a): Substitute for the words "Chapter Two" the words "Chapter One."

Article 9, paragraph 3: Delete the words "and to the provisions of sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 5 of Article 11 of the present Charter."

Article 11: Substitute:

"Article 11

"1. The Signatory States undertake to comply with the decisions of the Tribunal and to take the action required of them by such decisions or necessary to remedy the situation.

"2. If a Signatory State required by a decision of the Tribunal to take action to give effect to that decision is unable, or fails, to take such action within the time specified by the Tribunal, or if no time is specified, within a reasonable time, then that State, or any other Signatory State a party to the dispute, may apply to the Tribunal for a further decision as to alternative action to be taken by the defaulting State."

SCHEDULE II

Amendments to the convention on the rights and obligations of foreign forces and their members in the Federal Republic of Germany

Contents: Delete references to Articles 49 and 50 and Annex C.

Introductory words: Substitute:

"The United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the French Republic, and the Federal Republic of Germany agree as follows:"

Article 1, paragraph 3: Substitute:

"3. Other Sending State:

Any power, other than one of the Three Powers, which, by agreement with the Three Powers or any one of them, has Forces stationed in the Federal territory on the entry into force of the present Convention; and any other Power which may in future have Forces stationed in the Federal territory,

"(a) if before the entry into force of the arrangements for the German Defence Contribution, by agreement with the Three Powers, or any one of them, so far as such other Power does not, with the consent of the Three Powers, conclude a separate Convention with the Federal Republic concerning the status of its Forces, and

"(b) if after the entry into force of the arrangements for the German Defence Contribution, by agreement with the Federal Republic."

Article 17, paragraph 8: Substitute:

"8. A Standing Commission shall be established, to be composed of representatives of the appropriate authorities of the Three Powers and of representatives of the authorities of the Federal Republic. The duty of this Commission shall be to guarantee effective co-ordination between civil and military air activities."

Article 33, paragraph 1 (c): Delete.

Article 33, paragraph 3 (a): Substitute:

"The tax treatment of the Forces and their members shall be governed, to the extent that provision is not made in the present Convention, by the Agreement on the Tax Treatment of the Forces and their Members signed at Bonn on 26 May 1952, as amended by the Protocol signed at Bonn on 26 July 1952."

Article 33, paragraph 3 (b): Delete.

Article 36, paragraph 5 (d): Delete the word "Special."

Article 38, paragraph 1: Delete the words "this shall also apply to armed forces of the European Defence Community if the latter agrees to participate in this procedure."

Article 38, paragraph 7: Substitute:

"7. In implementing the first accommodation programme, if no comparable alternative accommodation is available in the same area, the Forces shall, for six months after the entry into force of the present Convention, be entitled to the first option on such publicly owned accommodation included in the property referred to in Article 13 of Chapter One of the Convention on the Settlement of Matters arising out of the War and the Occupation as becomes available. This shall not apply to accommodation in the Bonn Enclave."

Article 39, paragraph 2: Substitute:

"2. A Joint Supply Board shall be established, to be composed of representatives of the appropriate authorities of the Three Powers and of representatives of the Federal Republic. The Board shall be responsible for establishing by agreement periodical programmes for the procurement of the requirements of the Forces, and for resolving any difficulties which may arise in the course of the implementation of these programmes."

Article 42, paragraph 1: Substitute:

"1. The public services of the posts and telecommunications system of the Federal Republic shall be available to the Forces and their members. In this respect the Forces shall enjoy such preferential treatment as is necessary for the satisfactory fulfillment of their defence mission and is consistent with the reasonable reconciliation of the requirements resulting therefrom and the essential civilian and defence requirements of the Federal Republic. The conditions of service effective on the entry into force of the present Convention shall remain in force. These conditions of service shall be subject to review and modification at the request of any one of the Signatory States, where they are inconsistent with the present Convention. In the event of such a review the conditions of service to be determined shall be consistent with the needs of the Forces and the conditions of service of their members in the performance of the defence mission of the Forces."

Article 44, paragraph 2: Substitute:

"2. Germans who are working in the service of the Forces shall be subject to all obligations arising from the arrangements for the German Defence Contribution. They shall only be engaged on services of a non-combatant character including civilian guard duties."

Article 44, paragraph 10, first sentence: Substitute:

"The Mixed Commissions referred to in paragraphs 3 and 8 of this Article shall be composed equally of representatives of the appropriate authorities of the Three Powers and of representatives of the Federal Republic."

Article 47, paragraph 2: Delete.

Article 49: Delete.

Article 50: Delete.

Annex B, paragraph 3: Substitute:

"3. A Frequency Committee is hereby established, to be composed of representatives of the appropriate authorities of the Three Powers and of representatives of the Federal Republic. The Frequency Committee shall make its decisions by unanimous vote."

Annex C: Delete.

SCHEDULE III

Amendment to the Finance Convention

Introductory words: Substitute:

"The United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the French Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany agree as follows:"

Article 1, paragraph 1: Insert "The Forces;" between "The Power concerned;" and "Authorities of the Forces;".

Article 1, paragraph 2 (b): Delete the subparagraph.

Article 1, paragraph 2 (c): Substitute:

"(c) Funds for the support of the Forces:

Funds of the Federal Republic which are made available in accordance with paragraphs 1 to 3 of Article 4 of the present Convention to the Powers concerned to assist in meeting the costs of the Forces stationed in the Federal territory and their members."

Article 3: Delete.

Article 4: Substitute:

"Article 4

"1. (a) From the entry into force of the present Convention until the entry into force of the arrangements for the German Defence Contribution, the Federal Republic will provide a monthly average contribution of DM600 million as funds for the support of the Forces.

"(b) Out of the sum of DM600 million referred to in subparagraph (a) of this paragraph a sum of DM100 million a month will

be earmarked for particular defence measures agreed jointly between Three Powers and the Federal Republic, which latter sum will include expenditure for the NATO Infrastructure Programme. Payment of claims for Occupation damages can be included.

"(c) The provisions of subparagraphs (a) and (b) of this paragraph apply in any case only until 30 June 1955. If the arrangements for the German Defence Contribution enter into force after that date, negotiations shall take place between the Federal Republic and the Three Powers concerning the contribution of the Federal Republic to the support of the Forces for the period after 30 June 1955 and before the entry into force of the arrangements for the German Defence Contribution.

"2. During the first twelve months after the entry into force of the arrangements for the German Defence Contribution, the Federal Republic will make available as funds for the support of the Forces a total amount of DM3,200 million. These funds shall be made available as follows:—

"DM400 million a month for the first two months;

"DM300 million a month for the next four months;

"DM200 million a month for the last six months.

If the arrangements for the German Defence Contribution enter into force after 30 June 1955, these provisions shall not apply, and negotiations shall take place between the Federal Republic and the Three Powers concerning the contribution of the Federal Republic to the support of the Forces for a period not exceeding twelve months after the entry into force of the arrangements for the German Defence Contribution.

"3. The Three Powers recognise the right of the Federal Republic to propose that the provisions of paragraph 2 of this Article be re-examined should it consider that the burden imposed by the build-up of the agreed German forces justifies such re-examination. In this event, the Signatory States will examine all the relevant factors and if found necessary will agree to amend the above provisions on funds for the support of the Forces.

"4. In accordance with the spirit of Article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty the Federal Republic agrees that at the end of the period laid down in paragraph 2 of this Article it will be prepared to negotiate with other member Governments of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization who have forces stationed in the Federal territory in respect of questions relating to the support (for example, goods and services) of those forces having regard to the requirements of the forces of the Federal Republic.

"5. Funds to be made available in accordance with paragraphs 1 to 3 of this Article for one period of time may be utilized in other periods in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 6 of this Article. The Three Powers will be responsible for allocating or re-allocating among the Powers concerned, after consultation with the Federal Government, the amount made available in accordance with this Article. The provisions of Article 5 of the present Convention shall apply to the expenditure of these funds except to the extent that such funds are expended in accordance with sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 6 of this Article.

"6. The only expenditures chargeable to the funds for the support of the Forces made available in accordance with paragraphs 1 to 3 of this Article shall be:—

"(a) Amounts expended on payment authorizations issued after the entry into force of the present Convention to satisfy liabilities for accommodation, goods, materials or services procured or ordered before the entry into force of the present Convention by the authorities of the Powers concerned as a charge to occupation costs or mandatory expenditures, to the extent that such amounts are not covered by unexpended occupation costs and mandatory expenditure funds remaining available to the Three Powers for the purpose after the entry into force of the present Convention;

"(b) Amounts expended on payment authorizations issued before the end of the period covered by paragraph 2 of this Article under the Deutsche Mark budgets of the Powers concerned established in accordance with Article 5 of the present Convention. To the extent that the funds provided under paragraph 1 of this Article have not been fully expended to meet payment authorizations issued before the end of the period covered by that paragraph they will remain available to the Forces for a period of eighteen months for the liquidation of liabilities then outstanding which are chargeable to the funds for the support of the Forces. A corresponding procedure will apply to the funds made available in accordance with paragraph 2 of this Article; however, the latter funds will remain available to the Forces after the end of the relevant period for 12 months; and

"(c) Amounts expended for such other purposes as may be agreed between the Federal Republic and the Three Powers.

"7. The Three Powers undertake to make a consistent effort to ensure that the carry over will not increase and shall be substantially reduced as rapidly as possible. The authorities of the Three Powers and the Federal Republic will co-operate fully for this purpose and will assist each other by exchanging relevant information and in any other appropriate ways. The carry over within the meaning of this paragraph is that part of the funds made available by the Federal Republic for occupation costs and mandatory expenditures which has not been disbursed, together with that part of the funds made available in accordance with paragraph 1 of this Article which has similarly not been disbursed."

Article 5, paragraph 3: Delete the sentence "Expenditures under such budget * * * control over them."

Article 6, paragraph 1: Substitute:

"1. Subject to the provisions of Article 4 of the present Convention, the Federal Republic shall take all steps necessary to make available, as required, the funds for the support of the Forces."

Article 7, paragraph 1 (g) (iii): Substitute for the words "the defence contribution of the Federal Republic" the words "funds for the support of the Forces".

Article 8, paragraph 14: Substitute:

"14. Compensation awarded under a decision of an agency of the Forces shall, for the periods specified in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 4 of the present Convention, be chargeable to the funds for the support of the Forces of the Power concerned unless otherwise agreed between the Federal Republic and the Power concerned. An agreement between the Federal Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in that regard and in relation to ancillary procedure is annexed to the present Convention as Annex A. A similar agreement between the Federal Republic and the United States of America is annexed to the present Convention as Annex B."

Article 8, paragraph 15: Substitute:

"15. Notwithstanding the other provisions of this Article, claims in respect of damage caused to accommodation or moveables which have been made available for use by the Authorities of the Power concerned before the entry into force of the present Convention, and released by them after the end of the period covered by paragraph 2 of Article 4 of the present Convention shall be determined by the German authorities and shall not be charged to the funds for the support of the Forces, or to the Power concerned."

Article 8, paragraph 18: Delete.

Article 12, paragraph 6: Delete the sentence "Timely * * * 30 June 1953."

Article 13, paragraph 2: Substitute for the words "30 June 1953" the words "the end of the period covered by paragraph 2 of Article 4 of the present Convention,".

Article 13, paragraph 3: Substitute:

"3. During the period covered by paragraph 1 of Article 4 of the present Convention, the costs of the installations and works referred to in Article 20 of the Forces Convention shall be chargeable to the funds for the support of the Forces. During the period covered by paragraph 2 of Article 4 of the present Convention, the costs of the above mentioned installations and works shall be chargeable to the funds for the support of the Forces to the extent that provision is made therefor in the budgets of the Powers concerned. If installations and works should be carried out for which no provision has been made in such budgets, their financing shall be determined by prior agreement between the Federal Republic and the Powers concerned."

Article 13, paragraph 4: Substitute for the words "30 June 1953" the words: "the end of the period covered by paragraph 2 of Article 4 of the present Convention."

Article 13, paragraph 4: Delete the words "mentioned in paragraph 3 of Article 4 of the present Convention."

Article 13, paragraph 5: Delete.

Article 14: Delete the sentence "Representatives . . . involved."

Article 16: Delete the phrase "especially if agreements . . . desirable."

Article 18, paragraph 1: Delete.

Article 18, paragraph 2: Delete the words "which are not members of the European Defence Community,".

Article 19, sub-paragraph (a): Substitute:

"(a) in matters which under paragraphs 1 to 4 of Article 4 of the present Convention are to be settled by negotiation."

Annex 'A', Section 9: Delete.

Annex 'B': Add new Annex 'B.'

Annex B to the Finance Convention

In the case of the Forces of the United States of America the provisions of Article 8 of the Finance Convention shall be implemented in accordance with the following provisions:

"Section 1

"The functions of the appropriate agency of the Forces set out in paragraph 9 of Article 8 of the Finance Convention shall in respect to these Forces be delegated to the Federal Republic.

"Section 2

"1. The appropriate German agency shall promptly inform the appropriate agency of the Forces of any claim lodged with it and shall append such particulars at the latter agency may require.

"2. After receipt of these particulars, the appropriate agency of the Forces shall forward as soon as possible to the appropriate German agency such relevant information and evidence obtainable from its own sources as is necessary for dealing with the claim insofar as the making available of such evidence is permissible under the regulations of the United States. The German agency shall assess and pay any compensation upon the claim only in the full light of this evidence.

"Section 3

"1. The appropriate agency of the Forces shall include in the information and evidence forwarded to the appropriate German agency under paragraph 2 of Section 2 of this Annex a statement as to whether or not acts or omissions of the Forces as defined in paragraph 2 of Article 8 of the Finance Convention are involved.

"2. The German agency shall not assess or pay any compensation unless the appropriate agency of the Forces has issued a statement that acts or omissions of the

Forces as defined in paragraph 2 of Article 8 of the Finance Convention are involved.

"3. If during investigations of a claim circumstances appear which would lead to an inference different from that contained in the statement, the appropriate agency of the Forces shall, on the request of the appropriate German agency, review its statement taking into account the representations made by the German agency.

"Section 4

"If a claimant brings an action in the ordinary German court against the Federal Republic pursuant to paragraph 10 of Article 8 of the Finance Convention, the German agency shall forward to the appropriate agency of the Forces a copy of the complaint. Should the German agency deem it necessary in the light of the complaint to obtain from the agency of the Forces supplementary documents or evidence from its own sources for use in connection with the defence of the action, the German agency shall so inform the agency of the Forces as soon as possible.

"Section 5

"Should the legally enforceable judgment of a Court in an action brought under paragraph 10 of Article 8 of the Finance Convention differ from the decision of the German agency taken under Section 1 of this Annex, the decision shall be modified so as to make it accord with the judgment; this shall apply whether or not the authorities of the Forces exercised their right to participate in the action against the Federal Republic under paragraph 12 of Article 8 of the Finance Convention.

"Section 6

"To enable that part of the compensation awarded by the German agencies or Courts which under Section 7 of this Annex is to be charged to the funds for the support of the Forces of the United States to be so charged, the German agency shall by the fifteenth day of each month furnish to the appropriate agency of the Forces a list showing the amounts of compensation paid during the previous month.

"Section 7

"It is agreed, as provided for in paragraph 14 of Article 8 of the Finance Convention, that 75 per cent of the compensation awarded by the appropriate German agencies or by the ordinary German courts shall be charged to the funds for the support of the Forces made available under the Finance Convention. The remaining 25 per cent of the compensation shall be borne by the Federal Republic.

"Section 8

"The provisions of this Annex shall not affect the provisions of paragraph 16 of Article 8 of the Finance Convention."

SCHEDULE IV

Amendments to the Convention on the Settlement of Matters Arising Out of the War and the Occupation

Introductory words: Substitute:

"The United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the French Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany agree as follows:"

Chapter One—General Provisions

Article 8, sub-paragraph (d): For the words "paragraph 6 of Article 4, of Chapter Two of the present Convention", substitute the words "paragraph 1 of Article 12 of this Chapter."

Article 8, sub-paragraph (e): Delete.

Add new Articles:

"Article 9

"1. The Allied High Commission legislation concerning the reorganization of the German coal mining and iron and steel industries, to the extent that such legislation is in force on the date of the entry into force of the present convention, shall be maintained in force in so far and so long as deconcentration measures ordered before that date are still to be carried out or claimants are still to be protected.

"2. The Federal Government shall ensure that the measures decreed under the legislation referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article by regulations or orders of the Allied High Commission or of its subordinate bodies as well as the measures required to be taken in implementation of the plans approved by such orders shall be carried through to completion.

"3. The provisions of this Article shall be without prejudice to such expansion or affiliation of enterprises of the German coal mining and iron and steel industries as shall be permitted under the Treaty on the Establishment of the European Community for Coal and Steel.

"Article 10

"1. A mixed committee of experts composed of seven members shall be established according to the following procedure. Three of its members shall be appointed by the Federal Republic and one by each of the Three Powers immediately after the Federal Government has received the first application under paragraph 3 of this Article and has notified the Three Powers of that fact. The members so appointed shall elect a seventh member by majority vote within six months after this notification. If within that time the seventh member shall not have been elected or shall not have accepted election, the Board of Directors of the Bank of International Settlements shall be requested to appoint as a seventh member an expert who shall not be a national of any of the Signatory States.

"2. The function of the Mixed Committee shall be to consider applications for extensions of the final time for the disposition of securities required by regulations or orders of the Allied High Commission or its subordinate bodies or by reason of the terms of a plan approved by any such order.

"3. Applications must be filed with the Federal Government not later than one year before the expiration of the time fixed for the disposition of the securities. The applicant shall, until the decision of the Mixed Committee is rendered, be entitled to file any additional supporting papers.

"4. The Mixed Committee shall extend the time fixed for the disposition of the securities, provided that the applicant establishes that all of such securities could not, with the exercise of reasonable efforts, be disposed of on reasonable terms and on a basis which is compatible with the German public interest and that such disposition will not be possible within the remaining time without a disruptive effect on the German capital market.

"5. Any extension under paragraph 4 of this Article shall be granted for not more than one year but shall be subject to renewal upon a further application on the basis of the standards set forth in that paragraph. The Mixed Committee may attach appropriate conditions to any such extension or renewal.

"6. The decision of a majority of the members shall constitute the decision of the Mixed Committee. The Committee shall render its decision before the expiration of the time fixed for the disposition of the securities.

"7. The emoluments of the members of the Mixed Committee shall be paid by each of the Signatory States in respect of the member or members appointed by it. One-half of the emoluments of the seventh member shall be paid by the Federal Republic, and one-sixth by each of the Three Powers. The Mixed Committee may charge the remaining costs, in whole or in part, to the applicants.

"8. The Mixed Committee shall adopt its own rules for the conduct of its business.

"Article 11

"1. The Allied High Commission legislation concerning the termination of the deconcentration and liquidation of the I. G. Farbenindustrie A. G. i. L. to the extent that such legislation is in force on the entry into force of the present Convention shall be maintained in force until the liquidation of the I. G. Farbenindustrie A. G. i. L. in accordance with such legislation has been completely carried out. Those provisions of the legislation referred to in the first sentence of this paragraph which concern rights or obligations (Rechtsverhältnisse) continuing to exist after the completion of the liquidation of I. G. Farbenindustrie A. G. i. L. shall be maintained in force until such rights and obligations have been completely settled.

"2. The Federal Government shall ensure that the measures decreed under the legislation referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article by regulations or order of the Allied High Commission or of its subordinate bodies shall be carried through to completion.

"Article 12

"1. After the entry into force of the present Convention the Board of Review provided for under Article 13 (as amended) of Allied High Commission Law No. 27 shall consist of one member appointed by each of the Three Powers and three members appointed by the Federal Republic. As so constituted this Board of Review shall continue to be the sole appropriate body to review, on the petition of interested persons, any orders issued under sub-paragraph (c) of Article 5 of Law No. 27, or under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of Allied High Commission Law No. 35. The independence of the members of the Board of Review and their freedom of decision shall not be impaired by instructions or other actions of their Governments. Before rendering a decision the Board of Review shall grant the claimant a hearing.

"2. The emoluments of the members of the Board of Review shall be paid by each of the Signatory States in respect of the member or members appointed by it. One-half of the remaining expenses of the Board of Review shall be borne by the Federal Republic, and one-sixth by each of the Three Powers.

"Article 13

"In order to facilitate the smooth transition from the Occupation regime to normal diplomatic relationships, and to provide for the accommodation of the Embassies and Consulates of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the French Republic, the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and the French Republic are hereby granted the right, subject to the payment of compensation in appropriate cases, to the continued use for a transitional period of the property used by them on the entry into force of the present Convention, provided such property is required for use by the Embassies and Consulates to be set up by them."

Chapter two—decartelization and deconcentration

Delete whole Chapter.

Chapter Three—Internal Restitution

Article 1, sub-paragraph (a) (i): For the words "Military Government Law No. 59, as amended or supplemented by Ordinances No. . . . 240 and 243" substitute the words "Military Government Law No. 59, as amended or supplemented by Ordinances No. . . . 240, 243, 252, and 255."

Article 1, sub-paragraph (a) (ii): For the words "Laws No. . . . 21 (as amended) and 30" substitute the words "Laws No. . . . 21 (as amended), 30 and 42".

Article 1, sub-paragraph (b) (i): Replace the word "and" between "High Commissioner" and "paragraph 3" by a comma; add after "No. 202" the words "and Ordinance No. 254 of the United Kingdom High Commissioner".

Article 3, paragraph 3: Delete.

Article 3, paragraph 5 (a) (b) (c): Delete.

Article 6, paragraph 1 (a): For the words "Board of Review" substitute the words "Supreme Restitution Court".

Annex, Article 5, paragraph 5 (c) (i): Delete.

Annex, Article 9, paragraph 1 (b): For the words "Board of Review established by Regulation No. 6 under British Military Government Law No. 59" substitute the words "Supreme Restitution Court for the British Zone established by Ordinance No. 255 of the United Kingdom High Commissioner".

Annex, Article 9, paragraph 2: For the words "Board of Review" substitute the words "Supreme Restitution Court for the British Zone".

Chapter Four—Compensation for Victims of Nazi Persecution

Paragraph 4: Delete.

Chapter Five—External Restitution

Article 2, paragraph 2:

Substitute for the words "8 May 1955" the words "8 May 1956".

Substitute for the words "8 May 1956" the words "8 May 1957".

Article 3, paragraph 1: Substitute for the words "8 May 1955" the words "8 May 1956".

Article 3, paragraph 2: Substitute for the words "8 May 1955" the words "8 May 1956".

Chapter Six—Reparation

Article 2, first sentence: Insert after the words "Law No. 63" the words "as amended by Decision No. 24 of the Allied High Commission".

Chapter Seven—Displaced Persons and Refugees

Article 1, sub-paragraphs (a) (b) (c): Delete.

Article 3: Delete.

Article 5: Delete.

Chapter Eight—Claims Against Germany

Delete whole Chapter with Annex.

Chapter Nine—Claims Against Foreign Nations or Nationals

Article 3, paragraph 3: Insert after the words "Law No. 47" the words "as amended by Allied High Commission Law No. 79".

Chapter Ten—Foreign Interests in Germany

Article 2, second sentence:

Substitute:

"This legislation shall be reviewed by the Federal Republic in agreement with the other Signatory States on the basis of the provisions of the Agreement on German External Debts, concluded in London on 27 February 1953, in so far as this legislation involves claims dealt with in that Agreement."

Article 6, paragraph 2: Substitute for the words "the proposed Final Equalisation of Burdens (Lastenausgleich) Law" the words "the Law on Equalisation of Burdens of 14 August 1952 (Bundesgesetzblatt Teil I Seite 446)".

Article 6, paragraph 2 (last phrase before subparagraph (a)): Delete the word "proposed".

Article 6, paragraph 2 (c) (last phrase): Delete the word "proposed".

Article 6, paragraph 7: Delete the word "Final" (English text only).

Article 7, sub-paragraph (a) (i): Delete.

Article 7, sub-paragraph (a) (ii): Delete the words "No. 55 (second Amendment of Legislation concerning Monetary Reform)".

Article 7, sub-paragraphs (a) (iii), (b) and (c) (i) and (ii): Delete.

Article 9, paragraph 1: Delete the words "and also in connection . . . Law No. 55".

Article 12, paragraph 1: Insert after sub-paragraph (f): "Appeals under the last sentence of Article 2 and paragraph 3 of Article 7 of Allied High Commission Law No. 8, pending on the entry into force of the present Convention before the Patent Appeal Board established by Regulation No. 1 under Law No. 8 (amended), are hereby transferred to the Arbitral Commission and shall be dealt with by it in the same manner as appeals under this Article."

Chapter Eleven—Facilities for the Embassies and Consulates of the Three Powers in the Federal Republic

Delete whole Chapter.

Chapter Twelve—Civil Aviation

Article 1: Substitute for the words "Articles 2 to 7" the words "Articles 2 to 6".

Article 7: Delete.

SCHEDULE V

Amendments to the agreement on the tax treatment of the forces and their members

Introductory words: Substitute:

"The United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the French Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany agree as follows:"

Article 5: After the word "negotiations" insert the words "or by other means agreed between all the Signatory States."

Article 6, paragraph 1, 2, 3: Delete.

[Translation]

The textual conformity of the preceding photocopy with the original, deposited in the Archives of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, of the Protocol on the Termination of the Occupation Regime in the Federal Republic of Germany, signed in Paris on October 23, 1954, is hereby certified.

Bonn, November 2, 1954.

[SEAL] /s/ BERGER
Ministerial Director
Chier of the Legal Division of the Foreign Office

EXECUTIVE M, 83RD CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION—PROTOCOL TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ON THE ACCESSION OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

The Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty signed at Washington on 4th April, 1949,

Being satisfied that the security of the North Atlantic area will be enhanced by the accession of the Federal Republic of Germany to that Treaty, and

Having noted that the Federal Republic of Germany has by a declaration dated 3rd October, 1954, accepted the obligations set forth in Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations and has undertaken upon its accession to the North Atlantic Treaty to refrain from any action inconsistent with the strictly defensive character of that Treaty, and

Having further noted that all member governments have associated themselves with the declaration also made on 3rd October, 1954, by the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the French Republic in connection with the aforesaid declaration of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Upon the entry into force of the present Protocol, the Government of the United States of America shall on behalf of all the Parties communicate to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany an invitation to accede to the North Atlantic Treaty. Thereafter the Federal Republic of Germany shall become a Party to that Treaty on the date when it deposits its instruments of accession with the Government of the United States of America in accordance with Article 10 of that Treaty.

ARTICLE II

The present Protocol shall enter into force, when (a) each of the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty has notified the Government of the United States of America its acceptance thereof, (b) all instruments of ratification of the Protocol Modifying and Completing the Brussels Treaty have been deposited with the Belgian Government, and (c) all instruments of ratification or approval of the Convention on the Presence of Foreign Forces in the Federal Republic of Germany have been deposited with the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany. The Government of the United States of America shall inform the other Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty of the date of the receipt of each notification of acceptance of the present Protocol and of the date of the entry into force of the present Protocol.

ARTICLE III

The present Protocol, of which the English and French texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America. Duly certified copies thereof shall be transmitted by that Government to the Governments of the other Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned Representatives, duly authorised thereto by their respective Governments, have signed the present Protocol.

Signed at Paris the twenty-third day of October nineteen hundred and fifty-four.

For Belgium:
P. H. SPAAK
For Canada:
L B PEARSON
For Denmark:
H. C. HANSEN.
For France:
P MENDÈS-FRANCE
For Greece:
S STEPHANOPOULOS
For Iceland:
KRISTINN GUDMUNDSSON
For Italy:
G. MARTINO
For the Grand-Duchy of Luxemburg:
JOS BECH
For Netherlands:
J W BEYEN
For Norway:
HALVARD LANGE
For Portugal:
PAULO CUNHA
For Turkey:
F. KÖPRÜLÜ
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern-Ireland:
ANTHONY EDEN
For the United States of America:
JOHN FOSTER DULLES

I CERTIFY THAT the foregoing is a true copy of the Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the Accession of the Federal Republic of Germany signed at Paris on October 23, 1954 in the English and French languages, the signed original of which is deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I, JOHN FOSTER DULLES, Secretary of State of the United States of America, have hereunto caused the seal of the Department of State to be affixed and my name subscribed by the Authentication Officer of the said Department, at the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, this second day of November 1954.

[SEAL] JOHN FOSTER DULLES
Secretary of State
By BARBARA HARTMAN
Authentication Officer
Department of State.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Executive L and Executive M (83d Cong., 2d sess.) be considered together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I believe it would also be proper for the Senate to vote upon both treaties at the same time, but with the vote on each treaty to be recorded separately. I make that request because the issues involved are substantially or practically the same, and the protocols are so merged that I think it quite proper to make the request. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that one vote be taken upon both protocols, but that a separate vote be recorded upon each protocol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has requested that one vote be taken on both protocols, but be recorded separately. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, there are before the Senate two protocols relating to Germany which require advice and consent to ratification. Although they are part of a complicated network of agreements, they are in themselves very simple.

The first of these protocols terminates the occupation regime in the Federal Republic of Germany, and is signed by the Federal Republic and the three occupying powers—the United States, the United Kingdom, and France. On its own merits, termination of the occupation is highly desirable. It is now almost 10 years since the unconditional surrender of Nazi Germany. Rarely has a similar period seen such a transformation in any nation. From a land of chaos and destruction, with a discredited and defunct dictatorship, Germany has become a land of prosperity, with a well-established democratic government. The need for ending the occupation has long been recognized, but it was not possible to do so because of various difficulties with which the Senate is familiar. Those difficulties have now been removed through the medium of these agreements, of which this protocol is a part.

The second protocol before the Senate provides for the accession of the Federal Republic of Germany to the North Atlantic Treaty, and is signed by the United States and the other 13 members of NATO. This, also, is highly desirable on its own merits. Economically and geographically, Germany is in fact an integral part of the North Atlantic Community. From the military point of view, the difficulty—one might almost say the impossibility—of defending western Europe without Germany has long been obvious.

Two very great advantages will accrue to the NATO forces with the accession of Germany. The forces will be augmented by a significant German contribution, and they will be able to adopt a forward strategy by which the NATO defense line will be moved eastward a considerable distance.

UNITED STATES COMMITMENTS

So far as the commitments of the United States are concerned, neither of these protocols is substantially different from treaties which the Senate approved in 1952. Those 1952 treaties were—the convention on relations with the Federal Republic, which was approved by a vote of 77 to 5, and a protocal extending the protection of the North Atlantic Treaty to the area of the European Defense Community, approved by a vote of 72 to 5. Like the protocols now before us, these earlier treaties were a part of a much more complicated network of arrangements. This network collapsed last summer when the French Assembly voted against the European Defense Community.

The alternatives which have since been worked out have made necessary certain changes in detail, but not in substance, in the protocols which the United States is now called upon to ratify. I point this out to emphasize that the United States here, in effect, undertakes no commitments which the Senate has not already approved. Indeed, it can be strongly argued that these protocols will greatly strengthen Western Europe and thereby lighten the responsibility which the United States is already carrying.

So, taken simply by themselves, the two protocols now before us would be in the national interests of the United States. The protocols are closely related to and interwoven with the wider series of agreements of which I have spoken. Even though the United States is not a party to the other agreements which are involved, they are likewise clearly in our national interest. The details of these agreements are fully treated in the committee report, and I will not belabor the Senate with them now.

I point out, however, that in 1952, when the Convention on Relations with the Federal Republic was signed, there were also signed a number of subsidiary agreements covering such matters as taxes, finance, the stationing of troops in Germany, and the thousand and one questions which must be dealt with when an occupation regime is ended and sovereignty restored. These agreements were transmitted to the Senate for its information, but the Senate's advice and consent to ratification was not required. The agreements have since been amended in the light of changed circumstances, and they are available for the information of the Senate; but, again, no Senate action is required.

CONSEQUENCES OF THE AGREEMENTS

Mr. President, I should now like to say a few words about the results which can reasonably be expected from these overall agreements, taken as a whole. These results go far beyond the simple restoration of German sovereignty and the addition of German strength to NATO, as important as those two achievements are. As a result of these agreements, there will come into being a living, workable mechanism for the control of armaments, and at the same time there will come into being a greater and more enduring unity among seven of the most important countries of Western Europe—Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom.

This is a result which has long been a cardinal objective of American diplomacy. From the time the Economic Cooperation Act was passed in 1948, the Congress has consistently and repeatedly declared it to be the policy of the United States to encourage the integration of Europe. This is a great step forward in that direction. We thought such a step had been taken in 1952, and the Senate gave its vigorous approval, only to see the project come to naught when the French Assembly rejected the European Defense Community. Wise statesmanship prevailed, however, and these alternative arrangements to accomplish substantially the same objective have now been consummated.

Many leaders of many countries deserve credit for this happy event. Chancellor Adenauer, of Germany, Prime Minister Churchill, and Foreign Secretary Eden, of Great Britain, Premiers Mendès-France and Faure, of France, are prominent among them. And I think it appropriate that a special word of praise and tribute be reserved for the patient, persistent effort of our own American Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, who never wavered in his determination that the objective could be achieved because it had to be achieved.

I would be remiss if I did not mention with praise the work of our colleague, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. Last summer, during the critical time when the EDC had been rejected and Europe was searching for an alternative, Senator WILEY was in Europe. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations at the time, and at the request of the Secretary of State, he undertook a series of important conversations with the leading statesmen of Western Europe.

Little has been said about those conversations. But I know personally that at that critical juncture of world affairs, Senator WILEY was encouraging the Europeans to move ahead toward creating an integrated, defensible Western Europe. He was telling Europeans of the deep concern of this Nation at the failure of EDC and of the necessity for their going to work to recreate a new framework for a unified Europe. His efforts emphasize the bipartisan character of this undertaking.

NEED FOR PROMPT UNITED STATES ACTION

After our experience with EDC, when the United States acted on ratification first, to no avail, it was the combined judgment of the State Department and the legislative leaders that the wiser course in regard to the present agreements would be to let the countries of Europe take the lead. That has been done, and parliamentary action on the agreements is now complete in both Germany and France. Besides the United States, only Belgium, Denmark, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands have yet to act, and they are expected to do so within a short time. There is no longer any real doubt about the outcome, and it behooves the United States, having waited for others to take the lead, now to follow along promptly and enthusiastically.

In view of the Senate's many strong expressions of support in the past for the policy embodied in these agreements, it is unthinkable that we should now refuse to ratify them or that we should unduly prolong the debate. Indeed, I cannot conceive of anything here to be debated. We have previously expressed

ourselves as being overwhelmingly of one mind on this subject, and I believe we are of one mind still.

In a sense, what we do here today is anticlimactic. The real debate has taken place in Europe in the past several months; and the issue was finally decided in the Council of the French Republic early last Sunday morning.

So far as the Senate is concerned, our consideration of these two treaties partakes more of the nature of a ceremonial occasion than of the nature of a debate in which issues are resolved. It is an occasion for great rejoicing, not only in the United States but throughout the free world. It is an occasion when we happily mark the completion of a project which represents much toil and many sleepless, prayerful nights.

But as we commemorate a happy ending we also inaugurate a hopeful beginning. We not only do something which is good for its own sake; we also open the way to even better things in the future. I am convinced that we improve the chances for the unification of Germany. We improve the chances for a Big Four or Big Five meeting that will produce something more constructive and helpful than stalemate and propaganda. We put into operation a method of controlling armaments that may have possibilities of wider use.

Mr. President, there is one final point I should like to make. A number of our citizens have expressed genuine concern lest these agreements should open the way for a resurgence of German militarism. Historically, there is a basis for this concern, and we would be unwise indeed if we were to ignore it.

In my judgment, there are practicable, workable safeguards against such an eventuality. Those safeguards may be found in the limitations which West Germany has accepted with respect to its own rearmament and in the nature of the cooperative effort which will be put forth under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. But even more important, Mr. President, is the control which stems from the determination of the German people to build a democracy that will truly reflect the popular will. In this spirit of the German people—which I pray will endure—lies the hope for a strong and reliable partner in the defense of the free world.

These treaties will not, of course, solve all our problems; but many of those which are not solved will be made easier of solution. I have rarely seen a treaty which held so many possibilities of good and so few of evil.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to vote promptly and overwhelmingly in favor of the two protocols which are now before it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to commend and congratulate the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and every member of the Foreign Relations Committee for bringing these treaties to the floor of the Senate so promptly after their ratification by France.

I say that as one who wants the United Nations to succeed and who thoroughly believes in NATO as a means of affording a greater opportunity for our own security and the peace of the world. I therefore rise to congratulate the Senator from Georgia for bringing the treaties to the Senate so promptly.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts in commending the chairman and the entire membership of the Committee on Foreign Relations for their work on these treaties. I heartily approve of all the provisions of the treaty, with one exception, and I wish to inquire about that one. That provision is contained in executive L, article 8, subparagraph 1 (b), which concerns any future arrangements that might be made between the United States and Germany with regard to the status of our forces in Germany after the conclusion of the treaty.

Of course, we can make no distinction, in my judgment, between Germany and other NATO countries. We have already approved the status-of-forces treaty. I have no desire at all to bring that matter up at this time. However, in a desire to have the Senate look at the provisions of a treaty which deals with the status of forces in Germany, I wrote to the State Department and asked for assurances, which I hoped I might receive by this time, that any such treaty would be submitted to the Senate for ratification.

I received from the State Department, a very equivocal letter signed by Mr. Thruston Morton, substantially to this effect: "If we think it is a treaty, we will send it to the Senate; if we think it is not, we won't."

That, of course, is typical of the attitude of some officials in the State Department, particularly Mr. Morton.

I wonder whether the committee considered that subject at all in its hearings or in the negotiations which led up to the presentation of this treaty to the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that the committee did consider it. In its report, at page 9, the Senator will observe that the report deals briefly—not fully, but briefly—with this matter. The report states:

> Secretary of State Dulles was asked whether extension of the NATO Status of Forces Convention to Germany would be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent. He replied:
>
> "I believe that if the Status of Forces Agreement is extended in its present form it would not have to come back to the Senate for further ratification. If there are modifications in it, then that might be required if they were material."
>
> It should be noted that insofar as the rights and responsibilities of the three powers to station Armed Forces in Western Germany are related to "Berlin and to Germany as a whole, including the reunification of Germany and a peace settlement" they are to continue. Moreover, the Federal Republic agrees to the stationing in the Federal Republic, from the time the German defense contribution arrangements come into effect, of forces of the same nationality and effective strength as at that time may be stationed in the Federal Republic.

I may say to the Senator from Ohio on my responsibility—and I believe it to be the viewpoint of the committee—that some changes undoubtedly will be made in the status of forces agreement on the ratification and the coming into the NATO group of Germany as a full partner, as this treaty provides. It is hardly conceivable that those changes will not be of substantial or material importance.

That being true, I can give to the Senator from Ohio my complete assurance—and, as I say, I believe it is also the attitude of the committee—that we will insist that such changes be submitted to the Senate for its consideration as a new treaty.

Mr. BRICKER. That is the only assurance I wanted to have. I could not get it from the State Department. I note from the excerpt the distinguished chairman read that the Secretary of State said if there were material changes they might be submitted to the Senate. Certainly we ought not to leave it wholly within the judgment of one man whether changes are material.

Mr. GEORGE. I agree fully with the Senator. I believe amendments to this particular treaty will be material, because there is a material change in the status of Germany itself. It becomes a full sovereign, internally and externally, with probably no important qualifications. The only provisions that might be considered as qualifying the sovereignty of Germany relate entirely to some relationships between Western Germany, East Germany, and the Soviet Union.

Mr. BRICKER. That is in reference to the problem of consolidation?

Mr. GEORGE. That is all. I think the status of forces agreement will be amended. I do not see how it is possible to obviate amendment. No doubt the changes will be substantial and material, and I certainly think they should be submitted to the Senate. I have every confidence that they will be submitted to the Senate for its consideration and approval.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator; and with that assurance I shall submit no reservation. I certainly concur in what the chairman of the committee has said, that if there is any change in the status of forces agreement it should be submitted to the Senate because of the great diversity of procedure and of substantive law and the application of the law by the German courts in contrast with the courts of our own country. So I shall not submit any reservation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the ratification of the treaties.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, when 1 lone voice speaks against 14 in opposition to reporting these treaties from the Foreign Relations Committee to the Senate, I realize that the odds of being

able to sway the Senate are 100 to 1 against him. It is, however, with a strong sense of duty that I venture to bring my views to the attention of the Senate in the hope that when the Senate studies the many problems which are involved in the protocols we are to vote on Senators will find them so fraught with dangers as to jeopardize the future happiness and safety not only of the people of other countries but of our own people in the United States.

The action of this body today is of alarming importance. I cannot emphasize too strongly that we may be participants in an act which may lead to calamitous results, as were our predecessors in this body when they considered the Treaty of Versailles, which brought on World War II.

I ask, do we want the Eisenhower administration duplicating the tragic errors which occurred after World War I?

Mr. President, one has only to read what took place in the Senate after World War II when some of the distinguished Senators who are here today participated in the discussion and thought they were settling the problems of Europe for years and years to come, and that we were going to have peace for a long, long time; one has only to read that RECORD and note the congratulatory statements made when members of the Foreign Relations Committee spoke in behalf of the treaty then pending to realize that this is but a repetition of what took place at the end of that war. We all know the tragic results that ensued.

To get at the heart of what we are doing today, I feel it the duty of everyone of us to read again the Atlantic Charter. Here is what thrilled the world and definitely stated the policies for which we were fighting in World War II.

This is the charter which was sent all over the world. This is the charter which was spoken about to the German people, to the Austrian people, to the Japanese people, and to all those who were fighting the United States of America and her allies. What did that charter provide, Mr. President? I quote from it:

> Declaration of principles, known as the Atlantic Charter, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, August 14, 1941:
>
> "Joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world."

Indeed, Mr. President, one's mind goes back to the famous 14 points of Woodrow Wilson. Every Senator upon this floor knows what happened to those 14 points.

I read further from the Atlantic Charter:

> First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

Mr. President, why did our President and Mr. Churchill put that first of all? Because they wanted to impress upon the people of the enemy countries the fact that in the time of peace they were going to have every single acre, every kilometer, of ground they had at that time.

> Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.
>
> Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.
>
> Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished—

I call the attention of the Senate especially to the words "victor or vanquished"—

> of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.
>
> Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement and social security.
>
> Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries—

I repeat: "Within their own boundaries"—

> and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.
>
> Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.
>
> Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

Mr. President, that is what the people of the world relied upon. They relied upon that statement by the President of the greatest Nation on earth, which was joined in by the Prime Minister of Great Britain.

I call attention again to what happened after World War I. Every Senator will remember the plebiscite in the Saar. It was planned to let the people of that area decide after World War I who was to rule the Saar. The Saar contains about 991,000 acres, and has a population of a little less than 1 million. A vote was taken on the question, "Should France rule the Saar, or should Germany rule it?"

On January 19, 1935, after 15 years of non-German rule, a plebiscite was held. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that neither French nor German soldiers supervised the voting. An international army comprised of British, Italian, Swedish, and Dutch troops kept order.

Today we are passing again on the question of the Saar, a region which furnishes 12 million tons of coal a year; a region which has been a part of Germany for more than a thousand years, except during the time it was taken, for a short period, by Louis XIV and by Napoleon.

After 15 years, on January 13, 1935, when the people of the Saar voted, what was the result? For reincorporation into Germany the vote was 477,119. For incorporation into France it was 2,124.

Mr. President, I am one Senator who believes that when we take the oath of office, we pledge ourselves to legislate primarily for the United States of America. I am one Senator who believes in peace. I am one Senator who does not believe the United States should become involved in a war with any foreign country, if war can possibly be avoided.

I am one of the Senators who voted only a few weeks ago against the United States becoming involved with Chiang Kai-shek in a war.

I am certainly one who does not want to see another war in Europe, which, if it comes, will involve the United States of America under its treaties, because of the fact that the Saar, with an area of 991,000 acres, has been taken away from a vanquished country.

Oh, how well we remember Hitler talking about Danzig, little Danzig. Following Danzig came little Sudetenland, on the fringe of Germany.

Mr. President, at the time the Atlantic Charter was drawn up and was promulgated throughout the world, the Allies fighting Germany said, "We want no territory."

President Roosevelt, time and time again, announced that he was not fighting the German people, but was fighting Hitler. He announced that policy in the "quarantine" speech, and reiterated it frequently.

Leaflets by the millions were dropped by airplanes all over Germany and Austria, saying what fine people the Germans and Austrians were; how nice they would be treated in case they revolted against Hitler; that there would be self-determination among the peoples of the smaller countries, and that no territory would be taken from them.

I leave it to anyone who has read the Charter of the United Nations to decide for himself whether country after country was deceived by the so-called Big Three.

In the matter of the Paris agreement, which the Senate is asked to vote upon today, I call attention to the fact that for 1,000 years, except during the time when it was conquered temporarily by the French under Louis XIV and Napoleon I, the Saar was a part of the German empire; and that the overwhelming majority of the population of the Saar today is still German. Not only do the people of the Saar speak German, but their entire background and traditions are German.

Under the terms of the Atlantic Charter, it was specifically agreed that territorial aggrandizement in any form whatsoever was abhorrent to the signers.

All of us who have read the treaties with reference to West Germany's entrance into NATO, the Brussels Treaty Organization, the Saar statute, and the European Defense Community know that

all of these are supposedly for the purpose of "defense against Eastern aggression." Strangely enough, Mr. President, it was Dean Acheson, not John Foster Dulles, who first proposed the rearming of Germany.

I had the benefit not only of talking with persons who came from Germany and were visiting here, but I had the benefit of talking with scores of people who have relatives in Germany. I had the privilege of talking with the editor of the Steuben News, which is the official publication of perhaps the leading German-American organization in this country—an organization which is made up of Americans of German extraction. The organization was named after one of the great German heroes who came to this country and fought in the Revolution and whose life is commemorated every year at West Point.

It is interesting to note that, in opposing these treaties, J. H. Meyer, editor of the Steuben News, who is as loyal an American as has ever worn shoe leather, a short time ago wrote, with the backing of the executive committee, an open letter to President Dwight Eisenhower, which was published in the official paper of the society, and I desire to read a portion of it:

I wish to state the following—to me—plain facts and their—to me—logical consequences:

THE SAAR QUESTION

1. The Saar statute violates the letter (if it actually existed) and the spirit of the Atlantic Charter;

2. Its provisions are against that freedom of speech, for which you, as commander in chief of the Allied armies, fought. Human nature, the urge to be free, cannot be shackled by unilateral decision;

3. The so-called pro-German parties have no press of their own and no other facilities in these days of mass media to express their thoughts to the electorate in the 3 months' period prior to the referendum;

4. It is against the very spirit of our own Constitution that this Nation of ours should even give its tacit approval to such an act of barbarism, of which Soviet Russia might well be proud;

5. With decent human beings having been made the helpless pawns in a game of old-fashioned power politics, in which all the advantages are on the side of the Quai d'Orsay, the results of such a referendum and election are self-evident and we who profess to defend human rights, become guilty by association, at the very least;

6. There will be no formal peace treaty between Western Germany and her former enemies, at least not in our lifetime. Therefore, the Saar will become attached to France—but not only economically—immediately and permanently.

7. Shall one single man have the right to sell part of his national birthright to strangers for something that is to many observers more than ever delusive and illusory?

8. It is self-evident that such a man if he endeavored to exercise similar powers in this country, would be impeached;

9. The Bonn coalition, as recent states (laender) elections have proven, does no longer represent the will of a majority of the West German people. Even if the hard-headed and autocratic chancellor * * * (I quote American newspapermen who approve of him).

Mind you, Mr. President, I admire Chancellor Adenauer personally. In my opinion, today he is perhaps the best liked and the most popular man in all of Europe—far more popular, in my opinion, than is Winston Churchill.

I continue reading the letter:

Even if the hard-headed and autocratic Chancellor should beat the Diet into acquiescence, a vote in favor of ratification would be a pyrrhic victory and could not be binding on a free people.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to read further, but, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the letter written by Mr. Meyer to the President of the United States be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the remainder of the letter was ordered to be printed, as follows:

PROTOCOLS AND DECLARATION ON SOVEREIGNTY

(1) As has been said before: France wants Germany to be strong enough to withstand any act of Russian aggression, but not strong enough to make French fear complexes even worse. The arms pact mirrors that attitude 100 percent. It seems designed for the containment of our new ally Germany, rather than the containment of the enemy Russia. This includes the commitment of English divisions on the Continent;

(2) The negative character of the pact is so evident that it will prove self-destructive;

(3) We cannot expect a disillusioned German youth, whose minds, only a few years ago, were fired with the ideas of an united Europe, to don uniforms once again, as an inferior people. The Soviets will make excellent use of these pact stipulations which stamp the German soldiers as auxiliary troops of a type that existed in the days of the declining Roman Empire;

(4) These protocols, undoubtedly, have strengthened the "neutralist" forces in all of Europe;

(5) If Russian aggression should become a fact, the Western World would have to blame itself for the self-evident results of such direct aggression because the pact prevented the most populous nation of Europe to go the limit in its efforts to withstand aggression and to give full play to its inventive genius in physics and chemistry, for the benefit of all of Western Europe;

(6) The talk of a "sovereign Germany" is idle and will not deceive anyone; and

(7) We have gone a long way to alienate the pro-Western elements in Germany. While Dr. Adenauer does not express the sovereign will of the German people, we have failed miserably to create a free, untrammeled press, reflecting such a sovereign will. We have contributed to the uniformity of the German press by feeding it a diet of predigested official communiques which reflect the stand of American officialdom and its satellite, the Bonn coalition.

DIVIDED EUROPE—DIVIDED GERMANY

(1) When Premier Mandès-France and the Chamber of Deputies killed EDC, France reasserted only her national sovereignty. The supranational army designed to hold back Asiatic despotism has been replaced by a loose alliance of the traditional pattern, with all its inherent weaknesses. The French Communists did their best to feed that fire of nationalism—for reasons of their own;

(2) United States policy, consequently, suffered one of its severest defeats which no camouflage can hide;

(3) France will continue her retirement into a straight and narrow nationalism as numerous recent reports from reliable sources indicate; to wit, the coal-steel pact has become the subject of a bitter struggle between the Premier and M. Jean Monnet. In addition, the French Republic desires to solve her agricultural problems alone (plus the necessary American dollars) instead of choosing cooperative action with her neighbors;

(4) All this is only in consonance with age-old European concepts, to which we are still blind. Where EDC succumbed yesterday, the U. N. and the entire artificial building of pacts all over the world may well follow tomorrow—unless we reappraise and put an enlightened national self-interest first and foremost;

(5) The not so sovereign German people, through the commitment by the Chancellor, have pledged themselves not to have recourse to force to achieve the reunification of Germany. The French, true to the dictum of national self-interest will do their utmost to prevent such reunification, notwithstanding all pious talk.

And, for the very same reason, any future Germany may well turn her back on Western Europe in order to realize a primary national objective: national unity. A deal with Soviet Russia is well possible, just as much as the Western nations have made such deals with Soviet Russia.

Neutralization would follow. Such neutralization could be achieved by peaceful means with the result that the energies of the German people would be lost to the entire western world. Let us keep in mind that the recent pacts practically invite the Germans to employ such means by telling them that their one and only hope for reunification lies in making a deal with Moscow.

(6) The British and the French never mentioned their postwar pacts with Russia—and Poland—during the recent negotiations in London and Paris.

These pacts are in full force and effect today and may well pave the way (Geneva was only a beginning) towards that goal of coexistence which is so dear to their hearts and so abhorrent to us.

Can we blame the Germans if they should desire to insure and reinsure themselves against all eventualities, in view of the sovereignty pacts which Dr. Adenauer wants them to swallow?

FACTS AND CONSEQUENCES

Some important facts and consequences have been illustrated, I trust, sufficiently.

There are some other deductions which, I feel, an enlightened American policy, finally restored to direction and perception, should make:

(1) As the Western World went to war for Danzig in 1939, another calamity might well engulf us on account of the Saar. The so-called Free City of Danzig was a monstrosity created by an American President. Germans as well as other Europeans have not forgotten that. While we all object to the violent methods employed by the Nazi, we cannot erase the self-evident truth that any other nation would have followed the same course in due time.

Do we want to contribute to such another Danzig? Treaties and compacts will not prevent it. There is no substitute for the national will—in our own country as anywhere else. We have tried for too long to achieve impossible objectives; it is time now to make the best of harsh reality.

(2) The French who—technically speaking—declared war on Germany in 1939, prodded by Great Britain and others, should make some sacrifices for a change. Why not propose to them that both the Saar and Lorraine, which supplement each other admirably, be put together under that kind of authority which is to rule the Saar?

That would be the only feasible solution and, I feel, acceptable to all Germans.

(3) Half sovereignty will not make Germany and Western Europe strong. The Germans must become equals among equals—if our not so reliable allies do not agree, then

let us make that agonizing reappraisal, of which we have spoken all too long.

(4) Our diplomats must not base our German policies on the opinions of one man, but endeavor to penetrate through the jungle of protocol and officiousness to the minds of the German people. It will be most instructive.

The Chancellor's political genius is open to serious doubt. And the constellation of the Diet may well change in a short time. It is the considered judgment of competent observers that Adenauer's doctrinairism, narrow sectarianism, and authoritativeness are growing. He has often boasted of his curt handling of subordinates. In the long run, it will be most harmful to these United States to make one willful man—who served a shattered reich well in early postwar days—in an entire nation the one and only link between two great peoples and to listen to him more than to any other man.

Moreover, his unilateral decision as far as the fate of 1 million human beings and compatriots in the Saar is concerned, is, to put it mildly, unique. It is reminiscent of certain acts ascribed to him in 1919, which have never been disproven. To repeat it once again: In our own Nation, impeachment would follow such act immediately, even under the conditions in which West Germany finds herself today.

(5) With thoughts of a western union on the decline and nationalism once again increasing, it might well behoove us to begin our agonizing reappraisal now.

As far as Germany is concerned—Adenauer or no Adenauer, Bruto or no Bruto—sooner or later she must be permitted to follow her historic role of forming the bridge between West and East, by way of neutralization or by having her own national forces as France wanted them, and France has them. Let us take a calculated risk in this world of harsh realities.

Let us get out of the fool's paradise, in which we have lived all too long.

Let us also forego empty victory celebrations such as the one recently forced upon a very apathetic American people who would have profited by some plain and unadulterated talk on the state of American affairs in Europe and elsewhere.

THE UNITED STATES SENATE'S ROLE

May I, in conclusion, express the confident hope that the United States Senate will have an opportunity to study these multifold pact problems which are so fraught with danger for our own future, with the utmost care; that public hearings will be held to give proponents and opponents an opportunity to express themselves; and that the established prerogatives of that body will be jealously guarded by everyone who has the continued welfare of America and our people at heart.

Respectfully yours,

J. H. MEYER.

NOVEMBER 9, 1954.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as I said before, from the contacts I have had with persons who have been in Germany and with those with whom I have discussed the matter, and I might say also from listening to testimony as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I am entirely satisfied I shall be doing my duty as a Senator today in voting against the treaties, and I shall therefore so vote.

I realize that favoring the treaties are such distinguished Senators as the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who has been a Senator for 30 years, and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who has been chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and who has had personal conversations with the various heads of Europe, both titled and untitled. I can only say that I know they are acting in the way they believe to be for the best interests of the United States.

It has always been the policy of the Senator from North Dakota to contact the common people. It will be only a short time before the present Chancellor of Germany will no longer be Chancellor. He will move on. The heads of other countries will move on, and some of the elder statesmen will be removed from the scene, just as Von Hindenburg was removed and was succeeded by Chancellor Hitler.

The recent elections have shown that the fine Chancellor of Germany does not today have the support of the rank and file of the German people which he had at the time he was elevated to his high office. From the discussions I have had, I am satisfied the Saar question will rise to haunt all the signatories to the treaties, and, in my opinion, it will be the cause of another world war.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the several speeches made this morning. As I listened to the remarks of my distinguished colleague the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the thought kept running through my mind, "What is the alternative to an attempt to build unity among the nations of the West?"

As stated by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], these are not Republican protocols or Democratic protocols; they are protocols to treaties which came into being after the French Assembly had really terminated EDC. The heart of the world was troubled by that event and the heart of the world will be troubled in the future unless mankind can learn to work together. Treaties are not miracle workers. Treaties are merely instrumentalities of the human mind. If the human beings who frame them will utilize them, peace can be achieved—not only peace in Europe but peace in the entire world.

Mr. President, the same criticisms which have been applied to the United Nations Charter and to various other treaties can also be applied to the Ten Commandments. But, in reality, they are not criticisms of the Ten Commandments or of the treaties; they are criticisms of the individuals who attempt to work within the purview of those instruments.

Mr. President, as we look about the world today and see on the horizon something that was not there 15 years ago, namely, a great menace called the Kremlin, we ask ourselves, "What is the answer to that menace? Is it for each nation to go its individual way or is it an attempt to obtain a unification of those who think somewhat alike," even though they do not always think alike on all matters.

Mr. President, the treaty, called the Paris agreements, to which the pending protocols would give our adhesion, recently was ratified by the French Chamber of Deputies and by the German Bundestag. Certainly the members of the French Chamber of Deputies and the members of the German Bundestag know what the people of France and the people of Germany want. If they are mistaken in that respect, then perhaps the people of those two countries will move forward to an appreciation of the great statesmanship which has been demonstrated by their leaders.

Once more, Mr. President, we are seeking to build a security system; that is all there is to it. Once more the heart of the West is reaching out for guidance and direction, through a human instrumentality called the Paris pacts.

The Atlantic Charter, to which reference has been made, and the United Nations, to which reference has also been made, are also simply instrumentalities by means of which the human race has sought to bring about cessation of war. The failure of the various races of the earth to make those instrumentalities work is the result of what has been called "the little foxes" in the human brain—hate, distrust, intolerance, and bigotry. But we are all still seeking and hungering for a method of bringing about peace.

Mr. President, I repeat that the protocols now before the Senate are not the products of a Republican foreign policy. Neither are they the fruits or products of a Democratic foreign policy. Instead, they are the consequence of an American foreign policy, for by this means we think there is another opportunity to put into operation the law of self-preservation. Certainly, Mr. President, a fundamental law of human nature, both in the case of an individual and in the case of a nation, is self-preservation. We believe that by means of unification under agreements such as these, we may find an avenue leading to the preservation of our liberties. Because these protocols are neither Democratic nor Republican, but, instead, are American, I am sure they have the unqualified support and approval of most of the Members of the Senate. In my opinion, they mean greater security for America, and improved prospects for world peace.

Mr. President, I should hesitate there because of the statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who prophesies that these protocols will mean war. But he did not say why they would. Mr. President, they cannot mean war. When France and Germany recognize that they can sit down and can iron out the Saar problem—as they practically have done—that means there is hope, hope at least that the pressure from the West and the menace of the Kremlin in the North will cause France and Germany to get together to preserve themselves.

Mr. President, I know something of the background of these protocols.

It has been my privilege to watch our foreign policies take shape through the years. As the predecessor of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee before the voters unfortunately decreed otherwise last November, I did what I could to shape our policies on Europe and elsewhere, not into Republican policies or Democratic policies but into American policies. I know that other members of the committee, regardless of party, have

striven to do the same. If the Republicans had remained a majority in Congress at this session, I am convinced that the protocols under consideration would have reached the Senate in the same form in which they come to us today.

I say that not only out of esteem for my colleagues on the committee and their nonpartisanship in these matters but also because these protocols have been a long time in the making. They have not been pulled suddenly out of a hat. If we are to understand their full meaning, we have to go back a bit into history. We have to go back to the days of our great departed colleague, the late Senator Vandenberg. We have got to see these protocols in the context of a Europe shattered and divided, a weak and broken Europe over which hung the towering threat of Communist totalitarianism.

We must remember the Marshall plan resolution and the Vandenberg resolution, measures which were passed by enormous majorities in the Senate, measures which helped to save Europe and restore a spark of hope that free nations could stand together against Communist oppression. And we have to trace that spark through the dark days of Communist opposition to European recovery in Italy, in France, and elsewhere, through the dark days of the Korean aggression, to the rebirth of Western Germany, and the bright hope of the promise of Western European unity.

All these great historic events and others lie behind the matter which is before the Senate today. We come to these protocols only after a long and difficult journey. It was a journey, nevertheless, which had to be made if western civilization, of which we are an unalienable part, was to survive.

The American people in all humbleness can thank God for giving them the strength and the patience to see the journey through to the end. En route, we gave freely of our substance, to save Europe from hunger, and to reconstruct the war-shattered lands. We put weapons into the hands of the Europeans, so that they might defend their freedoms. And we encouraged, we pleaded, and we urged them to put aside their ancient quarrels and get together for their own good as well as ours.

Had the American people not had the strength, had they not had the patience, this journey toward European unity, toward freedom, and toward peace, could not have been made. Future generations may well remember this generation of Americans for the wisdom they showed in looking to the present realities and the future needs of the country, rather than backwards, to an easier past, perhaps, but to a past which can no longer return.

Mr. President, when nations have been fighting one another for literally a thousand years, as in the case of Germany and France, it is not very easy for them to forget their quarrels and the suffering they caused. But, Mr. President, those two nations belong to the West. In my humble opinion, they share our ideals, politically and otherwise. The law of self-preservation is operating. They, too, are letting the dead bury the dead, forgetting the past, and recognizing that if they are to survive they must survive shoulder to shoulder.

These protocols bring us to the end of one road. They will return Western Germany to the place where she rightfully belongs. I cannot understand why anyone should hesitate to give sovereignty back to Germany. If these protocols are not approved, Germany will then be a repressed as well as a depressed people, without sovereignty. Then what about the possibilities of an explosion? What about the condition which would exist under those circumstances? Let us place ourselves in the shoes of Germans, and realize how we would feel in their place. We all know that they have been "feeling their oats" again. They have come into their own. They have made the greatest recovery in Europe. They are a vital, vigorous, dynamic people. We need them, and they need us. These protocols are the cement which will bind us together.

Now, Mr. President, at the core of this issue before the Senate today, is the subject of the military contributions which can be made by the German Federal Republic to Western European defense.

In the view of the highest military leaders of our own and allied governments, that contribution will prove extremely significant in securing the most effective military posture for the Atlantic nations against Communist aggression.

All peoples realize, of course, that there must never be a resurgence of the type of German militarism which proved so disastrous to the peoples of the world and to the people of Germany itself. We realize, however, that within the outstanding democratic framework which has been achieved in the Federal Republic, thanks to the leadership of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, West German military strength will be a force for peace and freedom, and never for their opposite.

In this connection, I have read with deep interest comments made in a report filed with the Senate Committee on Appropriations by Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, special consultant to the committee's Subcommittee on Armed Services. The report is based upon extensive study which General Klein undertook in September and October 1954, in the course of which he discussed European problems with many of the leading figures in Western Europe. General Klein is, of course, well-known to my colleagues as a former combat soldier, newspaperman, veterans' spokesman, and civic leader, one who has devoted a great deal of time to problems of international relations, notably with respect to Germany.

I was sorry that I could not be present on the floor at the time my colleagues the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], commented on the numerous significant observations made in his report.

I send to the desk an excerpt from the report, from pages 12 and 13 of the report, entitled "German Rearmament," and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMAN REARMAMENT

The rearming of Germany poses difficult problems. Unlike the East Germans, Dr. Adenauer's government cannot dip freely into the ranks of former Nazis to officer the new cadres without arousing the most serious apprehensions among Germany's Western neighbors. The German military leaders to whom I spoke want an army based on the American model. On this basis, they would adopt the American system of training and the American relationship between enlisted men and noncommissioned and commissioned officers. Even new uniforms would be adopted to complete the break between the new and old German Army traditions. One of the organization plans under consideration is for the establishment of a board of older retired officers, Government officials, and scientists who would pass on all officers accepted for service in the new army. Thus, anyone tainted with nazism would be unacceptable.

Prussian militarism must never return. The United States shares in the responsibility with the other nations in watching the future rearmament of Germany.

History must not repeat itself. In 1919, at the Versailles Conference, Germany was permitted to build the Reichswehr to fight bolshevism. This Reichswehr later was the cadre of Hitler's army.

The new German Army must never become a political factor and must only serve the state. The United States and the treaty powers must use all safeguards that never again will German military might become a threat to peace or be used as an instrument of aggression.

The German Army must become a part of the Western World for the defense of the democracies and must remain a part of the NATO system of mutual security against Communist and possible Fascist aggression in the future.

I continue to hold grave reservations about German rearmament in view of ultranationalist sentiment that still exists in Germany, particularly since those who hold these views are now to be found arguing for a German accommodation with Soviet Russia. The one mitigating factor I can see is that the terms under which German rearmament is to be accomplished provide for quantitative limitations on German forces and controls on the type of armaments Germany is to produce. If we are to achieve a needed German military contribution to the Western community without undermining and ultimately destroying the painstaking efforts Western statesmen, including Chancellor Adenauer, have made to develop a free, democratic climate in Germany, it is essential that the agreed-upon factors governing German rearmament be adhered to faithfully.

In discussing Germany's participation in the new European Defense Community with former Germany Regular Army Generals Speidel and Heussinger, I was impressed with their view that the old-style German Army must never come back. Speidel and Heussinger participated in the famous putsch of July 20, 1944, against Hitler, when most of their coconspirators were executed by Hitler's hangman. The end of the war and liberation by the Allies saved Speidel and Heussinger from the same fate. If there is to be a Germany Army controlled by a civilian head and responsible to the Parliament then no better men could have been chosen for this task than these two anti-Hitler rebels who openly expressed their shame over Hitler's terrible crimes against humanity—a stain that will remain forever on the Ger-

man Army which became a willing tool of Hitler with the noble exception of such leaders as Witzleben, Stauffenberg, Goerderler, Schlabrendorff, and hundreds of others who fought Hitler until the bitter end. To this group the present leaders of the new German Army belong.

A dilemma confronting the Adenauer government is that it took office amid Allied insistence that Germany must write finis to its militaristic past. Now, after having been chided for its military tradition, Germany is told that it is moral and necessary to take up arms once more. This has proved specially confusing to the younger people who came to maturity through World War II defeat and in the period of Allied strictures—and intense propaganda—against militarism.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as I have previously said, the protocols bring us to the end of one road. They will return Western Germany to the place where she rightfully belongs, to a place of equality and partnership with other nations of the Western World. We cannot keep a people or a nation such as Germany down without having explosions. At the same time, they will strengthen the military defenses of the free nations, as illustrated earlier by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

They will do something more. They will make possible the creation of a very important living organism in Europe. That organism is the Council for Western European Union. For some time there has been a Council of Europe. We are not a part of it; but some years ago it was my privilege, together with other Senators, to go to Strasbourg. There we listened to the statesmen of Europe expressing, through words which could be clearly understood, their imperative hunger for a real unity of the West. Their problem was how to get over the roadblocks and barriers created by the conflicts of the past. One might say that the very pressure of the Kremlin itself, and the mistakes the Kremlin has made, have been the greatest instrumentality in destroying those roadblocks and barriers. That is why it has been possible for other nations, through their parliaments, to agree to the Paris pacts. They make possible the creation of a very important living organism in Western Europe. It is an organism which promises to absorb the bickering nationalisms and the hates of the Continent into a new concept of a united Europe. Like any other organism, however, it must be nourished if it is to survive and grow strong.

This organism is composed of the various nationalities which for a thousand years have been fighting one another. The hope is that they may follow a pattern similar to that which we followed on this continent because of pressures which existed in our early days, and because of the leadership of the people of this country which existed in pre-Revolutionary days. It is hoped that the European nations will sense the imperative need of unity.

These protocols represent the open door. They are the open door because certain nations of Europe themselves have first agreed to them. They have set the pattern. We did not set the pattern, but we have agreed with them. After EDC died, Eden of England—virtually another Colonel House—went to the various chancelleries of European nations, talked things out quietly and obtained agreement on the basic fundamentals. Then followed the meeting which brought about these treaties. So we have waited and prayed. Now Germany and France have said, "We, too, feel that this is the way."

We are not doing anything except what we have done in the past. We have helped, and we shall continue to help. We say to the other nations, "We will continue to work with you as teammates, in an effort to build a better and safer world."

The people of Europe have long known what is needed. Ask a Norwegian on the streets of Oslo. Ask a German in Bonn, a Frenchman in Paris, or an Englishman in London, as I personally have done. Ask the common people, the shopkeepers and farmers, and others who labor with their hands. Many times they are even ahead of their leaders—as sometimes happens in this country—in sensing the need of the moment and of the future.

What is it that Europe needs most? The answer will always be the same. It needs peace. The nations must learn to live together. They must learn to work together. That is the kind of nourishment which this living organism of a united Europe needs if it is to flourish. It needs the kind of institutions and the kind of spirit which will make it possible for the people of Western Europe to live together and to work together in peace.

The problem is extremely difficult. Sometimes even in this country we witness explosions over minor political issues and personalities. In order to understand the European situation we must put ourselves in their shoes. Thank God, they are doing a tremendous job. Their leadership is on its toes.

Mr. President, I have reached the conclusion of my remarks. I cannot end them, however, without expressing my appreciation for the kind words which the Senator from Georgia spoke about my activity in Europe this year. It seemed as though something had happened which presented an opportunity. I happened to be in Vienna when the French Assembly stuck a dagger, as it were, into EDC. It was then that I received a summons from Adenauer, followed by one from Churchill, and another from Mendès-France.

In conclusion, I wish to express my deep appreciation for the tremendous service to mankind that has been rendered by the statesmen of Western Europe. Chancellor Adenauer, the grand man of Germany, has helped his people move from the isolation of a defeated nation to recovery and freedom in a strong Western Germany. Former Prime Minister Mendès-France and his successor Prime Minister Faure have helped France retain its position of greatness among the free nations. Sir Winston Churchill and Foreign Minister Anthony Eden instilled life into the idea of an integrated Europe at the time when the defeat of EDC cast Western Europe in shadow. Prime Minister Spaak contributed his great intellect and boundless energy to the accomplishment of these aims. Prime Minister Scelba, of Italy, has been firm and forthright in his leadership. I commend these men. They did a great job.

I shall never forget the hours I spent individually with those men. I found them to be dedicated men, even as our own Secretary of State is. I found them to be dedicated to peace. I found them to be humble men. I found them to be men who seek guidance and direction. It was above the city of Bonn, in a castle, in the heights overlooking the German forest, that I spent 3 hours with Chancellor Adenauer. It was at Chartwell that I spent 2 hours with Churchill. It was in the chancellery in Paris that I spent hours with Mendès-France.

Mr. President, something unusual happened during those days. England took a new look. Never before in the centuries during which she has played a potent part in the affairs of the world had she ever placed or agreed to place her own troops on the Continent. It was then that Mr. Eden went forth, as I said, like a Colonel House, and brought about what is now the Paris Agreements.

I wish to pay my compliments to all those men. I wish to pay my compliments to Winston Churchill, to Spaak, and to Scelba, and to Faure, the present Premier of France.

These men sensed the need of the hour. They are not looking backward. They are not turning the clock back. They know that the facts of life today are different than they were formerly. The world has been contracted by the ingenuity of man. The other day a plane crossed the American Continent in 3 hours and 45 minutes, and another plane crossed from Newfoundland to southern Ireland in 3 hours and 25 minutes. We have the A-bomb and the H-bomb and guided missiles. We have facing us the overwhelming power of the Kremlin.

The hour calls for statesmanship. Thank God the statesmen of Europe have responded, and the people of Europe are backing those statesmen. They are hungry for these undertakings, and they want them far more than a great many people of the privileged classes do.

I hope that once these protocols have been ratified, these great men will act with the breadth of vision and the spirit of charity which Europe so desperately needs.

I hope they will, in their wisdom, rise above the narrow national boundaries which for so long have set their peoples at each other's throats instead of in each other's hearts. These protocols point the way. I pray that they will help usher Western Europe and the free world into a new era of security and peace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would advise Senators that the Senate is in executive session. It is desirable that the treaties be ratified as soon as is possible. After action on the treaties, the Senate will resume legislative session, and the Chair will be glad to recognize Senators who wish to speak on other subjects.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation of the statement of the chairman of the

Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. GEORGE], and of the former chairman of that committee [Mr. WILEY].

I feel the subject has been adequately covered, but I desire to add a few words on the subject so that the RECORD may be as complete as may be possible.

The occasion of this debate takes me back in personal remembrance to the days when we were discussing the ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty itself. I recall especially the beloved late Senator Vandenberg, who was so active in connection with that matter. I recall that our Secretary of State, Foster Dulles, was at that time a distinguished member of this body, and, of course, I recall particularly that the President of the United States, then General Eisenhower, was the person called upon to implement the treaty in a practical way abroad. The present occupant of the chair also had a hand in securing the ratification of that important treaty. So, Mr. President, I approach the subject from the standpoint of personal recollection.

Mr. President, in addressing the Senate on matters of foreign policy, I have frequently directed my attention to Asia. As a member of the Subcommittee on the Far East of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have naturally had a deep interest in that region and a very great concern with developments there. But I should like to make clear and to emphasize that I regard events in Europe of no less importance to this country. Our problems are truly global.

Europe and Asia constitute two vast fronts in a single struggle which is being waged for men's minds, loyalties, and allegiances. In its quest for world dominion, Communist totalitarianism does not distinguish between these continents, except perhaps for tactical reasons. The free nations cannot afford to make a distinction, either.

A growth in the strength of the forces of freedom in Europe no less than in Asia increases the security of the United States. Similarly, we cannot hope to shut out aggression by putting up a wall in one part of the world while leaving gaps elsewhere through which the aggressor can pass.

That is the great merit of these protocols which the Senate has under consideration. They fill gaps—important, perhaps vital gaps—in the worldwide defense structure of the free nations. They bring a sovereign Germany into NATO and at the same time lay the groundwork for a unified defense of Western Europe.

They are a magnificent demonstration of what free peoples can do when they face frankly and openly the facts of survival in a world threatened in every part of the globe by Communist tyranny. I find it most inspiring to watch the people of Western Europe put aside their ancient animosities and rivalries. The protocols replace those animosities and rivalries with a new hope for mutual progress and growth. Henceforth, the Germans, the French, the Italians, the British, and the other Europeans need no longer work at cross-purposes with one another. Their destinies are linked for the common good. That is a matter for which many of us have stood for years—the bringing together of European nations for their common protection and advancement.

These protocols can produce a Europe far different from that of the years preceding World War II, far different from the Europe of 1945 and 1946 when practically all that stood between the free European nations and obliteration was the strength and determination of the United States that those nations should not fall to the Communists. From these protocols can emerge a new Europe, a strong Europe, and a vital Europe.

For us, the protocols add still another stone—a massive stone—to the ramparts which defend the free world and this country as a part of it. Stone by stone, under the able guidance of the Secretary of State we have been erecting a worldwide barrier against the corrosive and eroding influences of communism.

The country is indeed fortunate to have a man of the caliber of Secretary Dulles at the helm of our foreign policy in these critical times under the inspired leadership of our President. His has been an outlook which encompasses the world. He was the chief architect of the great interlocking design of defense pacts in the Western Pacific—the Japanese treaty, the Philippines treaty, the Anzus pact, the Chinese treaty, and the Southeast Asia treaty. He did a magnificent job in all of these undertakings, first in support of the previous Secretary of State and then as Secretary of State. I can testify personally to his great ability, particularly in connection with one of them. As the Senate knows, I had the honor to serve with Secretary Dulles and the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] on the American delegation to the Manila Conference last year. The Secretary's work there, with the Filipinos, the Thais, the Pakistanis, and with other free allies, the United Kingdom, France, Australia, and New Zealand, was an example of wise and understanding diplomacy of the highest order.

And now to his vast accomplishments in the Pacific must be added his great part in bringing to life the London-Paris accords. One need only to recall the despair and uncertainty that followed the collapse of EDC last year to realize what an extraordinary achievement these accords represent.

I believe the Senate and the American people owe our Secretary of State a great debt for his tireless efforts on behalf of the country. But beyond that we, the United States of America, can give a prompt and glorious welcome to the birth of a new unit on the Continent of Europe. This new unit is a stupendous achievement and may well ultimately become the United States of Europe.

A United States of Europe, together with our United States of America, could lead the way to a firm and lasting world peace.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to act promptly and courageously in this vital matter.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I have been deeply disturbed by the events which have finally resulted in the treaties before the Senate today. It is indeed a serious risk which we run in promoting the rearmament of a nation against whom we have fought the two most devastating wars in history. Our determination to rearm that nation finds its justification in the hope that it will serve to make less certain a third and annihilating world war with which all humanity is threatened. The hope is that fire may successfully be fought with fire, devastation with devastation.

It is indeed an unsettling responsibility to ask Germany to rearm. In questioning the wisdom of this undertaking we need have no doubt of the present German Government or of its high-minded leader, Chancellor Adenauer. But men and governments are mortal. They will not outlast a certain appetite for military power and domination which has lain beneath German history for two centuries, and which, we have reason to fear, is not dead, but only lying in wait.

We might conclude these fears were groundless, were they not shared by so many millions of the German people themselves. They have lived through untold suffering. They have had personal experience with calamities brought upon them by the militarism of their rulers. If they are troubled, we must be also.

It is because of a sound instinct in the French people that they likewise have feared the rearmament of Germany. They have had the experience of three invasions from the east. They do not want another. While we can understand this, it is most difficult to understand why that country refused to agree to the European Defense Community, which erected safeguards that the present treaty does not provide. We have to accept the fact of that decision, however much we are bewildered by it.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly that the only safety to be found in this situation lies in the eventual liquidation of German rearmament through general disarmament. For that reason, I am the more cheered by certain words and deeds in the RECORD of the past few weeks, These relate to the greatest subject that is before the Senate, Congress, this country, and the world. That subject is the discovery of means whereby we can move from our present state of tension and arms race and the imminent possibility of atomic warfare into a period of peace and freedom.

There is nothing in all the responsibilities laid upon Congress, the administration, or the country which exceeds this subject in importance. Yet the day-to-day business obscures our principal responsibility and our highest opportunity. We can pick up the calendar from our desks, and as our eyes run down the list, we can see before us all kinds of measures of varying degrees of importance. Only here and there, and then principally in questions relating to defense, do we see any measures which relate themselves directly or even indirectly to our greatest responsibility.

In saying that defense bears some relation to it, I am expressing the conviction which I express from time to time to peace-loving and peace-seeking groups throughout the country. That state-

ment is that the only road to disarmament lies through armament. Our armament must be considered in the light of our progress toward disarmament. It must be pursued boldly and unremittingly, with the knowledge that unilateral decreases, little trimmings here and there, or bolder cuts in our plans and appropriations, and even any laxity in development, any weariness with research in the field of arms—any or all of these—strengthen the offensive position of the Soviet Government and weaken our own possibilities of attaining universal controlled disarmament.

The American people know that we are a peace-loving nation. They know that no other nation, no other people, has territory or resources which we wish to take over. They know that we have no hostility toward any people whatsoever. Particularly do we have no hostility to the peoples behind the curtains, whether iron or bamboo. We are determined that the governments of those peoples shall not proceed further in their program for enslaving the world. Our opposition is to their governments. We can have, as Christians, nothing but the best will toward the peoples themselves. As St. Paul said:

> He hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.

These men are our brothers. We suffer in a common net of evil. We and they are devoting our labor and our national resources to an arms race which cuts down their standard of living and ours, which cuts down the food, the clothing, the housing, and the education of our children to lower levels than they and we might otherwise reach.

We know this, but what does the world see and hear from us? It hears little except our progress with the atomic and hydrogen bombs. It hears little except our breathings of fire and smoke with regard to further expansion of Communist controlled territory. It sees little except fist shakings and warlike gestures and grimaces, of which the treaty before us is an example. We do not get through to the world our deep desire for peace and friendship.

Mr. President, we have just had a red-letter fortnight. It was a thrilling time. It was made so for the junior Senator from Vermont by two speeches on the Senate floor and one announcement from the White House.

One of these speeches was by the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] on March 22, and bears on the moral encirclement which must be forged around the Communist world if freedom and peace are to prevail. He set forth the purposes and the nature of our assistance to underdeveloped nations with particular reference, I assume, to the danger spots of the world—Asia and, in the coming months and years, Africa. He clearly set forth that our assistance in these areas is not one which is offered as a reward for following our ideas and policies or withheld as punishment where those ideas and policies are not followed. The fundamental notion is to improve the well-being of the peoples who are being drawn, all too unknowingly, toward Communist slavery.

Also to be commended is his urging that this be done through joining in plans which these people have already organized, such as the Colombo plan. We cannot be drivers and help these people much. We cannot take full responsibility for directing them. We can offer our services in helping them with their problems rather than trying to carry out our own plans.

I feel that there needs to be, in all considerations of help in underdeveloped areas, a careful discrimination as to the kind of help we give. For many of them there is a deficiency of food. For these people great electrical power developments or industrial undertakings are not the immediate human need. Irrigation projects may in some cases be feasible. Otherwise the great capital expenditures are not the thing. Rather what is indicated is such help as can be given by operations similar to those performed by our own county agents in the agricultural regions of the United States. We will miss the point and cripple our ability to help if we focus our thinking on great capital expenditures.

The junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] came up with the kind of intelligent suggestion that will arise in the minds of many if they are seriously concerned with our great problem of peace and freedom. It is evident that he does other thinking than that connected with the necessary daily grist of legislation. The pending legislation is necessary. The devotion of a proper amount of our thought to it is in the line of duty, but, unless we can also make our contribution to this great problem as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has done, we shall fall far short of the task which the people have placed in our hands when they elected us to this legislative body.

As you know, Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], proposes to control warlike activities of both ourselves and other governments by the means of agreeing to percentages of output of basic materials which shall be devoted to peace and devoted to war. This will require international inspection of the production and distribution of first basic materials, of which steel is the principal one. It does not involve any standstill agreement as to arms. It does involve an agreement by each of the principal nations of the world as to how much of their resources and labor shall go into war and how much shall go to peace.

The third event which made that fortnight a red-letter one in the cause of peace and freedom was the President's appointment of Harold Stassen to have personal responsibility for working on this major, this ultimate, problem. I have commented that the face we turn toward the world is predominantly warlike. From time-to-time, too rarely perhaps, the President comes through with words which express our intense desire for peace. As an example, some little time ago our President made a proposal looking toward the development of the peacetime uses for atomic energy. He gave substance to the proposal by offering a considerable amount of fissionable material for this purpose. That was a proposal heard around the world, and its influence still remains. Progress toward the application of this material should be expedited and the reports of that progress broadcast.

Again the President has come through with a deed in addition to the word. Mr. Stassen will be the visible evidence of our determination to work for a state of peace and freedom. The task which is set before him is not an impossible one.

In this connection, new evidences of support for universally controlled disarmament, or practical approaches thereto, appeared in the March 27 issue of the New York Times. The head of the British delegation to the five-power disarmament conference in London is the Honorable Anthony Nutting. I quote portions of the press dispatch:

> The British Government is considering whether to propose a control and inspection corps of several thousand officials, recruited from all over the world, to make international disarmament effective.
>
> This corps would stay in being forever and it would have the right to go anywhere at any time to do its job.
>
> It would receive official disclosures of military strength from every country and would have the power to verify such disclosures. Corrective action in the case of violations of disarmament agreements would be up to the United Nations.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The international control organization would have to be agreed upon and fully established as a prerequisite.
>
> Disarmament then would be accomplished in three phases. First would come a "freeze," possibly for several months, during which all nations would halt arms production, the induction of more military manpower and any increase in arms budgets.

In connection with this news dispatch and this information as to plans under consideration, it should be noted that the plan of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] avoids the difficulties of the "freeze" with its economic repercussions.

This whole undertaking demands the best thought of all of us, and we must devote an appropriate amount of our energy and our planning to it. I shall at a later time address the Senate on the subject of whether or not there is any possibility of persuading the Soviet Government to agree to the control of arms, armament, and armies. At that time I shall give my reasons for feeling that the task is not a hopeless one, but one which will yield to well-considered words and action.

Mr. President, only if the project for controlled disarmament is really a hopeful one and is pressed forward as such—only in that event do the treaties before the Senate make sense. Only in the light of disarmament does the contemplated rearmament become anything but a reckless playing of little boys with dynamite.

I urge on the administration, the Congress, and the peoples, a devotion to the carrying out of the project for peace and freedom, the hope of the nations. Only with this hope do I vote for the treaties.

QUEMOY AND THE MATSUS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the ghost of Neville Chamberlain arose day before yesterday on the floor of the United States Senate. I thought we had seen the last of the Chamberlain tradition when the Acheson-Marshall-Truman cabal was voted out of power. I thought we had seen the last of appeasement, retreat, and surrender. But the spirit of Neville Chamberlain—of Munich—is evidently very much alive. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has proved himself a most worthy heir of the Munich tradition.

Adolf Hitler said: "I must have Austria and the Sudetenland." Chamberlain answered: "If you insist, Herr Hitler, of course, you must have them—and woe be to those warmongers who point out that this is merely whetting the aggressor's appetite."

The Communist regime in China announces: "We must have Quemoy and the Matsus." The Senator from Tennessee replies that the Communists must be permitted to have those islands—and anyone who thinks otherwise is ipso facto engaged in a "war plot."

This was an irresponsible speech by the Senator from Tennessee, from beginning to end. But it proved a point. It proved very clearly what the majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], has been busy all week denying. He has been denying that the Democratic Party is the party of appeasement. He said the other day: "We want to be neither a war party nor an appeasement party." When the Senator from Tennessee urges that we give the Communists what they want, he rather effectively exposes the majority leader's statement as sheer rhetoric. And to my knowledge, not a single Democrat leader has repudiated the demand of the Senator from Tennessee that we surrender Quemoy and the Matsus.

This cheap talk about war plots is, of course, politically inspired. It is designed to divert attention from the fact that Democrat leaders are working feverishly behind the scenes in support of a Munich-type deal in the Far East. The proposed deal is that in exchange for our surrendering to the Communists Quemoy and the Matsus, the Communists will agree to a cease-fire in the Formosa Straits and will promise not to attack Formosa itself. Old Neville Chamberlain would be proud of his pupils.

Such deals were Chamberlain's stock in trade. Time after time he agreed to hand over a province or a nation in exchange for Hitler's promise that this represented his last territorial ambition. Is it the position of the Senator from Tennessee that the Communists can be counted on to keep their promises? When will the Democratic Party learn that it is not possible to deal with blackmailers? Peace cannot be bought by acceding to a tyrant's demands; only more demands result.

Yet, notwithstanding that charges of war plots and the like are the crude inventions of demagogs, I must admit that the strange attitude of the administration on this question lends a certain plausibility to the Democrats' war thesis. The charge that somebody is plotting war is obvious nonsense; but it is not so easy to deny that we are blundering into war.

I reminded the Senate the other day that one of the surest ways of discouraging an aggressor from starting a war is by making it crystal clear in advance what the consequences of aggression will be. I was not, heaven knows, the originator of this theory. It is merely commonsense. It was the President's own argument when he asked Congress for the Formosa resolution several weeks ago, and it was the argument most of us had in mind when we voted for the resolution.

But now when the chips are down and we know where the enemy plans to attack, the President refuses to say whether we will resist the attack. He refuses to give the enemy advance warning of the consequences of aggression.

The other day I pointed out that continued silence by the administration would simply encourage the success-happy Communists to stretch their luck. I asked the President to avoid that risk by declaring immediately what this country would do in the event of attack. On Wednesday, at his press conference, the President was asked to comment on our intentions. He blandly replied that he would not tell. Why would he not tell? No reason was given. No military or strategic disadvantage I can think of would result from making our intentions known. And none has been suggested by the administration or anybody else. I am completely bewildered by the administration's attitude. It is deadly dangerous and utterly inexplicable.

The President apparently told some Members of Congress that our reaction would depend on "the nature and strength" of a Communist attack. If this means that we will not enter the fight if the Nationalists show they can handle the Communists alone, no one will disagree. That goes without saying. But the important question—the question to which the Communists must be given the answer, while they are deciding whether to launch the attack—is: Will we furnish whatever air and naval force is needed to prevent the Communists from conquering Quemoy and the Matsus? Why will the President not answer that question?

It is being said in some official circles that the President is unwilling to speak out, for fear of offending the British. But if the President really intends to defend the coastal islands, he is going to offend the British anyway, sooner or later. What point is there in postponing this "disappointment" to our European allies? As a matter of fact, if we really want to avoid British displeasure, we should remember that the surest way of making the British mad at us is to get into a fight over the islands. If we continue to keep silent as to our intentions, we may have both British displeasure and a war.

I told the Senate, the other day, that by not disclosing its intentions, the administration was inviting a war in the Far East. I think there can be absolutely no question about this. Of course, we can not be sure that the Communists will not attack if they are told that in doing so, they will be taking on the United States of America. But if we make it crystal clear to the Communists that they will have to destroy the American Navy and Air Force before they can have the coastal islands, the chances are extremely good that the Communists will not dare attack. And if we fail to make this clear, the Communists will surely attack.

I ask again: Why does the President invite what may be an unnecessary war? We will not have war because of some sinister plot; and the demagogs well know this. But we may have war because of gross ineptitude in the handling of our foreign relations. In view of the way the administration is playing its hand, we may have no alternative but to choose between appeasement and war. The President can still avoid this awful dilemma, but not much time is left.

WHAT IS OUR ASIAN POLICY?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my answer to the speech just delivered on the floor of the Senate by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] takes the form of a resolution which I shall now offer, read, and briefly discuss.

I think the Senator from Wisconsin has today performed a service for the Senate of the United States by stating on this floor the primary issue in American foreign policy on the basis of which the American people must make a decision as to the direction our foreign policy shall take in the years immediately ahead.

Although I do not endorse various of the adjectives the junior Senator from Wisconsin used in his speech, I think that in his speech to the Senate today he has raised the issue of whether the United States will deliberately, intentionally, and willfully proceed on a course of action in Asia which will involve us, as an aggressor nation, in a war on the mainland of China, with the result that we shall become the subject of condemnation by the other nations of Asia.

Mr. President, I believe that we shall have to fight out this issue in the public forums of the United States in the weeks immediately ahead.

In commenting upon the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], I wish to make it clear that I do not approve of his criticisms of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] or of the main thesis of the speech of the Senator from Tennessee. It is my view that the argument of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], that we should not become involved in a civil war in China is absolutely sound. Also I wish to say that in my opinion the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], is not an appeaser as charged by the Senator from Wisconsin but is a great and patriotic American who believes that we should reject preventive war propaganda.

AMERICAN PEOPLE SHOULD DECIDE FOREIGN POLICY

Let me make clear my position that the foreign policy of the United States is not entirely within the province of the President of the United States, although we

have reached the point where there seems to be acceptance of the notion that American foreign policy must be what the President of the United States decides it shall be. The foreign policy must always be what the American people decide it shall be. If the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States will present the facts to the American people about the Asiatic situation, the foreign policy of the United States with respect to Asia will not be the foreign policy which the President of the United States seems to be following these days.

UNITED STATES INTENTIONS ABOUT QUEMOY AND MATSU SHOULD BE CLEAR

In my opinion, the President of the United States has no right to leave in suspension the question of America's position in regard to Quemoy and the Matsus. If I correctly interpret the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], that is his position. The difference between us is that the Senator from Oregon takes exactly the opposite position from that of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] as to what our policy in respect to Quemoy and the Matsus should be. I hope that honest, sincere, and patriotic men can always take opposite positions in the Senate as to what the foreign policy of our country should be.

UNITED STATES PRESTIGE HAS SUFFERED FROM DELAY

In my judgment, already great damage has been done by the President of the United States to the prestige of the United States in the field of foreign policy. I believe that the President of the United States has already delayed too long making clear to the world what our position is to be in regard to our Asiatic foreign policy. In my opinion, already the President has delayed too long in making clear to the world that we are going to insist on staying within the framework of international law. We are outside it today in respect to our Asiatic policy.

OUR ALLIES WILL NOT SUPPORT QUEMOY AND MATSU DEFENSE

What is happening around the world is that our allies are asking the question, "How can the proposed course of action of the United States in regard to Quemoy and the Matsus, in respect to which islands the United States does not have a single legal right under international law, be defended?"

UNITED STATES HAS NO RIGHTS IN QUEMOY AND MATSU

I have been waiting for the Secretary of State to answer a question which I put to him in the Foreign Relations Committee the other day. I asked the Secretary of State, "What principle of international law justifies the defense of Quemoy and the Matsus by the United States?" He did not name a principle of international law in justification of our position for the simple reason that he could not. In the light of the situation in Asia at the present time the defense of Quemoy and the Matsus cannot be reconciled with international law; on the contrary, in my opinion, if we defend them we would violate existing international law. We have no right to be defending these coastal islands with respect to which we have no territorial rights. That is the situation. The American people have the right to expect their President to stay within the framework of international law. He has made it perfectly clear that he does not understand the principles of international law, because if he did understand them he would not have asked the Congress of the United States for authorization to go outside the framework of international law.

What did he ask for? He asked for authority to strike the mainland of China before an act of war was committed against the United States. That is what the language of the resolution means. We cannot read its language in any other terms, in the light of existing international law. The President sent to us a resolution which was passed by the Congress, in which the President asked for power to take "such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores." A reading of the testimony before the committee which was submitted by the Secretary of State, by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and by other top administration witnesses, discloses that there is no question about what they seek to do. They seek authority to exercise the discretionary right to determine when we shall strike the mainland of China before an act of war has been committed against the United States. When we follow that course of action we walk outside the framework of international law. That is where the United States stands today, in the judgment of the world.

That is why Canada, France, and Great Britain are making it perfectly clear to us that they will not support us in the defense of Quemoy and the Matsus. They have no intention of supporting the United States in an aggressive course of action with respect to Quemoy and the Matsus, over which territory we have not a scintilla of legal right.

Of course, I am perfectly aware of the fact that these days when one makes the fight for peace which I am making in these arguments in the Senate and elsewhere in the country, he is likely to be called an appeaser, a follower of Chamberlain, or even a follower of the Communist line.

Mr. President, the judgment of history against the United States will be a sad one if America continues much longer to follow the foreign policy of Dwight D. Eisenhower. The time has come for the American people, in the interest of the tens of thousands of American boys who are likely to die if we continue to act outside the framework of international law, to make clear to the President of the United States that they do not want to defend Quemoy and the Matsus, over which we have no international legal rights.

I think the issue is that simple. I am perfectly willing, in this historic debate across the country in the weeks and months ahead—God giving us weeks and months of peace—to take this issue to the American people, because I am satisfied that an overwhelming majority of them disapprove of the President's request for authorization to strike the mainland of China before an act of war has been committed against us.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I will not yield until I shall have concluded. Then I shall be happy to yield.

I think it is very important that the American people make clear to the President of the United States at the earliest possible date the great groundswell of opposition to his proposal embodied in the resolution, that we should follow an aggressive course of action on the mainland of China or in defense of Quemoy and the Matsus, if he decides that such a course is necessary. It is about time for the American people to make some decisions about American foreign policy. They cannot decide intelligently and accurately unless we in the Congress see to it that they have the facts about American foreign policy in Asia.

THE PEOPLE ARE ENTITLED TO INFORMATION

The delightful social luncheon engagements at the White House with leaders of the Congress, in which we are given very little information, do not result in the American people getting the facts. I think the situation adds up to a policy of maintaining the status quo. The American people are not given the facts to which they are entitled. They are entitled to know from the President of the United States the answer to this question, "Why do you not tell us why you will or will not defend Quemoy and the Matsus?" The people of the United States are entitled to an answer to that question in the first instance, and our allies are entitled to it in the second instance.

WE HAVE DUTY AND RIGHT TO DEFEND FORMOSA

Before coming to the resolution which I intend to submit I wish to make it clear again that there is no one in the Senate or in the country more determined than I am to defend Formosa to the hilt, because we have the legal right and duty to defend Formosa. When we are defending Formosa we are within the framework of international law, not outside it, as we are with respect to Quemoy and the Matsus. When we defend Formosa we are defending the peace in the Pacific. When we defend Formosa we are doing what we are clearly obligated to do, in my judgment, under the Japanese Treaty, until the sovereignty of Formosa is determined by the juridical processes of the United Nations.

What the American people need to have told to them very clearly is that under the Japanese treaty Formosa's sovereignty was not determined. What the Japanese treaty did was release, so far as Japan is concerned, any claim Japan had over Formosa. However, the sovereignty of Formosa was never vested in Chiang Kai-shek.

That is why, while I was opposing the treaty, I tried to write into it a reservation which would make very clear that the treaty could not possibly be interpreted by anyone as strengthening Chiang's claim to any sovereign rights over Formosa. With regard to the

speech of the Senator from Wisconsin I wish to say that the American people are entitled to assurance from the President that American boys will not be called upon to die in China in defense of Chiang on Quemoy and the Matsus. The American people know that Chiang's civil war in China is not a matter in which we should become embroiled. Further, with regard to the social conferences with congressional leaders at the White House on yesterday and the day before yesterday it needs to be said that the vacuity of information that came out of those luncheon conferences was not reassuring to the American people. The public is now entitled to know from both the President and the congressional leaders what our policy is going to be in respect to Quemoy and the Matsus.

I am opposed to the President of the United States dragging us into the China civil war through any attempt to defend Quemoy and the Matsus. Therefore, I submit to the Senate and ask to have referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the committee hold early hearings on it, a concurrent resolution. I submit it on behalf of myself and on behalf of that great statesman from the State of New York, and my beloved friend, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. The resolution reads as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 21

Whereas it is the historic policy of the United States to promote peace throughout the world by urging the settlement of international disputes through juridical processes; and

Whereas the United States has always decried the use of aggression or threats of aggression in foreign affairs; and

Whereas there now is danger of United States involvement in atomic war with the Chinese Communists in the defense of the Matsu and Quemoy Islands occupied by forces of the Republic of China; and

Whereas the United States under international law has no territorial rights or claims to the Matsu and Quemoy Islands; and

Whereas a military defense of said islands by the United States subjects the United States to the charge of acts of aggression and involvement in a Chinese civil war; and

Whereas the major allies of the United States have declared that they are unsympathetic to and would not support the defense of the Matsu and Quemoy Islands; and

Whereas it is the right and policy of the United States under international law to defend Formosa and the Pescadores against communistic attack until such time as its sovereign status is determined by peaceful processes: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(a) the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area," approved January 29, 1955 (Public Law 4, 84th Cong.), shall not be construed to authorize the President to employ any of the Armed Forces of the United States in military operations concerning the Matsu and Quemoy Islands;

(b) the existing danger of war could be relieved by the cooperation of the Republic of China in the evacuation of such islands and the safe return of the forces of the Republic of China and the civilian inhabitants to Formosa;

(c) on the basis of such cooperation the President at the earliest practicable time should take appropriate action to lay before the United Nations the danger to the peace of the world presented by the threat of attack upon such islands, with the request that the United Nations undertake the supervision of such evacuation and the removal from those islands of the military forces of the Republic of China and the civilian inhabitants who may desire to seek refuge elsewhere; and

(d) the Armed Forces of the United States properly may be employed to render assistance which may be required to safeguard such evacuation and removal under such conditions as the United Nations may determine to be necessary to avoid, to the greatest practicable extent, involvement in hostilities with forces of the Chinese Communists.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21), submitted by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTION WOULD PLACE UNITED STATES WITHIN INTERNATIONAL LAW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say that by adopting such a concurrent resolution we would stay within the framework of international law. Moreover, we would return to the historic foreign policy of the United States, a foreign policy which has always made clear to the world that we do not follow a course of aggression or a course of threatened aggression, and that we have never claimed to exercise jurisdiction over territories to which we have no international-law rights.

In the interest of the judgment that will rest on the heads of future generations of American citizens, we had better get back to—and the President of the United States has the duty to the American people to lead us back into—the framework of international law, out of which he led us when he sent to Congress in the first place the joint resolution that sought to give him extraordinary and, in my opinion, unconstitutional powers.

PUBLIC OPINION HAS SHIFTED SINCE JANUARY

In the days that have passed since the historic debate on that joint resolution, a very interesting shift has been taking place in American public opinion. Those of us who dared to stand on the floor of the Senate and speak in behalf of the thesis I am reiterating today, expected to be castigated, and we have been castigated. But, Mr. President, a great change is taking place in American public opinion, and we are beginning to observe a growing evidence of it in American journalism.

Mr. President, I refer to the New York Times, which is certainly not an anti-Eisenhower newspaper. It is a newspaper which I say respectfully has, in my opinion, been trying to rationalize and alibi the President's mistakes ever since it made the mistake of supporting President Eisenhower in 1952.

What do we read these days on the editorial pages of the New York Times with regard to the Quemoy and Matsu situation? I read from the editorial entitled "Burning Daylight in Asia," published in the New York Times of Sunday, March 27, 1955. The editorial quotes the statement of the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations about time passing and about our burning daylight in Asia. In the course of the editorial the New York Times had this to say:

Mr. Reston gives this interpretation of the opinions of some other Senators who have not spoken out: "We are drifting into a war over Matsu and Quemoy. The administration is reconciling itself to the idea that this issue now rests not with Washington but with Peiping." So we have, as today's news describes it, a situation in which a certain kind of logic—the logic, perhaps, of death and widespread destruction—goes from the defense of Quemoy and Matsu to an all-out atomic attack on the industrial potential of Communist China. What this logic means in cost of human life and perhaps in a vast destruction of cities far outside China, the citizen may ponder.

It is clear that the resolution authorizing the President to take whatever steps are necessary to defend Formosa gave a choice only between rejecting the administration's foreign policy in the Far East, or accepting with it an ambiguous phrase that might justify an all-out defense of the Quemoy and Matsu Islands. Everyone in this country, certainly, including the President, would be happier if the Quemoy and Matsu Islands did not exist or if our national "prestige and honor" had not somehow seemed to be involved in their defense. If we had been able to persuade our Nationalist Chinese friends to pull out of them when they abandoned the Tachen islands, we would all be easier in our minds.

The tone of that editorial in the New York Times is quite different from that of the editorials the Times published when the joint resolution was before the Senate.

Elsewhere in the editorial the New York Times states:

There may, however, be one way out that has not been fully explored and exploited. From Japan to Canada and all around the circle of our allies and potential allies there is strong opposition to joining us in any hostilities brought on by attempts to hold the Quemoy and Matsu Islands. There is not the same opposition toward the defense of Formosa, which is a keystone in guarding the frontiers of all the free nations of southeast Asia—including the Philippines.

This newspaper believes that the time is ripe for a new Formosa Strait declaration. We believe that declaration should make it plain that we will put all we have into a defense of Formosa and the Pescadores islands, which are essential to such a defense. The Seventh Fleet is already a formidable obstacle to an attack on Formosa. It might be possible to throw at least a token force of American ground troops into the island to assist in repelling attack.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 27, 1955]

BURNING DAYLIGHT IN ASIA

Readers of this newspaper may well have been startled by a Washington dispatch from Anthony Leviero, published yesterday. Their minds will not be relieved by James Reston's article on the Far Eastern situation, on this page today. Mr. Reston quotes Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Mr.

GEORGE was facing the problem of what to do if the Chinese Communists invaded the Quemoy and Matsu islands lying off their coast. He knew, as the Pentagon knows, and as the White House knows, that there is grave danger that the islands will be invaded some time during the months of April and May. Senator GEORGE said: "We are burning daylight. The darkness is coming on in the Far East."

Senator GEORGE, at 77, in the twilight of his own career and in his 33d year in the Senate, has the courage and is in a position to speak out.

Mr. Reston gives this interpretation of the opinions of some other Senators who have not spoken out: "We are drifting into a war over Matsu and Quemoy. The administration is reconciling itself to the idea that this issue now rests not with Washington but with Peiping." So we have, as today's news describes it, a situation in which a certain kind of logic—the logic, perhaps, of death and widespread destruction—goes from the defense of Quemoy and Matsu to an all-out atomic attack on the 'industrial potential" of Communist China. What this "logic" means in cost of human life and perhaps in a vast destruction of cities far outside China, the citizen may ponder.

It is clear that the resolution authorizing the President to take whatever steps are necessary to defend Formosa gave a choice only between rejecting the administration's foreign policy in the Far East, or accepting with it an ambiguous phrase that might justify an all-out defense of the Quemoy and Matsu Islands. Everyone in this country, certainly including the President, would be happier if the Quemoy and Matsu Islands did not exist or if our national "prestige and honor" had not somehow seemed to be involved in their defense. If we had been able to persuade our Nationalist Chinese friends to pull out of them when they abandoned the Tachen Islands, we would all be easier in our minds.

There is the further argument which we find reiterated in today's dispatches from Taipei on Formosa, that the morale of Chiang Kai-shek's troops would collapse if the islands were abandoned or lost. There is a curious paradox in the fact that while Senator GEORGE and many others in this country fear involvement over the islands, some persons on Formosa suspect that we are making a quiet deal with the mainland Chinese to abandon them.

Here is a dilemma that can easily be understood. Whether a greater wisdom on the part of the State Department and the administration would have avoided it we do not know. The fact is we face it.

There may, however, be one way out that has not been fully explored and exploited. From Japan to Canada and all around the circle of our allies and potential allies there is strong opposition to joining us in any hostilities brought on by attempts to hold the Quemoy and Matsu Islands. There is not the same opposition toward the defense of Formosa, which is the keystone in guarding the frontiers of all the free nations of Southeast Asia—including the Philippines.

This newspaper believes that the time is ripe for a new Formosa Strait declaration. We believe that declaration should make it plain that we will put all we have into a defense of Formosa and the Pescadores Islands, which are essential to such a defense. The Seventh Fleet is already a formidable obstacle to an attack on Formosa. It might be possible to throw at least a token force of American ground troops into the island to assist in repelling attack.

What this situation calls out for above everything else is precision. The enemy ought to know just what he can do and just what he cannot do without meeting resistance from us. If he learns that he can take the Quemoy and Matsu Islands without provoking a major war, that fact may be tragic. Nevertheless, there are small tragedies and vast tragedies. A vast tragedy would be stumbling into war against the intention and the wishes of the majority of our people and our allies. A still vaster tragedy would be a loss of freedom through repeated retreats.

It is time that the fire-eaters in Washington, whether in the Pentagon or elsewhere, went into silence. We need calmness and wisdom. This newspaper hopes and believes that President Eisenhower, hating war as we know he does, and realizing, as he said he did, that one cannot see where a war will take us, will exercise his leadership during this coming critical week to save this country and the world from irretrievable disaster.

OFFSHORE ISLANDS NOT NEEDED FOR FORMOSA DEFENSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the arguments made by those of us who opposed the joint resolution, and who are now, in the debate across the country, opposing the President's Asia policy, is that there is no real danger that the Communists can take Formosa. With more than a hundred miles of open blue water between Formosa and the mainland, with the military power we have in the western Pacific, there is no real danger that the Communists can take Formosa. I happen to have more confidence in our military might than apparently have the preventive-war advocates in this country who would like to get us into war with China. They seem to think that our military cannot hold Formosa unless we defend Quemoy and the Matsus and in fact strike military installations in China. It is the position of the experts that there is no real danger that the Communists can take Formosa, but there is a great danger that we can get into a terrible, bloody war over Quemoy and the Matsus, to which we have no legal right. There is no justification for our joining Chiang in a civil war on Quemoy and the Matsus in order to protect Formosa. The "face-saving" argument is an unsound one.

"SAVING LIVES" MORE IMPORTANT THAN "SAVING FACE"

Since when in American history has the United States of America been worrying about "saving face"? Since when have we adopted that oriental psychological trait? I say, Mr. President, we had better pay more attention to saving the lives of American boys than to saving face. We had better pay more attention to the risks of peace than to the risks of war. If we permit the ruthless police dictator of Communist China to suck us into a war on the mainland of China, we shall have to kill millions of Chinese. I think that if that is done, the judgment of history will be that we are the aggressor in the situation, and as the result of that course of action, we will lose China for hundreds of years to come. Now is the time, before it is too late and while there is still an opportunity, for the United States to rededicate itself to the international-law principles which have always characterized our foreign policy.

On this point, Mr. President, one of the reasons I am such a strong advocate of the Paris Accord Treaty before the Senate for ratification today is that it is an example of freemen standing together within the boundaries of international law to meet the threat of Russian communism in Europe. It is another example of freemen joining forces within the international legal rights of each of the nations involved as a protectorate of freemen against the Russian threat of communism.

Why did I support strongly as I did the SEATO treaties? Because those treaties took the form of the nations of Southeast Asia, again within their sovereign rights, joining forces against the threat of communism. Those treaties involve in no way the invasion of territorial sovereign rights of other nations. They in no way involve the United States making territorial claims over territory to which it has no legal right.

That is, in part, the issue which must be drawn in the debate over Quemoy and the Matsus that will, in my judgment, be waged in the next few weeks across this country. I am willing to say on the floor today, having just gone across the country, that I am deeply convinced that the great rank and file of the American people, even on the basis of the inadequate facts which have been made available to them by the administration, are not in favor of what they already know about President Eisenhower's foreign policy with respect to Asia.

Mr. President, there are other editorials which support the thesis I am advancing here today. I wish to invite attention to a second New York Times editorial of March 31, 1955, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be made a part of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OFFSHORE ISLANDS

In pursuit of his long-standing policy of seeking peace President Eisenhower has initiated a new effort to win some kind of settlement, or at least a modus vivendi, with the Communist bloc—a settlement that would banish the specter of nuclear war. This effort, now being organized in cooperation with other western powers, takes as its starting point the impending ratification of the Paris pacts. These agreements fortify both western defenses and western unity in a manner acceptable to the whole free world and enable us to undertake new negotiations from a position of strength, which alone holds any promise of success.

But free-world unity is jeopardized today by growing division and confusion regarding a subsidiary problem of our far-eastern policy, involving the question of whether we shall or shall not defend the Chinese offshore islands of Matsu and Quemoy. There is no longer any question that we shall defend, as we are pledged by treaty to defend, both Formosa and the Pescadores, and that we shall do so with all the means at our disposal. In this policy we have won increasing support from all free nations. But these free nations, including our European allies and neighboring Canada, draw a clear line of distinction between Formosa and the Pescadores, on the one hand, and the offshore islands on the other. They not only decline to support our equivocal stand on the latter but definitely reject any idea of joining in their defense.

The United States, which pursues a policy of peace in the Formosa Strait, and for that reason presses for a cease-fire in that area, has announced that it will not fight for the offshore islands as such. But, as indicated again by President Eisenhower yesterday, it

continues its flexible policy regarding their defense in order to keep the enemy guessing. This is a hazardous game which may easily tempt the Chinese Communists to test our intentions. This, in turn, raises the danger that once we become involved in the defense of these wholly secondary positions we may be plunged into a major war of still unforeseeable consequences. The only thing probable about a war over these particular islands is that we would have to fight it alone.

In these circumstances it is high time to review our policy regarding these islands and clarify our position beyond any doubt or misrepresentation. We believe that such a review and clarification should lead to the decision to abandon the offshore islands and to evacuate the Nationalist troops and the local populations. This would be strictly in line with our treaty obligations, which do not extend to the offshore islands. It would preserve Western unity and assure us the moral support of the free world. It would demonstrate our willingness to preserve peace by putting a hundred miles of blue water between Formosa and the mainland.

There have been from the start only two arguments for the defense of the offshore islands. One, and not a very convincing one, has been their military utility as observation points and positions blockading Communist invasion ports. This argument carried greater weight when the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa stood alone. It does not apply now, when Formosa is protected by the American fleet and when any direct Communist attempt to invade Formosa itself would be met by counterattacks on the ports and staging areas of the mainland.

The other argument is that an evacuation of the offshore islands would smack of appeasement and thereby impair free Asia's confidence in us and wreck morale on Formosa. There may be some danger of this, but that danger can be met by further aid and additional guarantees to Formosa, and any new declaration concerning the offshore islands should be accompanied by steps toward this end.

Increased aid is already being given and could be further enhanced by stationing American token troops in Formosa to demonstrate our determination to fight for it, if need be. New guaranties could also be sought both through the United Nations and through consultation with our allies, who have indicated that once the offshore island question is settled they would consider joining with us in the defense of Formosa. Aid and guaranties of this kind would do more to bolster Formosan and Asian morale than is now possible under the constant menace of war. To President Eisenhower we look confidently for leadership in this cause.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to read two paragraphs from the editorial:

But free world unity is jeopardized today by growing division and confusion regarding a subsidiary problem of our Far Eastern policy, involving the question of whether we shall or shall not defend the Chinese offshore islands of Matsu and Quemoy. There is no longer any question that we shall defend, as we are pledged by treaty to defend, both Formosa and the Pescadores and that we shall do so with all the means at our disposal. In this policy we have won increasing support from all free nations. But these free nations, including our European allies and neighboring Canada, draw a clear line of distinction between Formosa and the Pescadores, on the one hand, and the offshore islands on the other. They not only decline to support our equivocal stand on the latter but definitely reject any idea of joining in their defense.

Elsewhere in this editorial the Times says:

In these circumstances it is high time to review our policy regarding these islands and clarify our position beyond any doubt or misrepresentation.

I digress from the editorial long enough to say that such is the purpose of my resolution. Its purpose is to give the Congress of the United States and the administration another opportunity to reexamine and clarify their positions regarding Asia. Such a reexamination is sorely needed, because American policy in Asia, if it is not clarified and if we move into a defense of Quemoy and the Matsus, will leave us, I fear, in a position where we will stand alone in Asia, because the action itself will convict us of aggression in Asia.

Elsewhere in this editorial the writer says:

This would be strictly in line with our treaty obligations, which do not extend to the offshore islands. It would preserve Western unity and assure us the moral support of the free world. It would demonstrate our willingness to preserve peace by putting a hundred miles of blue water between Formosa and the mainland.

Likewise, Mr. President, there is a rather interesting editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald, a newspaper which seems to have blown hot and cold on this issue. Its most recent editorial contribution on this subject is headed "Atomic War Over Matsu?" I ask unanimous consent to have the entire editorial made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATOMIC WAR OVER MATSU?

This Capital is in the midst of a war of nerves about the Matsu and Quemoy Islands. The deadline for a Chinese Communist attack on the Matsus may be approaching, some sources believe, and the assault may come by April 15 unless the Chinese are deterred by the certainty of American retaliation. If an attack should come, the same argument runs, the question would be whether the counterattack should consist of an effort to blot out Communist airfields with tactical atomic weapons or whether it should also aim at China's industrial potential. Thus is the deadly prospect of nuclear war raised over a couple of tiny and in themselves insignificant island groups on the doorstep of Communist China.

This possibility of involvement over the Quemoys and Matsus has caused increasing concern among our allies. The British have made known their intention not to join in a war over the coastal islands; and last week the Canadian Foreign Minister said much the same thing. These protests evidently are aimed at dissuading the administration from what other governments consider a rash course; our allies know that if a major war should develop from a clash over the Matsus the question of cause would become academic and they would inevitably be drawn in. The fact remains that despite a large measure of support for the American pledge to defend Formosa and the Pescadores, most of the free world simply does not believe that the Matsus and Quemoys are worth a war.

How, then, did we get into this paradoxical situation in which the administration is being urged to fight for some remote islands which under peaceful circumstances it probably would relinquish? It is instructive to recall that the Matsus and Quemoys were very lightly held by the Chinese Nationalists until 1953. Then, as part of the policy of unleashing Chiang Kai-shek, we abetted him in garrisoning the coastal islands until he now reportedly has between a fifth and a fourth of his entire army on them.

An opportunity to get off this hook existed last fall when the administration began its praiseworthy effort to revise its China policy in a more realistic direction. A withdrawal from the Quemoys and Matsus would have been a logical corollary of the evacuation of the Tachens and the releashing of Chiang in an attempt to bring about a cease-fire. But the coastal islands were left in an anomalous status, apparently in part for bargaining reasons, in part as a concession to Chiang and his spokesmen in Congress. It may be suspected that there now is an element of blackmail in Chiang's refusal to give them up, for a war over the coastal islands represents his one remaining hope of restoration on the mainland.

If it is easy to see how the predicament might have been avoided, it is not so easy to see a way out at this stage. Against the argument that we should abandon the Quemoys and Matsus and force Chiang to withdraw, there is the countervailing argument that this might undermine the defense of Southeast Asia and paralyze the will to resist Communist subversion. Furthermore, the argument goes, it would be extremely difficult to sustain the morale of Chiang's army if another withdrawal were to follow the evacuation of the Tachens. Such action might leave Chiang's ranks wide open to subversion.

Also, it is said, the amazing new developments in tactical atomic weapons make it possible to regard them virtually as weapons of precision. That is, small atomic weapons could be used against military targets without necessarily endangering "unrelated" centers. If an American counterattack were confined to the use of such weapons against military targets, Russia might not feel bound to enter the conflict.

While there undeniably is some truth to these contentions, there also are powerful arguments on the other side. Military men have acknowledged the usefulness of the Matsus and Quemoys in a defense of Formosa, but no responsible military leader has said that they are essential. That is the point that stands out: a war over the Quemoys and Matsus would be a war over islands that are not militarily essential. Moreover, no one can be sure that a war over these islands would not lead to general war. In such a situation Senator BRIDGES' crass comment that no "American white soldier" would be forced to fight in Asia would become even more ridiculous. There is no safe warrant for the easy assurance that air and naval action would suffice or for the blithe assumption that, as Elmer Davis puts it, only ground troops have mothers.

Finally, we must consider the responsibility for initiating atomic war. From a strictly military viewpoint it would be logical to use atomic weapons wherever they could be employed profitably—especialy if reliance on them as narrowed our capabilities in conventional weapons. In a large war, even a war concerned directly with the defense of Formosa, their use would be inevitable. But in a war over the Matsus and Quemoys—in which a large part of the world would be critical of the American position—to initiate the use of atomic weapons would be to cross a vast psychological bridge. Even if such weapons could be restricted to purely military targets, Asians have not forgotten that the only atomic bombs ever used in war were employed against an Asian nation; and Chinese propaganda would be sure to stress the point.

This newspaper is not so presumptuous as to think that there is an infallible prescription for protecting the American interest in

this dilemma. President Eisenhower has exhibited great statesmanship on the avoidance of nuclear war; and there is every reason to think that he will not be stampeded by zealots who would welcome a holy crusade against communism. Conscientious men in Government are aware of the risks. There is something to the point that at this stage the prestige of the free world might suffer a serious blow in an abandonment of the Quemoys and Matsus, and that the most disastrous course of all would be for this country to undertake to defend them and then back down.

But Congress and the public ought to understand just how close war may be, and to have no illusions about its nature or about the solitary situation of this country once it started. The hope lies in the sagacity of President Eisenhower in a decision that Congress has left in his hands, and in the earnest efforts of free world diplomacy to enlist the help of Moscow in averting a Chinese attack. Meanwhile, the administration would do well to put a muzzle on the tough talk that, far from dispelling any idea that we are a "paper tiger," may contribute to the notion that we are one.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the editorial says, in part:

This is the deadly prospect of nuclear war raised over a couple of tiny and in themselves insignificant island groups on the doorstep of Communist China.

This possibility of involvement over the Quemoys and Matsus has caused increasing concern among our allies. The British have made known their intention not to join in a war over the coastal islands; and last week the Canadian Foreign Minister said much the same thing. These protests evidently are aimed at dissuading the administration from what other governments consider a rash course; our allies know that if a major war should develop from a clash over the Matsus, the question of cause would become academic and they would inevitably be drawn in. The fact remains that despite a large measure of support for the American pledge to defend Formosa and the Pescadores, most of the free world simply does not believe that the Matsus and Quemoys are worth a war.

EVACUATION OF QUEMOY AND MATSU ISLANDS

Mr. President, I wish to say that, in my judgment, the immediate course of action which should be followed is that we reveal to the world our determination to stay within our international legal rights which automatically will bring to an end even the suggestion that we shall defend a few square miles of rocky land off the coast of the mainland of China over which we have no international-law rights. My resolution provides that we shall proceed at once to use our good offices and juridical processes in connection with the evacuation of Quemoy and the Matsus if Chiang wishes to cooperate. But if he does not, then the answer must be: "You stay there alone. We will not endanger American boys in the defense of the Nationalist Chinese on Quemoy and the Matsus. We will give you coverage, if you want it, with the cooperation of the United Nations, to return to Formosa, because we have a legal right to defend Formosa."

Then I think we must make it very clear to the Communist segment of the world that we stand ready, in cooperation with our Allied friends, to discuss with their top leaders the present danger of war; and once again take the rules of reason to the issues of peace and war, and demonstrate that it is the United States and our allies who are seeking peace.

We shall not maintain among the allies the unity which is so essential in the struggle to maintain peace if we follow a course of action in Asia which our allies cannot support. If we look at the record in respect to Quemoy and the Matsus I think we must acknowledge we are wrong; because I think we are making threats of aggression in Asia today in respect to these islands and in respect to the possibility of the President authorizing a strike against military installations on the mainland of China before an act of aggression has been committed against the United States.

The time has come when the President of the United States has no moral right to remain ambiguous any longer with the American people about Quemoy and the Matsus. The American people are the ones who will do the dying and they have the right to say to the President, as I think they are calling out by the millions today, "Mr. President, what is your policy in regard to Quemoy and the Matsus? Are we or are we not going to defend them? What justification can you give for our dying in their defense if you should decide to defend them?"

MAJORITY AGAINST DEFENSE OF QUEMOY AND THE MATSUS

If the answer of the President is that his policy is to defend them, I think the overwhelming majority of the American people will make it very clear to him, in the exercise of the American democratic processes, that he is not their leader.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I merely wish to congratulate the senior Senator from Oregon upon a speech that I believe should be carefully pondered by the people of the Nation, and by all the Members of the Congress.

As my colleagues know, I have felt for a long time, as I said earlier in the day, that our military involvement in the defense of Quemoy and Matsu, or an attack by the United States on the mainland of China, would be unjustifiable both in law and in morals, and that it would subject the United States and the people of this Nation to losses and sacrifices which they should not be asked to make. It would represent an intervention in a civil war which has no direct course than to the defense of Formosa to which we are of course committed. I wish to say again that I am very proud and happy to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon in presenting this resolution to Congress. I hope the Foreign Relations Committee will give it early consideration and report it favorably to the Senate. I am convinced that it is greatly in the interest of our people and of the peace of this country and of the world.

Mr. MORSE. I am proud and inspired to have the distinguished junior Senator from New York on my side. As a great American liberal, he always believes in a government by law, not only with respect to domestic law, but international law, as well.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that it seems to me his logic is inescapable. It would be a great mistake for this Nation to permit itself to be placed in such a position that national pride and national honor would require us to go to war over the islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

Situations that develop in which the pride and honor of two nations are at stake make it impossible, at times, to avoid war.

Almost a hundred years ago, a situation of that sort developed over a little island named Fort Sumter. From the time the fighting started over that island, it was impossible to head off a great war.

I certainly hope that the United States will not become so committed to islands which are within almost a stone's throw of the Chinese mainland as to make it impossible for us to withdraw with honor and pride.

I say that the best way for us to save face over Quemoy and Matsu is not to get our face on Quemoy and Matsu.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, and thank him for his comments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was not my privilege to hear all of the Senator's comments, but I know his views about the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

This evening it will be my privilege to address the University of North Carolina Students' Forum, in Chapel Hill. I shall speak in the same vein as has the Senator from Oregon.

I think we must realize that the decision which may be made about Quemoy and Matsu may affect not only our relationships in the Far East, but may affect also the measure which is now before the Senate. We are about to vote on a treaty with West Germany. The purpose of the treaty is to include West Germany in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and to restore West Germany's sovereignty—in other words, to strengthen our position and collective security in the West.

First, hostilities over Quemoy and Matsu will put an end to the four-power conference.

Second, it will put an end to any possibility of working out delicate relationships with West Germany, by diverting our attention from Europe to two islands off the Chinese mainland.

Third, I do not understand the necessity for the President to appoint a disarmament officer if the United States is to engage in hostilities over Quemoy and Matsu.

The senior Senator from Oregon has properly pointed out that it is anything but prudent judgment to extend the perimeter of American defense to within 6 miles of the Chinese mainland. I think the Senator is doing a great service for his country by his statement today. There is still time for the President to hear the views of others besides those whom he has heard.

There have been some voices which have been louder than the voices of those who marched around the walls of Jericho. I hope the President will realize, from the Biblical story about the walls of Jericho, that while the noise was loud around those walls, only a very few were involved in the party.

While the noise about going into Quemoy and Matsu is loud and determined, only a few Americans really feel that such action should be taken.

I hope the record is clear that our position in reference to the defense of Formosa is unmistakable. Let the world clearly understand that. The Senator from Oregon is right. When we cannot get the Canadians to support our policy, then our policy deserves some reexamination. When we cannot find allies anywhere in the world save Dr. Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek who will support us, then we are in trouble.

I think it is interesting to observe that the Secretary of State, returning from Bangkok, could not deliver to the Government or to the Senate assurances that even the Philippines would be with us.

On the issue of American participation in the defense of Quemoy and Matsu Islands the United States has two allies in the Far East: Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek. I submit that we had better reexamine our policies. This is not to say that those two allies are not wanted, because they are; but surely we should not sacrifice all others for those two, who are supported by reason of American power.

I assure the Senator from Oregon that his bringing this matter to the attention of the United Nations again, whether it be successful or not, is honorable. The only policy that I know which we should pursue, which men may see for all time—and I emphasize for all time—when we are in difficulty and in doubt, is a policy of doing that which is right—morally right, legally right, and in every way politically and diplomatically right.

If we accede to political expediency at home or abroad, we will be in trouble.

If the President of the United States will appease those who are trying to drive him further and further into a warlike position; if he will appease the political opponents at home, then he may very well be in a position in which he will be forced to appease political opponents abroad.

We do not want any appeasers; we want people who will stand on principle and be dedicated to using prudent judgment and wise decisions.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I am glad to have him join with me in support of my position on this issue.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have been much interested in the remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

Based on his great experience as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and his present knowledge of the world problems of the United States as a result of his membership on the Committee on Foreign Relations, does not the distinguished Senator agree it is extraordinary, despite the threats and rumors now being heard about possible war, that the administration nevertheless follows the urgings of the "budget firsters," and further heavily cuts our military defenses?

Mr. MORSE. I think the position of the administration in cutting defense appropriations is a great mistake, and may very well threaten the security of the United States.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is recognized.

GERMANY AND THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT COMPLETELY SURROUNDED BY PACTS, GUARANTEES INTEGRITY COLONIAL-SLAVERY SYSTEM EMPIRE-MINDED NATIONS OF EUROPE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I voted against the North Atlantic Pact in 1949, and at that time, on June 12, 1949, in a debate led by the then senior Senator from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg I said:

> Mr. President, the North Atlantic Pact simply and without question guarantees the integrity of the colonial systems throughout Asia and Africa.

VITAL LINK TO LOWER WAGE STANDARD OF LIVING

I said further on that occasion that—

> A decision to ratify the North Atlantic Pact Treaty by a two-thirds majority of the United States Senate will, in the judgment of the junior Senator from Nevada, be a vital link in the chain of events that, taken together, is bound to wreck the economic structure and the wage-living standards of this Nation—the sole objective being to immediately reduce this Nation to 1 of 58 or more units or States in a commonwealth of nations to be known as the Federation of the World.
>
> It is, therefore, vital that the United States Senate take the necessary time to examine and to add up the administration's postwar proposals—and note the trend.
>
> The Senate and the people of this Nation should be advised whether the five major postwar proposals are really the separate major emergency measures that they have been continually represented to be or whether they are all related, having one objective—that objective being immediately to tie the United States into such a commonwealth of nations—to be known as the Federation of the World, with its wealth and wage-living standards averaged with the Asiatic, European, African, Middle East, Near East, and South Seas countries.

DIVIDED AFRICA BETWEEN EUROPEAN NATIONS

Mr. President, we proceeded to divide Africa between four empire nations, and defended the colonial possessions in Asia of the European empire-minded nations—all of this subsequent to the adoption of the Atlantic pact.

SURROUNDED BY MUTUAL ASSISTANCE PACTS

Mr. President, on March 6, 1953, under the heading: "International Mutual and Economic Assistance Pacts," I said:

> Mr. President, I call the attention of this distinguished body to the fact that we are completely surrounded by mutual assistance and economic pacts and treaties.

EUROPEAN PACTS WITH RUSSIA

I now call brief attention to the fact that in the debate of March 6, 1953, which I shall later ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, I cited England's pact with Russia, with a paragraph reading as follows:

> The high contracting parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war.

That agreement was made in 1945, and is still in good standing, Mr. President.

At the same time I called attention to France's pact with Russia. These are independent mutual security pacts, Mr. President, and they are still in good standing. One paragraph in France's mutual security pact with Russia reads:

> The high contracting parties agree to render each other every possible economic assistance after the war, with a view of facilitating and accelerating reconstruction of both countries, and in order to contribute to the cause of world prosperity.

RED CHINA'S PACT WITH RUSSIA

The Communist government of China also has a mutual security pact with Russia, one paragraph of which reads:

> The high contracting parties agree to afford one another all possible economic assistance in the postwar period in order to facilitate and expedite the rehabilitation of both countries and to make their contribution to the prosperity of the world.

On April 4, 1949, or about that date, we approved a treaty called the North Atlantic Pact, and I now quote from the debate held on March 6, 1953. Article 2 of that pact reads:

> The parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations. * * * They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them * * * to promote conditions of stability and well-being, and to encourage economic collaboration. It should facilitate long-term economic recovery through replacing the sense of insecurity by one of confidence in the future.

I now read further from the address, under the heading "United States Completely Surrounded With Mutual Assistance Pact":

> I call attention to the fact that beginning in 1942 with the English pact with Russia and the French pact with Russia, and continuing with Russia's pact with China and our pact with the European nations, we have been completely surrounded with pacts, all agreeing to help one another.
>
> As a result we are financing both sides of our own war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the debate which took place on March 6, 1953, as marked.

There being no objection, the debate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL MUTUAL AND ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE PACTS

Mr. MALONE and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nevada.

UNITED STATES ENTIRELY SURROUNDED BY MUTUAL-ASSISTANCE PACTS; UNITED STATES FINANCES BOTH SIDES OF THE KOREAN WAR

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I call the attention of this distinguished body to the fact that we are completely surrounded by mutual assistance and economic pacts and treaties.

A few days ago the Russians said that of course they were furnishing Communist China with war materiel under their mutual-assistance pact. Both England and France have mutual-assistance pacts with Russia—and we have the Atlantic pact with 11 of the European nations which includes both England and France—each of the 4 treaties or pacts contains a pledge of mutual economic assistance and all are in full force and effect and are being observed to the letter.

In addition England recognized Communist China. This closes the gap so that we finance our own war in Korea—and our opposition in Korea, China, and in Russia.

In March 1949, the junior Senator from Nevada called to the attention of this body the fact that both England and France had separate mutual economic and assistance pacts with Russia reading startlingly like the Atlantic pact with us.

ENGLAND'S PACT WITH RUSSIA

In the pact between England and Russia, which was signed by Anthony Eden and V. Molotov, and which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in toto in March 1949, article 6 reads as follows:

"The high contracting parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war."

This pact has 10 more years to run—and no notice has been given or attempt made to cancel it.

FRANCE'S PACT WITH RUSSIA

In a similar agreement made between France and Russia, and signed by Molotov and Bidault, of France, article 6 reads as follows:

"The high contracting parties agree to render each other every possible economic assistance after the war, with a view of facilitating and accelerating reconstruction of both countries, and in order to contribute to the cause of world prosperity."

This pact also has several years to run and there is no indication that either party wants it canceled.

CHINA'S PACT WITH RUSSIA

A few days ago the press carried the announcement that the Russian representative here had stated that, of course, Russia was sending war material to Communist China under the mutual-assistance pact signed with China, which still has a considerable time to run, and there is no indication that either party wants it canceled.

Article 6 of the alliance between the Russians and the Republic of China says:

"The high contracting parties agree to afford one another all possible economic assistance in the postwar period in order to facilitate and expedite the rehabilitation of both countries and to make their contribution to the prosperity of the world."

UNITED STATES PACT WITH ATLANTIC PACT NATIONS, INCLUDING ENGLAND AND FRANCE

On April 4, 1949, or about that date, we approved a treaty called the North Atlantic Treaty. Article 2 says:

"ART. 2. The parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations. * * * They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them * * * to promote conditions of stability and well-being, and to encourage economic collaboration. It should facilitate long-term economic recovery through replacing the sense of insecurity by one of confidence in the future."

UNITED STATES COMPLETELY SURROUNDED WITH MUTUAL ASSISTANCE PACTS

I call attention to the fact that beginning in 1942 with the English pact with Russia and the French pact with Russia, and continuing with Russia's pact with China and our pact with the European nations, we have been completely surrounded with pacts, all agreeing to help one another.

As a result we are financing both sides of our own war.

FURNISHING RUSSIA THE SINEWS OF WAR

Many times since March 1948 the junior Senator from Nevada stood on the floor of the Senate and explained this seeming paradox. At that time he placed in the RECORD 86 trade treaties between Russia and the Iron Curtain countries on the one hand, and 17 Marshall plan countries, several of them made by England and France with Russia, calling for the shipment of everything needed by the Russians to enable them to fight world war III with us.

Later—in 1950—he placed 96 such trade treaties in the RECORD.

The point is that we are completely surrounded by pacts. We agreed to help the European nations. We have built factories there so that they could increase their production from about 96 percent in 1948, when we passed the first Marshall plan, to about 160 percent at this time.

The four mutual-assistance pacts complete the circle—we are at war with ourselves—the cold war, that is. The junior Senator from Nevada called attention at that time to the lack of markets for the goods to be produced by the Marshall plan countries except in Russia and the Iron Curtain countries.

Under the mutual-assistance pacts, the European countries sell goods to Russia and Russia sells the necessary goods to Communist China.

Therefore the taxpayers of America are furnishing about 75 percent of the material used to kill their own boys in Korea.

THE "NEW" PLAN

There are two notable visitors in our midst today, Mr. Butler and Mr. Eden.

Mr. Butler is the author of the slogan "Trade, not aid." There is no secret about the fact that that slogan emanated from the same agency which coined the phrase "reciprocal trade."

Of course, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is not reciprocal, and was never intended to be. But the slogan "reciprocal trade" sold free trade to the American people under a misleading dateline.

THE GREATER OUR DEBT, THE GREATER OUR WEALTH

Their Lord Keynes first sold an ailing president on the theory that the greater our debt, the greater our wealth—we now owe approximately $270 billion.

THE MORE WE DIVIDE OUR MARKETS, THE GREATER OUR WEALTH

They are now selling us the proposition that the more we divide our markets with the nations of the world the greater our income will be. All we have to do is to complete the job of wiping out all protection to our workingmen and investors. We have already transferred the constitutional responsibility of the Congress of the United States to regulate foreign trade through the imposition of duties, imposts, and excises to the executive department through the enactment of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—Reciprocal Trade Act.

The executive department has for 20 long years regulated our foreign trade with only one idea in view. What is that view, Mr. President? It is to divide the markets of this Nation with the nations of the world, so that we will all live alike, average our standard of living with the sweatshop labor of foreign nations.

ANOTHER $7 BILLION

In the meantime, of course, we are to make up the trade-balance deficits with seven billion or nine billion or ten billion dollars annually, whatever it requires.

Mr. Dulles and Mr. Stassen have just completed a trip to Europe to get information with which to support another $7 billion appropriation.

MR. ANTHONY EDEN (BRITAIN)

Mr. Eden arrived in this country on March 4 and in a New York interview with a New York Times reporter said, among many other things, "We are asking nothing from you."

Mr. President, in that same interview, Mr. R. A. Butler, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the father of the slogan "Trade, not aid"—slogan which further confused our people—voiced the expectation of selling this idea to the American people.

I read from an article published in today's New York Times. The headlines read: "Eden Reveals Aim on Convertibility of the Pound Sterling," meaning that the United States must put up five to ten billion dollars more to maintain the fictitious pound value. "He links progressive freeing of pound to United States guaranty of dollars as protection."

He asks for nothing. Therefore, he asks for everything including our life's blood—our very sources of our income.

FICTITIOUS VALUES SUPPORTED BY DOLLARS

This is the "nothing" he asks for:

"The United Kingdom, as banker for the Commonwealth, to undertake a staged and progressive advance to convertibility of sterling into dollars but on a stout leash limiting payments to current trade accounts, as distinguished from accumulated storing debt and to designated dollar commodities."

We will find within a very short time the suggestion being made that $5 billion or $10 billion be granted to them through a new bank or through the World Bank in order to support the fictitious price of the pound, as well as other European currencies.

I read further from the interview as reported in the New York Times.

These are his aims:

"The United States Government, or an international agency like the International Monetary Fund, to create a guarantee fund of dollars to underwrite the success of the effort and protect Britain's meager gold-and-dollar reserves."

Mr. President, we have been losing our gold reserves at the rate of about two billion dollars a year. They buy our gold with the money we give them. So here it comes. We are to stabilize the pound at its fictitious value. I quote further:

"The exchange rate of the pound sterling in terms of dollars to be unpegged from the current official par value of $2.80 and permitted to fluctuate within a predetermined range below that figure with the objective of enhancing the competitive status of Commonwealth exports in world markets."

MANIPULATION OF MONEY VALUES FOR TRADE ADVANTAGE

Mr. President, there is a trick involved in the manipulation of the currency of a nation. It simply means that when a nation wants to export more it merely lowers the price of its money, and when it wishes to import more it merely raises the price of its currency.

We do not manipulate the value of the dollar, we are the victim.

At one time the sterling bloc had as many as 28 different values for its pound. The price of the pound is fixed in each area with respect to whether or not imports are desired.

When a nation within the sterling bloc wants to encourage imports from another country it raises the price of exchange in that nation's money, and when they want to

discourage imports from that country it gives less in terms of value of that currency.

CHILE—EIGHT DIFFERENT VALUES FOR ITS MONEY

I recently discussed the question of the import duty on copper on the Senate floor.

At that time I put into the RECORD eight different values of the Chile peso. The peso is used in exactly the same way; to regulate trade. Its value is manipulated with reference to the value of the money of the country from which the imports are to come or are to be prevented from coming.

NO COUNTRY KEEPS TRADE AGREEMENTS WITH US

There is not one foreign country—and I say this without fear of contradiction—which has kept the spirit of its trade treaties with the United States.

THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES WILL NOT TRADE WITH EACH OTHER

Italy cannot even sell an orange in one of the other European countries, and the countries cannot sell their products in Italy. That is just an illustration. They all act alike in preventing trade between themselves. The bars are up between all the countries in Europe; yet the whole area of Europe is less than about half the area of the United States but containing practically twice the population.

WE SUPPORT IT ALL

The trick is that we are supporting all of this subterfuge, and now we are getting ready to step into it again and divide what markets we have left with them. I read further:

"The United States to remove or modify existing impediments to international trade of the free world through lower tariff rates, simpler and more expeditious customs procedures, more equal opportunity for British and other foreign shipping to compete for American freights."

Mr. President, let us watch this attempt at customs simplification. I have not read the recently proposed legislation on customs simplification, but when the subject was seriously proposed 2 years ago I did read the proposed legislation very carefully. This was the fishhook in it: They would change to the use of the foreign valuation of the article for fixing the existing tariff or import fees or duties, as the Constitution of the United States calls such regulation, instead of the American value, which would cut in two or reduce to one-third or one-fifth of the amount of the import fee that exists at the present time when fixed on the American dollar value. That is the fishhook.

Mr. President, there are many ways of lowering the tariffs. That is only one way. One other is through trade agreements, which are never kept by anyone but this country. Another way is through inflation. It is a well-known fact that the dollar is worth about 33 to 35 percent of what it was worth in 1934; therefore, the effective duty or tariff protection is lowered accordingly.

I quote further:

"The United States, by long-term agreements or otherwise, to lead the way toward more stable prices of raw materials, particularly in the sterling area, and thereby reduce or eliminate wide fluctuations in the British balance of payments with the Western Hemisphere."

That means the same thing that was suggested by Mr. Churchill when he arrived in this country a short time ago, namely, that we enter into a cartel agreement and guarantee that certain materials coming from sterling-bloc countries would always have a profitable price to the sterling countries.

We are asked to enter into the very thing that we avoid in this country through the Sherman Antitrust Act.

I read further:

"The items on the Commonwealth prospectus are there because, in the view in the recent Commonwealth conference, they require some solution before there can be any bridging of the 'dollar gap' through 'trade—not aid'."

Yet, Mr. President, Mr. Eden says he asks for nothing.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the great propaganda splurge made immediately following the election. They started immediately after the election to sell the "trade, not aid" slogan to this administration. Some of the suggestions would do credit to a highwayman.

Mr. President, I have before me an article published in the New York Times of November 30, 1952. The headline reads:

WHAT THE COMMONWEALTH WANTS FROM UNITED STATES

I quote:

"For one thing, the United States tariff on dutiable imports has been cut some 60 percent between 1937 and 1951 without any noticeable effect on imports. For another, customs regulations designed to encourage stoppage rather than entry of foreign goods have been vastly more effective than tariff rates in holding down imports."

Mr. President, that is where they intend to switch from the American value to the European value, thereby cutting the tariff down by one-third to one-tenth.

I quote further:

"If only for psychological reasons, however, career economists"—

Mr. President, note that it refers to career economists—

"here assume that the customs simplification law will be passed at the next session of Congress and that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will be extended beyond the June 30 terminal date."

Mr. President, in the same interview, as reported in the New York Times of March 6, 1953, Mr. BUTLER is quoted as follows:

"Although it was known in this country as the point 4 program, Mr. BUTLER described as 'point 1,' among the things he would have this country undertake, 'a greater volume of overseas United States investment, private and public, in developing the good things of the earth, especially in underdeveloped countries.' "

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that when any investor invests money in almost any foreign country, including England, he cannot get his capital investment out of the country; he cannot sell his property and return the capital to the United States from that country.

Therefore, United States investors are not investing in those countries. Of course, Mr. President, if any foreign nation will safeguard the integrity of such investments, there will be no difficulty in getting investors to invest in that country, and there will be no shortage of investments there, if it simply will guarantee not to confiscate the investments, as has become the custom.

I read further from the article in the New York Times, quoting Mr. BUTLER:

"We want the chance of trading commercially with the dollar with the minimum barriers of tariffs, discrimination in shipping policy, 'Buy American' legislation and the like."

In other words, Mr. President, at one time we were smart enough to give our Government officials, when making purchases of materials, 25-percent leeway in connection with the purchase of materials produced in the United States, knowing that in most foreign countries the wages paid are probably one-tenth of those paid in the United States, and certainly never more than one-half, with the exception of Canada. Therefore, there is no chance of competition between goods produced in the United States and goods produced in those foreign countries, unless there is some way or means by which to favor the goods produced in the United States. However, foreign countries now wish to have that United States legislation repealed.

I read further from the New York Times article quoting Mr. Butler:

"I welcome the trends in this direction in recent reports of the Committee for Economic Development and the Advisory Board for the Mutual Security Agency."

Mr. President, if there is anyone who does not know what the Committee for Economic Development is, let me advise him that it was organized about 1938 by Mr. Paul Hoffman, the man who spent the money under the Marshall plan and ECA, and who, in his articles in various magazines, which I have read from time to time here on the floor of the Senate, advocated that we break down all protection to the American workingmen and investors and permit all foreign materials to be imported into the United States, as in the case of butter imported from Denmark and other countries. We did break down the protection to the dairy farmers and now the Government is purchasing the butter that is produced in the United States and storing it in warehouses or caves in the United States—as was done in the case of eggs at one time. I do not know just where all of the butter is stored, but millions and millions of dollars' worth of it has been put in storage, and much of it has become rancid.

Finally, the stored butter is either thrown away or given away, while the American people eat the butter that is imported from abroad or the oleomargarine.

The result is that the United States is stabilizing the world price of butter. That action is similar to the action our Government took in the case of potatoes—until finally the Government had so many potatoes that it gave away tremendous quantities of them and also destroyed and burned quantities of them, and finally there was a shortage of potatoes in our country. Of course, Mr. President, it takes experience to be able to run out of potatoes.

MR. STASSEN, MUTUAL SECURITY DIRECTOR

At this point I wish to call attention to a statement made by Mr. Stassen. Even Mr. Stassen has stated now that our European friends are trading with the enemy. I quote now from an article appearing in the Chicago Tribune of March 2, 1953:

"Harold Stassen, foreign-aid administrator, said today too much British rubber and other strategic materials supplied by nations supposedly friendly to the United States are going to Russia."

Mr. Stassen proceeded to make recommendations to stop those shipments.

Of course, Mr. President, all that is necessary to stop those shipments is to require of those countries, as the price of our cooperation with them, that they stop trading with the enemy; that is all that is needed.

The Wherry-Malone-Kem resolution stopped that trading with the enemy; but thereafter this body decided to supplant that measure with the Battle act, which permitted the President of the United States to decide how much trading with the enemy would be permitted. The result has been that those countries have continued to engage in that trading, without restraint.

TWO APPROACHES TO DESTROY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. President, there are two approaches to destroy the United States, the political approach and the economic approach.

COMMUNIST APPROACH

The political approach is called communism. As a matter of fact, socialism may be just as bad; it is simply communism in the infant stages. However, we seem to have caught up with communism. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the

Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are handling that phase of the matter. I believe that the matter is in good hands. We will eliminate the third gender in the State Department and many of the individuals who have been working with the enemy, instead of for the United States.

ECONOMIC APPROACH

However, there is another approach to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate. It is the economic approach.

We can destroy our country economically, just as well as we can destroy it by any particular "ism" on earth. The political approach in an attempt to destroy the United States is by our potential enemy, Russia; but the economic approach is by our supposed allies, or at least our potential allies. Some of them—the sterling bloc—are represented in the United States today. Supposedly they are, or will be, our allies; but in the meantime they would destroy us by means of a division of our markets—the source of our income.

We are supposed to remove the duties, imposts, and excises—to a point where all the low-wage, sweat-shop countries will be able to export to our shores the products of their sweat-shop labor.

That is proposed to be done by removing all duties, imposts, or excises, which represent the difference between the costs of production in those low-wage, sweat-shop countries and the costs of production in the United States with our higher wage standard of living.

The materials produced in those foreign countries are very often produced by means of materials and machinery we have previously given to them. Yet now they propose that we remove all duties, imposts, and excises, so as to make it possible for them to maintain their sweat-shop, low-wage conditions, and for their manufacturers to keep or pocket the difference between their production costs and what the traffic will bear here. Mr. President, anyone who stops to think can readily understand that such procedure would encourage those countries to continue to hold down the wages paid to their working people.

ENCOURAGE HIGHER FOREIGN STANDARD OF LIVING

However, Mr. President, we should follow the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution charges Congress with the responsibilities for regulating foreign trade. If the duties and imposts were fixed on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, so as to give the foreign countries an equal opportunity to enter our markets, but without giving them any advantage in that respect, and if provision were made for flexibility, so that as the wages paid in those countries went up, the duties here would go down, then those countries soon would see that they would receive no advantage by paying low wages, and thus they would be encouraged to raise their standard of living, so as to move toward a high standard of living.

Mr. President, a tremendous propaganda machine has been working on the American people, since the date of the last election.

So we may know what their real objective is, let me refer to an article in Look magazine on November 18, by Arnold J. Toynbee, who is described as following "the tradition of great historians." In that connection, I now read from a description which appeared in the magazine Look on November 18, 1952:

"Arnold Toynbee * * *, the world's foremost living philosopher-historian."

Mr. President, in that issue of Look magazine, Mr. Toynbee's article is entitled "The Next Step in History." It is a 3-page article, but we have to read only 1 paragraph—which I shall read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—in order to know exactly what Mr. Toynbee thinks the next step in history will be. I read now from his article:

"THE NEXT STEP IN HISTORY

"(By Arnold J. Toynbee)

"The steps that are needed are not emergency measures but permanent arrangements for putting and keeping our house in order."

After including in the article a great deal of material to the effect that we are moving toward a one-world government, Mr. Toynbee says:

"This, though, would be unlikely to be the end of the process of western constitutional development, for a western electorate would soon begin to ask itself why it should not elect this common western legislature as well as the local national legislatures. If democracy means the control of governments by legislative bodies that are elected and reelected by the people, then democracy would call for the direct election of a common legislative body charged with the supreme responsibility of controlling the western community's common executive services."

There is where we are headed, Mr. President, according to the great historian, Mr. Toynbee; and it is no secret that the entire European setup, led by the sterling bloc, is headed toward that particular objective to bring us into the family of European nations. They would have one legislature for the Atlantic Pact nations, added to from time to time as they see fit to take in new member nations.

Then the Congress of the United States would become a State legislature, and our present State legislatures and State governors would become county commissioners, I suppose. That is about the way such a plan would work. We would be outvoted all of the time.

Mr. President, all this material goes to show us exactly what is the objective of the visit to our country of Mr. Eden and Mr. Butler, who now are in the United States to arrange the next logical step to level our economy with the European nations.

We are to abolish all duties and all other regulations of foreign trade, as the Constitution directed the Congress of the United States to do. The Congress has transferred such control to the Chief Executive, and he now has full control of the regulation of foreign trade; Congress no longer has such control.

So we pay subsidies to American producers, and allow foreign products to enter the United States free of any tariff or duty.

How we can continue to pay subsidies and still reduce taxes is something that no one has yet figured out. I notice that everyone now says we must find out how much money each of the departments want before we can reduce taxes. If one ever gets into a serious conversation with the head of a department, he will be crying with him before the conference is over. It will be found impossible to reduce the appropriation. Not only that, it will probably be found necessary to raise it, and there will therefore be no reduction of taxes.

I like what Mr. REED says: "Let us reduce taxes to what we think the people of the United States can pay, and read the menu backward—then go home, and let them scream." That is the only way we can reduce taxes.

Now, Mr. President, I want to call attention for a moment to an article written by a columnist whom I have quoted several times on this floor. The article is entitled "Forgotten Treaties With Russia," and it is written by Constantine Brown. It was published in the Washington Evening Star on February 16, 1953. People would find it profitable to read. Exactly as the junior Senator from Nevada has already quoted, there is but one objective, and that is to reduce this country's living standard, and when we finally run out of money with which to pay the subsidies, with all of the material coming in from foreign nations, we will then begin to understand what foreign trade on a free basis with the lower living standard of wages of other nations means.

I should like to call attention to Britain's relationship to Japan. I have before me the U. S. News & World Report of December 5, 1952, from which I read:

"John Foster Dulles, as Secretary of State, is to find himself in the middle of a trade war between America's principal allies in the Far East and in Europe. Japan and Britain are at each other's throats in a bitter battle for world markets."

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada, as Senators may remember, stood here on the Senate floor to suggest that the treaty written by Mr. Dulles and approved by the Senate had then and there lost Japan; it was only a matter of time until they would make a decision.

Anyone who knows, anyone who will study the natural sources of the raw materials available to them and their natural markets, will know that when we lost China to the Communists—and we did it deliberately—we then and there laid the groundwork to lose Japan. Reading from the U. S. News & World Report of December 5, 1952, I continue:

"Britain, hard up and alarmed by Japan's recovery, is working desperately to check the flood of Japanese goods into normally British markets. Japan, struggling to rebuild her trade and obliged to restrict dealings with Communist China, is determined to regain markets in southeast Asia and to get more markets in Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America.

"In this head-on clash, old antagonisms between these two allies of the United States are coming to the surface. British Commonwealth countries are raising barriers against Japanese goods, British traders are making charges of cutthroat competition."

Their skilled labor is even lower paid than it is in Britain. It was from 7 to 12 cents an hour when I was there in 1948.

I continue:

"The British Government is trying to keep Japan from getting most-favored-nation treatment. The Japanese are accusing the British of dirty dealing. Anti-British feeling is rising, fanned by a quarrel over whether Japanese authorities shall have power to punish British and Commonwealth troops for offenses committed in Japan.

* * * * *

"Japanese competition already is squeezing the British. The sterling area which Britain looks upon as her market, bought $244 million worth of Japanese goods in 1950 and more than twice as much in 1951."

Mr. President, I read further in the article, the following:

"British countermeasures to meet this competition are becoming more drastic and are a matter of growing concern in Japan. British and Commonwealth countries recently have raised new import barriers aimed at Japanese products. The importing of Japanese textiles by Singapore, Hong Kong, west Africa and several other areas has been cut sharply or suspended.

"Britain is trying to limit Japan's trade in other areas, also. This is being done by delaying Japan admittance to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Japan outside GATT, is denied the benefits of lower tariffs in effect among the 34 member countries."

Mr. President, there is little point in reading further. It is simply a matter of leaving Japan on our payroll. We are sending money there, spending it for national defense purposes, and when we quit Japan is going to China.

Certainly we cannot continue to allow their imports to come in here free of any duty. Four crockery plants have closed down in Ohio, within the last few weeks. That is only a start.

When we get around to considering the American people, the workers and investors, as a part of our responsibility, then Japan has this choice: Where is she going to go? Can she trade with the Far East, right at her doorstep? No, she cannot, as long as the colonial system exist, and we support it.

She must trade within her natural area, and in order to do that she will have to make a deal—and she will make it with China when the time comes.

MR. FORD—EUROPEAN PLANTS

Now, Mr. President, we have had lately a statement by a great industrialist, Mr. Ford. Mr. Ford says that we should drop all our tariffs and all our duties and have free trade throughout the world, that it would be wonderful.

Mr. Ford has a plant in England where he can produce his Ford automobiles cheaper than he can produce them in the United States under paying standard-of-living wages.

I cannot say that I blame him, except that I think he is shortsighted. In other words, when he builds up competition, as he will, if he gets away with this statement of his—which, of course, I hope he does not—and if the people of the United States wake up in time, he certainly will not get away with it.

But if he did, and he thereby threw these people in the United States out of work in the various areas, from the mining areas to the crockery areas, in the watch manufacturing areas and the textile States, and almost every place else—and as a matter of fact, that is exactly what it would result in—then what happens?

As it is now almost every man in the United States who has a job is a potential buyer of a Ford, or an automobile of some kind. With the kind of wages they have over there, from 40 cents a day up to $2 or $3 a day, not 1 in 100 is a potential buyer of an automobile.

I believe that by ruining the home markets he will ruin himself if he could bring about the change. He possibly thinks he can work the slave labor against the high standard-of-living labor in this country, and profit by it. God help him if he did get away with it; that is all I can say.

The business machines, General Electric and in general big business, will be for this free trade I predict. What is big business? I would describe it for the purpose of this statement as business of such size and such a nature that it can put its plants in the area of low wages, behind the sweatshop labor curtains and import the goods at a lower price than they can produce them here paying our standard-of-living wage.

The little businesses are the ones that cannot do that. They must stay home and take the consequences. I think they will rise up to stop this silly business.

NEVADA, CALIFORNIA, AND FREE TRADE

I have received a telegram which indicates that the Legislature of the State of Nevada is passing a resolution memorializing Congress to stop this business of free trade which affects mining, the cattle business, the wool business, the textile business, the crockery business, and practically all small business in this country.

If Congress is going to ignore the production areas that make this country great, and which pays the taxes—I guess they think it time for them to take a hand. I will have the resolutions at the next session of the Senate.

Also, I am advised through Senator Harold J. Powers, president of the Nevada Senate, that they have passed a resolution along the same line in the California Legislature, and I hope to have that resolution by the time we return for the next session of the Senate.

Now, Mr. President, I think—and this is merely the junior Senator from Nevada speaking—we should have a domestic policy that would safeguard the integrity of our economic system, that would place a floor under the wages and investments in this country, that would preserve our market to the extent of giving foreign nations an equal break in our markets but no advantage.

Let the 1934 Trade Agreements Act expire. The people of the Nation are waking up; they pay the bills to pay for the appropriations which this Congress so blithely makes.

Let the 1934 Trade Agreements Act expire, and it automatically goes back to the Tariff Commission, which is an agency of the Congress whose responsibility it is to fix duties, excises, and imposts, and to regulate foreign trade.

Let the Tariff Commission fix such duties on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

That is simply commonsense in keeping ourselves in business in this country.

A report recently made by a former Chairman of the Budget, Daniel W. Bell, now Acting Chairman of the Public Advisory Board for Mutual Security, contained 10 recommendations. I ask precedent. There being no objection, the outline will appear in the RECORD at this point.

"[From the New York Journal of Commerce of March 5, 1953]

"RECOMMENDATIONS

"The recommendations made in the Bell report are:

"1. Basing trade policy on national rather than group interest and adopting measures to help industries affected by the change in policy readjustment by extending unemployment insurance, retraining workers, diversifying production, and converting to other lines.

"2. The adoption of a new simplified tariff act providing for a general reduction in duties and the elimination of present uncertainties by consolidating tariff rates into seven basic schedules. The redrafting of the Tariff Act would be done by the President according to standards set up by Congress.

"3. Extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act without time limit.

"Customs simplification

"4. Customs simplification by the prompt passage of a bill similar to the one passed by the House in 1951, plus the creation of a Commission to propose further measures along these lines.

"5. Reduction of tariffs and elimination of quotas on agricultural products to allow freer import at world prices of goods not produced in this country, with a repeal of section 104 of the Defense Production Act.

"6. Elimination or reduction of tariffs on metals and minerals of which imports are a major part of United States supplies; in cases where domestic production must be increased for defense purposes, it should be encouraged through special purchases and contracts.

"7. Elimination of import excise taxes on petroleum products. If imports should reach a level where they impede domestic exploration and development, other measures to assure a domestic industry adequate to defense needs may be taken.

"8. Elimination of the requirement that 50 percent of the cargo on aid and loan shipments is reserved to domestic carriers, except in the case of countries that discriminate against American vessels.

"Buy-American study

"9. Reconsideration of buy-American legislation.

"10. The establishment, with United States participation, of an international organization to promote the objectives of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

"In its recommendations for a new tariff act, the report suggests that the 7 basic schedules consist of a free list, 4 groupings of commodities bearing duties of 10, 20, 30, and 40 percent ad valorem; a specific list for basic agricultural and mineral raw materials, and an extraordinary list of commodities whose importation should be limited for security reasons."

The first recommendation is enough. It appears we are supposed to take the miners, the people in the sheep business, and the sheepherders and teach them how to make hats, unless the hat business is also destroyed by competition from abroad.

If we placed a tent over the city of Washington, we would have nothing but an international lobby, and Mr. Bell has apparently fallen heir to the common affliction.

I hope that before the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act—comes up for extension that there will be a sufficient number of Senators who will stand on the floor until it dies.

Mr. President, I received a letter from a man in Tonopah, Nev., not long ago. I had asked him if there was anything I could do for him in answer to his first letter. He said a little testily, "Don't do anything more for me. Just do not do anything more to me. That is all I would ask."

COLONIAL SYSTEMS GUARANTEED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 7, page 9254, which includes the paragraph I have just read, a statement was made to the effect that by adopting the Atlantic Pact, we are guaranteeing the integrity of colonial systems throughout Europe and Africa.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD at this point my remarks in the debate which took place on July 12, 1949, as marked.

There being no objection, the debate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

(CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 7, p. 9254)

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty, Executive L (81st Cong., 1st sess.), signed at Washington on April 4, 1949.

THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT VERSUS THE REAL OBJECTIVES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the North Atlantic Pact simply, and without question, guarantees the integrity of the colonial systems throughout Asia and Africa.

I thoroughly agree with the statement of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Taft] yesterday, when he said:

"It is said that arms given to European countries cannot be used by them in dealing with their colonial possessions outside the scope of the pact, but surely anyone can see that all the armed forces possessed by any country are in one pool and that the bigger that pool is the more easily they can find arms to undertake action which may be considered aggression in their colonies."

VITAL LINK TO LOWER WAGE STANDARD OF LIVING

A decision to ratify the North Atlantic Pact Treaty by a two-thirds majority of the United States Senate will, in the judgment of the junior Senator from Nevada, be a vital link in the chain of events that, taken together, is bound to wreck the economic structure and the wage-living standards of this Nation—the sole objective being to immediately reduce this Nation to 1 or 58 or more units or States in a commonwealth of nations to be known as the Federation of the World.

It is, therefore, vital that the United States Senate take the necessary time to examine and to add up the administration's postwar proposals—and note the trend.

The Senate and the people of this Nation should be advised whether the five major postwar proposals are really the separate major emergency measures that they have been continually represented to be or whether they are all related, having one objective—that objective being immediately to tie the United States into such a commonwealth of nations—to be known as the Federation of the World, with its wealth and wage-living standards averaged with the Asiatic, European, African, Middle East, Near East, and South Seas countries.

A WORLD COMMUNITY GOVERNED BY ORGANIC LAW

I believe fundamentally in the final emergence of a single world community, whose purpose would be governed by organic law.

At present, however, such an ideal is utterly impossible of achievement, and any attempt to bring it about at this time would destroy whatever opportunities we possess to live through the trying times of the necessarily severe readjustment period without a real threat of destroying all hopes for the very thing we wish to bring about—a peaceful and prosperous world.

What we should play for is time. A war now would be highly destructive and perhaps catastrophic, even—as seems likely—if we should win it.

As time goes on the aggressive Communist tide will tend to recede, just as the onrushing Moslem tide receded during the Middle Ages.

The people under Soviet control will tend more and more toward an effort to regain their liberties and to evolve a system by which they can live in common dignity and material security which, of course, is the core of our own vision.

As time goes on the present tense situation will tend to relax and it will certainly calm down in the distant future if we are able to hold fast and reorganize the non-Soviet world so that it can function in today's terms while reducing the present attractive opportunities for Soviet expansion.

AN OUTMODED FEUDAL WORLD

We know that the feudal world of Europe, Asia, and Africa—made up of petty kings, strong-arm despots, and colonial landlords—can no longer survive the conditions imposed by a scientific world.

We know that the colonial landlords of England, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium can no longer keep their serfs deindustrialized in an industrial world and producing only raw materials to be shipped to the master nation in return for which they are forced to buy the necessary manufactured and processed articles to cover their backs and to secure the necessary tools and implements to eke out a bare existence.

We know that some of these landlord nations have lived off the colonial areas of the Near East and the South Seas for more than 300 years.

We know all these things. Yet by our every action, through our national and international hybrid policies and programs, we seek to perpetuate these very European, Asiatic, and African feudal and nationalistic states, many of them living off the colonial countries and areas producing wool, meats, cotton, minerals, and many other products, including manufactured goods, with what amounts to slave or indentured labor in Africa, Asia, and the South Seas, which is intended to compete on even terms—through our "free trade" policies—with our own workingmen.

This type of slave labor pool is only a step away from the Russian methods in their forced-labor mining, manufacturing, and agricultural areas.

The North Atlantic Pact is simply another step down the road of guaranteeing the status quo in international affairs and holding in subjection the colonial peoples of these areas.

THE PEOPLE OF THE COLONIAL COUNTRIES ARE ON THE MOVE

It is not a question of taking the easy way of simply guaranteeing the status quo, because the peoples of the world are on the move. They will no longer submit to virtual slavery and a submerged role in economic affairs.

It is the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada, after visiting most of the nations of the world following World War II, that with all the resources of this Nation we cannot prevent a world economic readjustment on a basis of the new industrial and scientific methods.

To do anything but recognize economic progress will mean that we ourselves will be subject to the pitfalls and influences of socialism or something worse in trying to extricate ourselves from the economic debacle to which our present policy will inevitably lead us.

PRESENTLY KNOWN FIVE-PART ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM

The long-range five-part program has been presented to the Congress and to the Senate by the President of the United States to correct the European problems, each as an emergency in its own right; however, taken together they include and interlock the national and international economy. The five-part program includes:

First. The North Atlantic Pact, which was not the first proposal made, but which is before us today. It would have the effect:

A. To guarantee the integrity of the colonial system of all Asia, Africa, and Europe, thus extending the political and economic control of France's Indochina, New Caledonia, French West Africa, and Morocco; England's Singapore and Malayan States, East Africa and the Sudan country, South Africa, Northern Ireland, and many other areas; the Netherlands, Indonesia, and Belgian Congo in Africa.

B. Adding to the power and obligations of the Congress to later pass laws to discharge such obligations of the treaty, under the provisions of article 1, section 8, of the Constitution which automatically become the law of the land upon the approval of such treaty by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate—and which takes no account of the absence of action of the House in concurring in such future obligations, including the implied immediate and automatic declaration of war or other suitable action.

I quote the following from the Supreme Court:

"The Supreme Court, in the case of *Geofroy v. Riggs* (133 U. S. 266), says:

"'The treaty power, as expressed in the Constitution, is in terms unlimited except by those restraints which are found in that instrument against the action of the Government or its departments, and those arising from the nature of the Government itself and of that of the States. It would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids or a change in the character of the Government or in that of one of the States, or a cession of any portion of the territory of the latter, without its consent. * * * But with these exceptions, * * * there is no limit to the questions which can be adjusted touching any matter which is properly the subject of negotiation with a foreign country'."

C. It abrogates the 173-year-old right of the United States Congress to alone decide when our utimate security and safety is threatened, and provides that when the safety of any one of the signatories to the pact is threatened, we are automatically to consider our own safety in danger, regardless of the circumstances or of any independent judgment of our own.

Second. Appropriations to make up the trade balance deficits of the European nations each year in cash, currently labeled the ECA, under which our chief export is cash.

Third. The 3-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act under which the State Department has adopted a selective free-trade policy of lowering the tariffs and import fees below the differential between the cost of production in this country and that of our foreign competitors, on each particular product, on the theory that the more they divide our markets with the nations of the world, the less their annual trade-balance deficits will be.

Fourth. Approval by the Congress of the International Trade Organization, under which 58 nations with 58 votes, each nation with 1 vote, we would have the same vote as Siam, would meet at least once each year, and would distribute among themselves the remaining production and markets of the world, eventually on a basis of population—we assign to this organization all of our right to fix tariffs or import fees.

Fifth. The bold new program heretofore outlined, included under recommendation No. 10 of the midyear economic report of the President, just transmitted to Congress, the proposal to enact legislation to provide technical assistance to underdeveloped areas abroad and to encourage investment in such areas.

The bold new program would, according to its proponents, guarantee investments of businessmen, processors, and manufacturers, so as to encourage them to go into the foreign areas throughout the world and produce the necessary products to serve such areas, thus serving any markets that were supposed to be made available to the workingmen and industries of the United States through the Marshall plan; and in addition through the reduction of our own tariffs and import fees, to ship the products of the low-cost Asiatic and European labor into the United States, thus displacing the American workingman, simply by transferring American jobs to foreign soil.

THE ALLIANCE PACT AND IRELAND'S SEAN MAC BRIDE

The operation of the North Atlantic Pact in relation to protecting the integrity of the colonial areas throughout Asia, Africa, and all of Europe, was correctly expressed by Sean MacBride, Prime Minister of Ireland, when he said that they would like to cooperate, but as a nation they could not. They are denied the first condition of action as a nation, namely, the possession and control of the soil of their national territory, of which six counties are kept by Britain and are claimed as part of the United Kingdom—the territorial integrity of which is, in effect, guaranteed by the Atlantic Treaty.

Mr. MacBride further said, in answer to a question, that article 4 of the draft of the Atlantic Treaty, which is a consultative article, refers to the territorial integrity, political independence or security of the parties to the treaty.

In that connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article under date of April 13, entitled "Capitol Stuff" by a well-known columnist, regarding Ireland's position in relation to the proposed North Atlantic Pact.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"CAPITOL STUFF

"(By John O'Donnell)

"Just to pursue that ancient 'this is where I came in' line, we wish to direct the attention of readers with Irish blood to the present visit in Washington of Sean MacBride, Eire's Minister of Foreign Affairs.

"The extremely hush-hush talks of Ireland's MacBride and United States Secretary of State Dean Acheson mean just one more unreeling of that ancient theme: that the last tie which binds this piece of ground in the Atlantic to the monarchy of Britain must be slashed. These are the facts:

"Ireland's Secretary of State MacBride has told United States Secretary of State Acheson that his government holds office because the voters elected its members on the platform pledge that the artificial partition of Ireland would be abolished. That Ireland will not enter into any Atlantic military alliance which prohibits the majority of any nation from changing frontiers to meet the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the inhabitants.

"And at the same time, the Washington diplomatic representatives of His Britannic Majesty have insisted to our State Department that the United States must no meddle in his delicate problem. And when the heads of our Armed Forces have mildly reminded the Londoners that we would like to have the use of the airfields of Eire as a part of our chore in saving all of Western Europe from the Kremlin, they have been met with the brusque British comeuppance:

"'Well, we won World War I while the Irish were staging a revolution. We won World War II without Irish bases which we wanted. And if world war III comes along, we'll win that without the Irish—provided you come across as Franklin Roosevelt did 10 years ago, and from then on.'"

"All of this brings up the present battle over the Atlantic Treaty and the proposition of whether to give, under some new lend-lease setup, billions of American military equipment, planes, guns, and brains. This is just an echo of what happened upon Capitol Hill after World War I, when Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations got what it deserved—an ignominious exit via the international garbage can.

"Trick clause in fuzzy-brained League

"In 1919, when the great battle over the League was being staged, the voters of Irish descent played an important part. The same holds true today.

"The trick clause in the fuzzy-brained League of Nations was article 10, slickly written into the pact by Britain for the sole purpose of knocking off all efforts of the Irish to win their independence.

"Well we've got the same setup in the present Atlantic Pact. If the Irish were stupid enough to sign it they would pledge that for the next 20 years (according to article 13) they must respect the territorial integrity and political independence of the cosigners (read article 4).

"In other words, the present Government of Eire, elected on a platform sworn to end the present partition of their nation, would perforce agree to brush aside its most important issue for at least 20 years. Back in 1919 and 1920, during the days of the troubles which flamed into the honest Anglo-Irish war, a tough, hard-fighting, and accurate shooting Irish settled that problem when the identical proposal was slipped into the League of Nations by Woodrow Wilson on the needling of Lloyd George.

"Into the present conversations moves notorious article 10 of the League of Nations, which the Senate of 1919 courageously tossed back in Woodrow Wilson's teeth. Had the Wilson League of Nations gone through, these United States would have been called upon to send troops to Ireland to preserve the status quo of that time. In other words, we would have been pledged to use Americans to shoot down Irishmen who wanted freedom from the London rule.

"Same Senate, same diplomacy, same attitude

"Thanks in great measure to two great Senators from Massachusetts—Henry Cabot Lodge and David Ignatius Walsh—article 10 of the League and the League itself were properly killed.

"And now, 30 years after, the same thing pops up again. Same Senate, same slick British diplomacy, same angry 'to-hell-with-it' attitude of the Irish.

"What the British slipped into article 10 of the old league of nations they've put into article 4 of the North Atlantic Treaty. Why they haven't the simple honesty to call it by its right name—a military alliance against communism—we don't know.

"This article 4 proclaims that 'the parties' (this means United States fighting men carrying the battle load) will take suitable action whenever, 'in the opinion of any of them' (that is Great Britain), the territorial integrity, political independence, or security of any of the parties is threatened. Well, if the voting majority of North Ireland votes to toss the British crown the hell out of there and join up with Eire to create one simple state, that article, by any reading of words, means that the territorial integrity of the King of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is most seriously threatened.

"And so we are going to send United States troops over there to protect the absentee landlords of London? This is going to be good. But we heard most of it back in 1919 and 1920. The Irish won then and we think they're going to win again."

AN AMERICAN POLICY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the problem is not so difficult and complicated as the administration's propaganda machine would have us believe. It can be approached through a workable American policy which will protect our economy both on the domestic and foreign front while we are working toward a single world community, whose purposes would be controlled by organic law.

As I see it, this American policy must include:

1. An immediate withdrawal from our present commitment to the British Empire objectives and a firm demand for the consolidation into a federation of states—a United States of Europe—of what is left of Western Europe, the 16 ECA countries, formed into a structurally sound, free economy, unburdened by individual monetary conspiracies, Marxist regulations, bilateral agreements, restricting licensing arrangements, or other barriers to manufacture and trade among themselves. It would in fact be a United States of Europe.

Such a Europe containing 16 or more nations could be as intimately linked with us as is Canada at the present time. This step is absolutely necessary for the survival of the nations of Europe and for any help rendered by us to be effective.

Second. A flexible import fee system, substituted for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, to maintain our wage-living standard while we are helping other nations of the world to raise their own.

Such a system is the only logical substitute for the administration's three-part free-trade program, which gives American workingmen the lip service of promised labor legislation, and then plunges them into direct competition with the low-wage, low-living standard, slave labor of Europe and Asia.

The flexible import fee bill which the junior Senator from Nevada has already introduced will be offered as a substitute for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act when that measure comes before the Senate for the 3-year extension. Under the flexible import fee, the peril point automatically becomes the tariff or import fee and such import fee would be lowered in accordance with the rise of the living standard in a competitive country, and when they were living about like we are then free trade would be the almost automatic result.

Third. The rebuilding of our national defense organization to the point that it can protect us against any overt gesture from any nation or nations which may seek to extend their system of government to the Western Hemisphere, or into any territory whose integrity we consider important to our ultimate peace and safety. Such a defense organization should be spearheaded by an air corps prepared to keep any possible enemy grounded in any emergency.

Fourth. An extension of the Monroe Doctrine, or open-door policy, to embrace all nations in Europe and Asia, whose cooperation and integrity we consider necessary to our own peace and safety. This pronouncement would be a continual and effective warning to all empire-minded nations which might seek to extend their governmental systems into such areas, just as the Monroe Doctrine has served as a warning to such nations for 125 years that we would consider any effort to extend their system to the Western Hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

Fifth. Feed emergency hungry peoples of other countries to the extent of our ability without embarrassing them or ourselves by calling it a loan, and without endangering the welfare of our own people. We cannot feed all the hungry people in the world—since in some areas there has been hunger for 2,000 years—and our economy could not stand the strain.

Sixth. Lend money to private industry within such needy foreign countries on a business basis to the extent of our ability without injuring our economy. This measure could be handled through the World Bank in much the same way that RFC loans are made to industries that need emergency rehabilitation in our own country. The result would be gradually to build up their standard of living through increased efficiency in production. Such loans would be secured in the same manner as our own people are required to secure RFC loans.

RESOLUTIONS—PRELUDE TO ATLANTIC PACT 1948 DEBATE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on June 11, 1948, there occurred in the Senate a debate during which the then senior Senator from Michigan presented the resolutions leading up to the North Atlantic Pact. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the debate which took place on that date, as marked.

There being no objection, the debate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INTERNATIONAL MILITARY ALLIANCE RESOLUTION—INTRODUCED BY MR. VANDENBERG

Mr. MALONE. The real question confronting the Senate is not whether or not the proposed resolutions violate the United Nations Charter, but the real question is—do the resolutions violate the established principles of the United States Senate and its constitutional relationship with the executive branch of the Government.

Is it the Senator's idea in presenting the resolution that he wishes to encourage the President and the State Department to go further in making such treaties as he indicates are necessary, than they normally would go, under the normal independent operations of our Government departments?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the purpose is to encourage the use of regional arrangements for whatever advantage can be found in them, not only for the sake of international peace and security, but also for the sake of our own national security, wherever it can be developed through this instrumentality.

Mr. MALONE. Is it the Senator's idea that individual Senators shall commit themselves to this type of treaty without any understanding whatever of the details which may be included in such a treaty?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Not the slightest. On the contrary, the statement is categorically made, not only in the text of the resolution, but in the committee report, and in every word that I have uttered during the past several hours, that there is no commitment which is not completely subordinate—if there be any sort of commitment at all—to the utterly independent judgment of the Senate when the constitutional process is subsequently invoked.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask one further question. I have listened very carefully to the able Senator from Michigan for the past 2 hours. While I have heard him assure Senators that the resolution was not a violation of the United Nations Charter, at the same time I have heard very little discussion as to whether or not it is a violation of the principles laid down in the Constitution of the United States, under which the the Senate is charged with checking independently any action, through treaties, of the President of the United States and the State Department. We are not supposed—at least, until now, we have not been supposed—to be a party to a treaty until all the evidence is known to Members of the Senate, and after committee approval, full discussion and a two-thirds affirmative vote is had.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan permit me to respond to that point?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am afraid that I do not follow the argument of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. We dislike to leave our desks. We are very much interested in what our colleagues are saying. Until the acoustics of this Chamber are improved, I ask Senators to speak a little louder.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me to respond to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. It so happens that I was one of the Senators in the committee who brought out the very point to which the Senator from Nevada refers. The committee inserted language in the resolution to meet that very point. In line 6, on page 1, the language "by constitutional process" was inserted; and on page 2, lines 5 and 6, the words "by constitutional process" were inserted. That language is inserted because it is the surest, most effective, and most nearly indisputable manner of making it absolutely certain, beyond any possibility of doubt, that any kind of arrangement to which the Senator from Nevada refers will come back to the Senate for ratification. I can completely set the Senator's mind at rest on that point.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Michigan will yield while I discuss the question further with the Senator from Masachusetts, I ask the Senator from Massachusetts what, then, is the purpose of the resolution?

Mr. LODGE. I think the purpose of the resolution is to show that we are in sympathy with the broad trend of strengthening the freedom-loving countries; but it does not commit us to anything definite. They must make the showing. If they make a good showing, and if it is advantageous to our national security to help them, we shall help them. If the showing is not good enough, we shall not help them. It is the most perfect arrangement, from the standpoint of American interest, that could possibly be imagined.

Mr. MALONE. Of course, I defer to the wishes of the Senator from Massachusetts to participate in the debate, but are we not already on record through the United Nations and other actions of the United States Senate making our position clear?

Mr. LODGE. I wanted to participate at this point, because this happens to be something in which I was very much interested when the subject was before the committee.

Mr. MALONE. I yield to that impulse.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MALONE. Do I correctly understand that at the close of this debate we are to vote on this very important policy-making resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I had intended to make a statement on this subject. I consider it very important, for the reason that I believe there has been a tendency on the part of the Senate over a period of years slowly to relinquish its independent attitude, not only with respect to treaties, but with respect to appropriations for foreign nations and various other subjects concerning which we were supposed, at the time of the original writing of the Constitution, if I correctly understand it, to be independent.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am very glad to yield the floor so that the Senator from Nevada may make his statement.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, in my humble opinion, the resolution before this body places the Senate on record as advising the President to pursue, among other things, to quote the language of the resolution:

"Progressive development of regional and other collective arrangements for individual and collective self-defense in accordance with the purposes, principles, and provisions of the Charter.

"Association of the United States by constitutional process with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security.

"Contributing to the maintenance of peace by making clear its determination to exercise the right of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 should any armed attack occur affecting its national security."

These recommendations are paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) in the resolution presented by the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Their purpose is to place the Senate on record as advising the President to negotiate regional security agreements under the United Nations Charter. Each regional security agreement, when negotiated by the President, must be ratified subsequently by the Senate. But by advising the President to go ahead the Senate in effect guarantees that a future Senate will ratify such treaties.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I know that the Senator would want me to give at least my interpretation of the record, and make it perfectly clear.

Mr. MALONE. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I certainly should not want the statement of the Senator from Nevada to stand as the interpretation of what is to occur.

Mr. MALONE. I shall be very happy to have the Senator explain his position.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Repeatedly I have insisted that we must be perfectly sure that when we exercise the advise function in respect to the advice to the President on this subject, we are not yielding any of our subsequent consent prerogative. So far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, he completely disagrees with any assertion that the exercise of the advice functions is a surrender of the consent function. I know that that is precisely the position which the able Senator from Nevada wishes to maintain. I agree with him 100 percent as to what is the correct interpretation of the situation which we confront when we give advice. I would not want him to withdraw from his own conclusion by asserting that we had surrendered any such right.

Mr. MALONE. I am very glad to have the opinion of the Senator from Michigan. I have listened very carefully to the Senator from Michigan, and all his proposed policies for the past several months, and I understand his position perfectly well.

I am not contending that such a treaty made subsequent to the passage of the resolutions would not have to be ratified by this body, but I also believe that there is through these resolutions an implied approval of any such treaty which may be made, and that this action could well be the first step in relinquishing the policy which has long been established through the Constitution of the United States. This is the first step, just as we took the first step in violation of the Constitution by appropriating money for foreign nations for any purpose over a long period of years, through small appropriations in the beginning. Finally we reached the point where the appropriations for foreign nations closely approached, and even surpassed, what ordinarily would constitute an entire year's appropriations for the expenses of this Government. It required some time to establish this precedent, but it was finally established, and is not now questioned.

In my humble opinion this is the first step toward breaking down the independence of the Senate by the executive department, and the constitutional provision that the Senate review any such treaty before final approval.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I think I understand perfectly what the Senator from Nevada has in mind. He is not saying that after we give our advice, we must give our consent; but he is saying that if we advise about a matter, then if that matter is carried out substantially in accordance with our advice, we shall have practically bound ourselves morally to give our consent. I understand that is what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. MALONE. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey has expressed perfectly my feelings in the matter.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to say, if the Senator will further yield, that one thing which has been difficult for me to understand is that repeatedly on the floor of the Senate Senators have argued that we cannot do what we would like to do in a certain matter because we have done something 1 or 2 years before, which binds us in our action now. I think the Senator from Nevada wishes to be sure that when we give our advice, we shall be willing to go through with the matter and give our consent later on, rather than run the risk of being accused by any nation of a breach of good faith if we do not later give our consent.

Mr. MALONE. I think that is entirely true. It would be like the situation which has developed in various committees—for instance, in the committee considering flood-control matters. Witnesses appearing before the committee often say, "The authorization of this project does not appropriate the money." But once the project is authorized, the witnesses then say to the Appropriations Committee, "You are morally bound to make this appropriation, because the Congress of the United States has authorized this project." In other words, although technically the committee could refuse to make the appropriation, morally it is bound and cannot refuse.

Mr. HAWKES. I may say to the distinguished Senator that I am one who believes that the Congres should be very careful in the authorizations it makes. In my business life, my constant practice has been that

after I have authorized something, I follow through with it and pay the bill and carry on in accordance with the authorization.

One of the criticisms I have of this great body—and I have made this criticism both on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere publicly—is that often when we authorize an expenditure we are told at the time of the authorization that it does not necessarily follow that we shall appropriate the necessary funds, following the authorization; whereas, in the last analysis, I find that every time a question of making an appropriation arises, the argument is advanced that inasmuch as the authorization has been made, we must make the appropriation.

Mr. MALONE. I think the Senator's analogy is perfect. In other words, if the Senate in effect directs the President and State Department to make such treaties, indicating the nature of such agreements, they will have a perfect right to say to the Senate later, "You directed us to do this, and now we expect you to ratify this treaty." Then tons of propaganda will go out over the country; and the first thing we know, our votes will be in the pocket, or else our votes will be minority votes and we have lost our opportunity.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does not the point the Senator from Nevada has raised go to the very basis of this entire matter? I understand that the Senator has raised the point that if we take the initial step now proposed, we shall ultimately be bound to take others. Is that the point?

Mr. MALONE. Yes. We shall be taking this step without having any idea whatever of what is in the mind of the President or the State Department as to the kind of treaty that will be presented to us later, but in effect we are directing them to make it without such knowledge.

Mr. BALDWIN. Then the only alternative the Senator has to offer is that we do nothing. Is that correct?

Mr. MALONE. We have already indicated our position through ratifying the United Nations Charter in the regular way. The alternative I would offer is that we follow the Constitution of the United States and not commit ourselves in advance. I am not a part of the State Department, and I do not believe the Distinguished Senator from Connecticut is a part of it. Certainly we are not the President of the United States. The Constitution of the United States provides that the President shall make the treaties and shall send them to this body for ratification. At that time when the Senate considers the proposed treaties, prior to ratifying them, all the evidence is supposed to be available to the Senate. It is not available now.

Mr. BALDWIN. Where does the Senator find in the resolution anything which says that any treaty made under this resolution by the State Department or the President is not to be ratified by the Senate?

Mr. MALONE. The entire requirement that we must later ratify it in the regular manner is lost in a maze of verbiage indicating that we are urging such treaties—and therefore the final ratification will be a mere matter of form.

Mr. BALDWIN. Then obviously the Constitution will prevail, and the arrangements now being considered by us would be subject to the constitutional requirements.

Mr. MALONE. I think the Senator is entirely correct. The Senator from Connecticut has been a Member of the Senate for about the same time that I have; he and I are both yearlings. Of course, I defer to the long experience of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and I listen with very great attention to everything he has to say. But still I say to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut that there is nothing in the Constitution which even implies or in any way would lead me to believe that we are a part of the State Department or the executive branch of the Government, and that we must, in advance, give them permission to make or, in fact, direct them to make, any kind of treaty whatever.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me call the attention of the Senator to paragraph (2) of the resolution:

"(2) Progressive development of regional and other collective arrangements for individual and collective self-defense in accordance with the purposes, principles, and provisions of the charter.

That means that we favor taking the step of developing regional arrangements, as I understand.

Then the resolution further says:

"(3) Association of the United States, by constitutional process"—

I take it that means exactly what my good friend the Senator from Nevada is talking about—

"with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security."

In other words, we shall enter into these regional arrangements if we find it advisable and wise to do so as a protection of our own national security and our own national interest.

It seems to me that in all the history of treaty making, that is the process we have always followed. Whether we undertake it individually as a Nation or whether we undertake it as a group of nations, does not seem to me to make very much difference. It takes two to make a contract; but there have been treaties between 2 nations and there have been treaties between 22 nations.

It seems to me this proposal envisages no more than we already have done, except it indicates our willingness to go forward along the path of settling our difficulties by the process of agreement in treaties; and then we go further in the resolution and say that if the United States becomes a party to such an arrangement, it must be on the basis of observance of our constitutional processes.

I submit to the Senator that is the time-honored way by which we have always proceeded in such matters.

Mr. MALONE. May I interpose?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. MALONE. I say to my distinguished colleague that the present proposal is somewhat similar to the procedure used in connection with trade treaties at this time. There was a time when all treaties had to be ratified by the Senate. Then it was proposed to the Congress by the executive branch of the Government that a different procedure be followed; and, finally, after first one step and then another, this body relinquished all authority in respect to ratifying trade treaties. They are now made entirely independent of the Senate—and go into effect even against the wishes of this body.

I submit to the Senator from Connecticut that if we take the initiative in this matter and urge the President or the State Department to do certain of these things, then we shall be morally bound to follow whatever they do. However, we will be taking this action without any indication of what those treaties will provide.

If the distinguished Senator from Connecticut will bear with me until I proceed a little further with my remarks, perhaps some of his questions will be answered.

PACTS HAVE COST NATION TRADITIONAL INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, during that debate I contended:

That in my humble opinion, the resolution before this body places the Senate on Record as advising the President to pursue, and among other things, to make an Atlantic Pact; to quote the language of the resolution:

"Progressive development of regional and other collective arrangements for individual and collective self-defense in accordance with the purposes, principles, and provisions of the charter.

"Association of the United States by constitutional process with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security.

"Contributing to the maintenance of peace by making clear its determination to exercise the right of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 should any armed attack occur affecting its national security."

Mr. President, because of the pacts under consideration, affecting the United States of America, we have lost the position we held for 175 years, of insisting on the right to decide when our national security was in jeopardy. Practically every one of the pacts completely binds us to go to war when nations such as England and France which have individual security pacts with Russia are in war. Because of our pacts with England and France and other European nations, and which we now have also with many of the Asiatic nations, we are committed to go to war when any one of those other nations is at war.

PACTS PREVENT UNITED STATES FROM BEING JUDGE OF OWN SECURITY

We are no longer the sole judge of when our security is threatened.

Mr. President, I also call attention to the fact that we have no control over decisions by these nations as to when and where and over what they shall get into war. That situation arises from our guarantee of the integrity of the colonial slavery system throughout the world, because the way they get into war is through the defense of that system.

They are trade wars, wars to defend their colonial slavery possessions. France and Indochina afford one instance. Neither the United States nor France had any friends in Indochina, simply because the people of Indochina knew that if our principles prevailed, they would continue in colonial slavery under France. They did not know very much about communism, but they knew plenty about colonial slavery, and they were having no more of it.

POLICY OF DIVIDING NATIONS AND PEOPLES FOLLOWED EVER SINCE WORLD WAR II

Since World War II, we have followed a policy of dividing nations. Germany is today divided into four parts, controlled, respectively, by Russia, the United States, England, and France. India is divided into two parts—India and Pakistan. Indochina is divided into two parts. Korea is divided into two parts. Every sign indicates that China will have two parts very soon—with tacit recognition of Red China, and leaving Chiang Kai-shek in the United Nations.

Mr. President, again I remind the Senate that the United States is continually signing pacts with other nations; and the nations with whom we have signed the pacts have, in turn, signed pacts with our potential enemies; and those pacts are still in good standing. Furthermore, through these pacts we

have guaranteed the integrity of the colonial slavery system throughout the world, and have guaranteed that we shall go to war if any of the nations with whom we have signed pacts goes to war; but in that connection we have no control over where or when or over what these nations shall get into war. For these reasons, Mr. President, I shall vote against ratification of the pacts now before us.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I expect to vote for ratification of the pending treaties, but I shall vote for them with some misgivings. I shall vote for ratification of the treaties because I believe that that is an essential step on the road to the building of a strong, free Western World and to the redress of the balance of power in Europe.

I believe that the increase in the strength and defense capacity of Western Europe—and the establishment of the maximum amount of unity that is possible among the nations of Western Europe—should be the cornerstone of American foreign policy, just as I believe that the unity and strength of the Atlantic community of nations is and should be the cornerstone of American defense policy.

The accords submitted today to the Senate are a necessary implementation of this policy. The pending agreements restore to Western Germany—to the Germany that the free world recognizes—the last measures of severeignty. Under the terms of this agreement, Germany is given her full seat at the council table of the western European nations. Under the terms of these agreements, the Federal Republic of Germany is given not only full sovereignty but full membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Germany is welcomed back into the bosom of the European family, a free and equal member, with full and equal responsibilities for the defense of Western Europe and the free world.

To this course, I see no feasible or practical alternative. Yet it is not without grave doubts and reservations that I come to this conclusion. I have the greatest respect and the highest regard for Chancellor Adenauer and President Heuss, who are true devotees of democracy and the democratic way.

The present Government of Germany is a democratic government. But I do not know how deep the democratic current runs in Germany. I am not convinced that Germany has yet developed a sufficient tradition of democratic faith and practice to permit her to withstand the siren call of totalitarianism in the years ahead.

I regard with considerable apprehension the prospect of the rearmament of Germany. At the present time there is, among many of the people of Germany, a strong resistance to rearmament. Generally speaking, rearmament is not a popular cause in Germany today.

I believe one of the reasons for this is that the democratic elements in Germany themselves fear the effects of a remilitarization of that country. I am sure that many of the German people feel an even greater apprehension than I do over the effect which the sight and possession of a German Army will have on the German people.

If totalitarian, militaristic-minded elements again regain a dominant voice in German political life, and if the voice of the soldier and the officer corps should again command the respect it has enjoyed in Germany for so many generations and centuries, we—all of us, including the German people—will have reason to regret it. Then one of the principal fruits of the dearly bought victory we won 10 years ago will have been lost.

But I recognize, Mr. President, that today's threat to world peace must be met today. I recognize that Germany must be brought into the family of free nations, and must be kept securely there. I recognize that Western Germany must be permitted to fill the power vacuum which exists in central Europe. I recognize, finally, that Germany must make its contribution to the defense of Western Europe.

I pray, however, that our policymakers and the leaders of our Government will do whatever is possible to lend aid and comfort to the democratic elements in Germany and to maintain whatever safeguards are possible against the rebirth of the militaristic spirit in Germany.

The fears or France must be given due weight. They are not without substance. The apprehension of the French people is shared by a great many people in this country, as it is shared by millions of people throughout Europe.

We must not and we dare not give to the peoples of Europe—the French, the Dutch, the Norwegians, the Danes, the Beligians; yes, and the Czechs, the Poles, the Hungarians, and the Austrians—to all peoples who in the past have suffered at the hands of Germany—substantial grounds for believing that we are bent on encouraging the restoration, not of a free German nation, but of a militaristic German nation, a power-seeking German nation.

We shall never be forgiven—history will never forgive us—if we are judged primarily responsible for making the same mistake—for leading to the same course of events—which occurred after World War I.

There is already too great a parallel. In many respects it sounds as if the same record were being played over and over again. I fear these similarities; yet I know there is a difference.

It is on the basis of this difference and on the basis of my hope that we have learned from our mistakes of the past, that I shall cast my vote in favor of ratification of the pending agreements.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OUR PRAYERS COULD CHANGE THE WORLD

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think it appropriate at this time to read into the RECORD a letter which I received this week from an old lady in Wyoming whom I have known for years. She is more than 90 years of age. The letter is simple. It is direct. It is impressive. It will have wide appeal and it is a fitting conclusion to the present debate.

Writing from her home at 124 Wyoming Avenue, Sheridan, Wyo., under date of March 21, 1955, she says:

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At the present I am more exercised over world peace than any other one thing. If we could only achieve that, "All other things could be added." I am a strong believer in prayer. There must be some 500 or more in our Congress today. If every voice could be offered up in honest prayer, no one knows what might be the results.

Lay aside all prejudices, all political and religious differences. We all worship the same God. "And all things whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive." Matthew 21:22. This is just as true today as when it was uttered.

I wish you would read this article, "Our Prayers Could Change the World," to the Senate and have it published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

You know I am an old lady past 90, and what I do I must do quickly. God bless you.

Sincerely,

MRS. MARY J. ASH.

P. S.—Please don't feel me presumptuous in writing like this. I do it in all sincerity.

M. A.

Enclosed with the letter was an article entitled "Our Prayers Could Change the World," written by Stanley High, one of the editors of the Reader's Digest. By a curious coincidence Stanley High was born in Douglas, Wyo., where his father was minister of one of the churches. I am sure he will appreciate the letter of Mrs. Ash.

At the top of the article my dear friend from Sheridan writes:

I wish every Congressman would read this and act accordingly.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Stanley High be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR PRAYERS COULD CHANGE THE WORLD

(By Stanley High)

How can the average American, the average citizen of any free nation, help win the struggle to save freedom and achieve a just and lasting peace?

The answer to this universal question now comes from the weighty testimony of many distinguished men. It is this: A lasting peace can be achieved only through the rediscovery of the free world's spiritual resources, the reviving among free peoples of a dynamic religious faith.

"Peace cannot be left to the diplomat and the soldier," says President Eisenhower. "It desperately needs the transforming power that comes from men and women, the world over, responding to their highest allegiances and to their best motives. The cause of peace needs God."

"The West has erred," says the historian Arnold J. Toynbee, "because it has chosen to fight communism with communism's own materialist weapons. As long as the battle is fought on these terms, the Communists will keep on winning. Western democracy must base its appeal on more than freedom, more than prosperity; it must base its appeal on religion. Only in this way can democracy turn the tables on the Communist assailants. The grace of God might bring about this miracle."

Charles Malik, Lebanese Ambassador to the United States and an Arab spokesman in the United Nations, says, "Nothing is more ridiculous than those who say 'fight communism' and then concentrate on the economic and social alone. The real challenge is intellectual and spiritual. What is needed is a positive message, something humble, outreaching, touching the hearts of men, touching their need for understanding, providing hope. How can such a message be given reality save by multitudes of ordinary men and women stirred and exalted by religious faith?"

Is there a way whereby religion's power to shape events can be made effective? President Eisenhower believes there is. He set it forth before the assembly of the World Council of Churches:

"How can we help strike this spark of dedication in receptive hearts around the earth? By personal prayer by hundreds upon hundreds of millions. The goal should be nothing short of inviting every single person in every single country who believes in a Supreme Being to join in this mighty, intense act of faith. If this mass dedication launched an unending campaign for peace, supported by prayer, I am certain wondrous results would ensue."

This conviction of the President is backed up by the judgment of other Americans who, in times of great crisis, acknowledged their faith in prayer. When, in 1787, the threat of failure loomed over the Constitutional Convention, Benjamin Franklin called for daily prayers:

"I have lived, sir, a long time; and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see that God governs in the affairs of men. We have been assured, sir, in the Sacred Writings, that 'except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.' I firmly believe this; and I also believe that, without His concurring aid, we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel."

With the fate of the Union at stake in his decisions, Abraham Lincoln said: "I talk to God. My mind seems relieved when I do and a way is suggested. I should be a self-conceited blockhead if I should hope to get along without the wisdom that comes from God and not from man."

If each of us set aside some time every day to pray fervently for a just and lasting peace, is it likely that wondrous results would ensue?

For the answer to this question do not look to those who are skeptical of prayer and ignorant of praying. The opinions on prayer of such men, says Dr. George A. Buttrick, are like those of tone-deaf men judging music. Here, as in any field of knowledge, we should turn to experts—men who speak of prayer from their own observation and experience.

"If prayers were not answered," says Dr. Buttrick in his book Prayer, "praying would long since have vanished in man's despair and pain."

"If praying did not produce results," said the late Rufus Jones, renowned Quaker philosopher, "it would soon be weeded out of the human race. It would shrivel like the functionless organ."

In these times it is not prayer which has failed, but we who have failed to pray. Dr. Alexis Carrel believed that "prayer is our greatest source of power. But," he added, "it is miserably undeveloped."

God does not "force His assistance on us," says Father James Keller, founder of The Christophers. "He leaves us free to take it or leave it. The key to the door is given in Jesus' words: 'Ask,' 'Seek,' 'Knock.'

"It is as clear, as simple as the story of the small boy struggling mightily to lift a heavy stone. He couldn't budget it. Happening to pass by his father asked, 'Are you using all your strength?' 'Yes, I am,' said the boy impatiently. 'I don't think you are,' said the father. 'You haven't asked me to help.'

"The road to a just and lasting peace has some mighty big stones in it."

"Some years ago," says Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, "the scientist Steinmetz prophesied the time would come when we would take prayer into our laboratories and release tremendous power. Countless men and women today, in the laboratories of their own lives, are proving what prayer can do. A hard core of thoroughly dedicated prayer-scientists, focusing spiritual power on men and events, could loose a redeeming, creating force in the world which no evil host, not even the Communists could stand against. I believe there are tens of thousands of people around the world ready to join in the fellowship and adventure of such an experiment."

"We will never rid the world of war," says Evangelist Billy Graham, "until we ourselves are rid of iniquity. What does God say? 'From whence come wars and fightings among you * * * come they not from your lusts?' What has God promised? 'When a man's ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him.' "

Is there any doubt, ask Dr. Rheinhold Niebuhr, that "our dedication would influence the policies of nations? The task of overcoming pride and arrogance, which assail every nation and are an obstacle to peace, is a religious one. Greater humility and patience in our dealings with other nations must begin with a deeper humility and patience in us, as individuals. Granted we deal with an unscrupulous foe. Yet, how better than by the spirit born of our prayers can be convince him of the honesty of our purposes, the sincerity of our desire for peace?"

From our dedication through prayer we could expect a unity for peace among the world's peoples made vastly stronger because its source was spiritual, not merely military and material. Father Keller quotes the conclusion of Napoleon as he looked back from St. Helena on the ruins of his conquests: "There are two world powers, the sword and the spirit. The spirit has always vanquished the sword."

"Faith has indeed moved mountains," says President Eisenhower. "Ours is a time when great things must again be dared in faith."

Millions profess that belief. Will we accept the challenge?

PROTOCOL ON THE TERMINATION OF THE OCCUPATION REGIME IN THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, AND PROTOCOL TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ON THE ACCESSION OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the protocols will be considered as having passed through their various parliamentary stages up to the point of consideration of the resolutions of ratification. The clerk will now read the resolutions of ratification.

The legislative clerk read the resolutions of ratification, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive L, 83d Congress, 2d session, a protocol on the termination of the occupation regime in the Federal Republic of Germany, signed at Paris on October 23, 1954.

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive M, 83d Congress, 2d session, a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of the Federal Republic of Germany, signed at Paris on October 23, 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolutions of ratification? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, 1 vote will be taken on the resolutions of ratification of the 2 protocols, but the vote will be recorded on each separately.

EXECUTIVE L (83D CONG., 2D SESS.)—THE PROTOCOL ON THE TERMINATION OF THE OCCUPATION REGIME IN THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, SIGNED AT PARIS ON OCTOBER 23, 1954

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll first on Executive L.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], if present and voting, would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senators from Utah [Mr. BENNETT and Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senators from South Dakota [Mr. CASE and Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is detained on official business.

I also announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senators from Utah [Mr. BENNETT and Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senators from South Dakota [Mr. CASE and Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 76, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—76

Allott	Green	Morse
Anderson	Hayden	Murray
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Neely
Barrett	Hill	Neuberger
Beall	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bender	Hruska	Pastore
Bible	Humphrey	Payne
Bricker	Ives	Potter
Carlson	Jackson	Purtell
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cotton	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Curtis	Kilgore	Scott
Daniel	Knowland	Smathers
Dirksen	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Long	Sparkman
Dworshak	Magnuson	Stennis
Eastland	Mansfield	Symington
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Thurmond
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Thye
Frear	McCarthy	Wiley
Fulbright	McClellan	Williams
George	McNamara	Young
Goldwater	Millikin	
Gore	Monroney	

NAYS—2

Langer	Malone

NOT VOTING—18

Aiken	Capehart	Kennedy
Bennett	Case, S. Dak.	Kerr
Bridges	Chavez	Mundt
Bush	Ervin	Schoeppel
Butler	Hennings	Watkins
Byrd	Jenner	Welker

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 76 and the nays are 2. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification on Executive L is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE M (83D CONG., 2D SESS.), THE PROTOCOL TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ON THE ACCESSION OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, SIGNED AT PARIS ON OCTOBER 23, 1954

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll will now be called on the resolution of ratification on Executive M.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], if present and voting, would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senators from Utah [Mr. BENNETT and Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senators from South Dakota [Mr. CASE and Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is detained on official business.

I also announce that if present and voting the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senators from Utah [Mr. BENNETT and Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senators from South Dakota [Mr. CASE and Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 76, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—76

Allott	Green	Morse
Anderson	Hayden	Murray
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Neely
Barrett	Hill	Neuberger
Beall	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bender	Hruska	Pastore
Bible	Humphrey	Payne
Bricker	Ives	Potter
Carlson	Jackson	Purtell
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cotton	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Curtis	Kilgore	Scott
Daniel	Knowland	Smathers
Dirksen	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Long	Sparkman
Dworshak	Magnuson	Stennis
Eastland	Mansfield	Symington
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Thurmond
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Thye
Frear	McCarthy	Wiley
Fulbright	McClellan	Williams
George	McNamara	Young
Goldwater	Millikin	
Gore	Monroney	

NAYS—2

Langer	Malone

NOT VOTING—18

Aiken	Capehart	Kennedy
Bennett	Case, S. Dak.	Kerr
Bridges	Chavez	Mundt
Bush	Ervin	Schoeppel
Butler	Hennings	Watkins
Byrd	Jenner	Welker

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 76 and the nays are 2. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification on Executive M is agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be advised of the Senate's advice and consent with reference to the ratification of the protocols.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said. Mr. President, prior to the vote on the two protocols today I wanted to correct an editorial comment in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald. However, in order to expedite the vote, I acceded to the request of the majority leader that I not speak at that time. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE AND THE TREATIES

Today or tomorrow the Senate will approve the Paris treaties to restore sovereignty to West Germany and make that country a part of the Western defense system. The last doubt about the Senate's attitude was removed yesterday when its Foreign Relations Committee voted 14 to 1 in favor of ratifying the treaties, with only Senator LANGER in opposition. This almost unanimous approval reflects the eagerness of the American people to keep the North Atlantic Alliance and the European continental defense system strong enough to discourage Communist aggression. We hope that the Senate will reemphasize American unity on this point by an equally overwhelming vote for the treaties.

The delay in ratification reflects no lukewarm attitude on the part of this country. The Senate had been waiting only for France and Germany to act on the treaties. In a matter so vitally affecting the future of France and Germany, it would not have been psychologically appropriate for this country to have taken the lead. Now that the great hurdles have been cleared in Paris and Bonn, however, an emphatic American endorsement will be a useful contribution to the cause of peace.

It is undoubtedly true, as Senator HUMPHREY has pointed out, that rearming of West Germany is a calculated risk. But the risk is wholly different from that which the Allies took after the First World War and which led to the rise of Hitler. Nor is the chief difference the lesson that the German people have learned a second time about the dangers of militarism. Rather, it lies in the integration of the German Army that will now come into being with the larger defense system of the Western World. West Germany will now be a part of NATO. Possibly more important, it will be a part of the Western European Union, which will control the type and volume of its armaments. A reunited Germany would not be able to go on the warpath again without defying all Western Europe as well as the United States.

Whatever risk there may be that Germany will break out of this defense system and once more menace her neighbors, it is minor compared with the present danger of aggression from behind the Iron Curtain. Any cool appraisal of present conditions must emphasize the necessity of bringing West Germany into the alliance that is keeping the peace in Europe. The people of France and Germany have made heroic adjustments in their thinking to permit the strengthening of this defense system. The United States has from the beginning given its pledge of support. Now that the final steps in the ratifying process are being taken let them be as impressive as possible.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to read one sentence from the editorial, as follows:

> It is undoubtedly true, as Senator HUMPHREY has pointed out, that the rearming of West Germany is a "calculated risk."

I have the greatest respect for the editorial writers of the Washington Post and Times Herald, but I suggest that their quoting out of context what I said is doing a disservice to them and to the junior Senator from Minnesota. What I pointed out in the Committee on Foreign Relations was that whenever a treaty is entered into with a foreign country, particularly in the light of the history of Germany, a calculated risk is involved, but that in this case it is one that is well taken, in view of the tense

international situation, and because of the importance of having Western Germany integrated into the western defense system.

The junior Senator from Minnesota pointed out that one of the real hopes of continuing democracy in Germany was to have Western Germany, the Federal Republic of Germany, made a part of the family of free nations and to bring her into the confines of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and in that way give support and stature and assistance to the political parties of Germany, who are striving for the democratic way of life in Germany, and endeavoring to give Germany a representative government.

It was with that realization that I voted for the ratification of the protocols today. It is a great victory for the free world to have free Germany given back her sovereignty and to have her participate as a free partner in the family of nations, which will be an even greater bulwark of strength because of Germany's active participation.

INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS CONVENTION, WITH ANNEXES, AND FINAL PROTOCOL TO THE CONVENTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive R, the International Telecommunication Convention, 83d Congress, 1st session.

I should like to say that if the motion is agreed to, we expect the consideration of the convention will take only a short time; but there will be another yea-and-nay vote, so I ask Senators to remain in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention (Executive R, 83d Cong., 1st sess.), the International Telecommunication Convention, with annexes, and the final protocol to the convention, with understandings which were signed at Buenos Aires on December 22, 1952, by the delegates of the United States of America and the delegates of other countries represented at the International Telecommunications Conference, Buenos Aires, 1952, which was read the second time, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION CONVENTION

(Preamble)

While fully recognizing the sovereign right of each country to regulate its telecommunication, the plenipotentiaries of the Contracting Governments, with the object of facilitating relations between the peoples by means of efficient telecommunication services, have agreed to conclude the following Convention:

CHAPTER 1—COMPOSITION, FUNCTIONS AND STRUCTURE OF THE UNION

Article 1—Composition of the union

1. The International Telecommunication Union shall comprise Members and Associate Members.

2. A Member of the Union shall be:

(a) any country or group of territories listed in Annex 1 upon signature and ratification of, or accession to, this Convention, by it or on its behalf;

(b) any country not listed in Annex 1 which becomes a Member of the United Nations and which accedes to this Convention in accordance with Article 16;

(c) any sovereign country not listed in Annex 1 and not a Member of the United Nations which applies for membership in the Union and which, after having secured approval of such application by two-thirds of the Members of the Union, accedes to this Convention in accordance with Article 16.

3. (1) All Members shall be entitled to participate in conferences of the Union and shall be eligible for election to any of its organs.

(2) Each Member shall have one vote at any conference of the Union and at any meeting of a permanent organ of the Union of which it is a Member.

4. An Associate Member of the Union shall be:

(a) any country, territory or group of territories listed in Annex 2 upon signature and ratification of, or accession to, this Convention, by it or on its behalf;

(b) any country which has not become a Member of the Union in accordance with paragraph 2 of this Article, by acceding to this Convention in accordance with Article 16, after its application for Associate Membership has received approval by a majority of the Members of the Union;

(c) any territory or group of territories, not fully responsible for the conduct of its international relations, on behalf of which a Member of the Union has signed and ratified or acceded to this Convention in accordance with Article 16 or 17, provided that its application for Associate Membership is sponsored by such Member, after the application has received approval by a majority of the Members of the Union;

(d) any trust territory on behalf of which the United Nations has acceded to this Convention in accordance with Article 18, and the application of which for Associate Membership has been sponsored by the United Nations.

5. If any territory or group of territories, forming part of a group of territories constituting a Member of the Union, becomes or has become an Associate Member of the Union in accordance with subparagraphs (a) and (c) of paragraph 4 above, its rights and obligations under this Convention shall be those of an Associate Member only.

6. Associate Members shall have the same rights and obligations as Members of the Union, except that they shall not have the right to vote in any conference or other organ of the Union. They shall not be eligible for election to any organ of the Union of which the Members are elected by a plenipotentiary or administrative conference.

7. For purposes of paragraphs 2 (c), 4 (b) and 4 (c) above, if an application for Membership or Associate Membership is made, by diplomatic channels and through the intermediary of the country of the seat of the Union, during the interval between two plenipotentiary conferences, the Secretary-General shall consult the Members of the Union; a Member shall be deemed to have abstained if it has not replied within four months after its opinion has been requested.

Article 2—Seat of the Union

The seat of the Union and of its permanent organs shall be at Geneva.

Article 3—Purposes of the Union

1. The purposes of the Union are:

(a) to maintain and extend international cooperation for the improvement and rational use of telecommunication of all kinds;

(b) to promote the development of technical facilities and their most efficient operation with a view to improving the efficiency of telecommunication services, increasing ther usefulness and making them, so far as possible, generally available to the public;

(c) to harmonize the actions of nations in the attainment of those common ends.

2. To this end, the Union shall in particular:

(a) effect allocation of the radio frequency spectrum and registration of radio frequency assignments in order to avoid harmful interference between radio stations of different countries;

(b) foster collaboration among its Members and Associate Members with a view to the establishment of rates at levels as low as possible consistent with an efficient service and taking into account the necessity for maintaining independent financial administration of telecommunication on a sound basis;

(c) promote the adoption of measures for ensuring the safety of life through the cooperation of telecommunication service;

(d) undertake studies, formulate recommendations, and collect and publish information on telecommunication matters for the benefit of all Members and Associate Members.

Article 4—Structure of the Union

The organization of the Union shall be as follows:

1. the Plenipotentiary Conference which is the supreme organ of the Union;

2. Administrative Conferences;

3. the permanent organs of the Union which are:

(a) the Administrative Council,

(b) the General Secretariat,

(c) the International Frequency Registration Board (I. F. R. B.)

(d) the International Telegraph Consultative Committee (C. C. I. T.)

(e) the International Telephone Consultative Committee (C. C. I. F.)

(f) the International Radio Consultative Committee (C. C. I. R)

Article 5—Administrative Council

A. Organization and working arrangements:

1. (1) The Administrative Council shall be composed of eighteen Members of the Union elected by the plenipotentiary conference with due regard to the need for equitable representation of all parts of the world. The Members of the Union elected to the Council shall hold office until the date on which a new Council is elected by the plenipotentiary conference. They are eligible for re-election.

(2) If between two plenipotentiary conferences a seat becomes vacant on the Administrative Council, it shall pass by right to the Member of the Union, from the same region as the Member whose seat is vacated, who had obtained at the previous election the largest number of votes among those not elected.

2. Each of the Members of the Administrative Council shall appoint to serve on the Council a person qualified in the field of telecommunication services.

3. Each Member of the Council shall have one vote.

4. The Administrative Council shall adopt its own Rules of Procedure.

5. The Administrative Council shall elect its own Chairman and Vice-Chairman at the beginning of each annual session. They shall serve until the opening of the next annual session and shall be eligible for re-election. The Vice-Chairman shall serve as Chairman in the absence of the latter.

6. (1) The Council shall hold an annual session at the seat of the Union.

(2) During this session it may decide to hold, exceptionally, an additional session.

(3) Between ordinary sessions, it may be convened, as a general rule at the seat of the Union, by its Chairman at the request of the majority of its Members.

7. The Secretary-General and the two Assistant Secretaries-General, the Chairman of the International Frequency Registration Board, the Directors of the International

Consultative Committee and the Vice-Director of the International Radio Consultative Committee shall participate as of right in the deliberations of the Administrative Council, but without taking part in the voting. Nevertheless, the Council may exceptionally hold meetings confined to its own Members.

8. The Secretary-General of the Union shall act as Secretary of the Administrative Council.

9. (1) In the interval between plenipotentiary conferences, the Administrative Council shall act on behalf of the plenipotentiary conference within the limits of the powers delegated to it by the latter.

(2) The Council shall act only in formal session.

10. Only the travelling and subsistence expenses incurred by the representative of each Member of the Administrative Council in this capacity shall be borne by the Union.

B. Duties:

11. (1) The Administrative Council shall be responsible for taking all steps to facilitate the implementation by the Members and Associate Members of the provisions of the Convention, of the Regulations, of the decisions of the plenipotentiary conference, and, where appropriate, of the decisions of other conferences and meetings of the Union.

(2) It shall ensure efficient coordination of the work of the Union.

12. In particular the Administrative Council shall:

(a) perform any duties assigned to it by the plenipotentiary conference;

(b) in the interval between plenipotentiary conferences, be responsible for effecting the coordination with all international organizations referred to in Articles 26 and 27 of this Convention;

and, to this end,

(1) conclude, on behalf of the Union, provisional agreements with the international organizations referred to in Article 27 of the Convention, and with the United Nations in application of the Agreement contained in Annex 6 to the Convention; these provisional agreements shall be submitted to the next plenipotentiary conference in accordance with Article 9, paragraph 1 (g) of this Convention;

(2) appoint, on behalf of the Union, one or more representatives to participate in the conferences of such organizations, and, when necessary, in coordinating committees established in conjunction with those organizations;

(c) appoint the Secretary-General and the two Assistant-Secretaries General of the Union;

(d) decide on the numbers and grading of the staff of the General Secretariat and of the specialized secretariats of the permanent organs of the Union, taking into account the general directives given by the plenipotentiary conference;

(e) draw up such regulations as it may consider necessary for the administrative and financial activities of the Union;

(f) Supervise the administrative functions of the Union;

(g) review and approve the annual budget of the Union;

(h) arrange for the annual audit of the accounts of the Union prepared by the Secretary-General and approve them for submission to the next plenipotentiary conference;

(i) fix the salaries of the members of the International Frequency Registration Board and all of the officials of the Union, taking into account the basic salary scales determined in accordance with the terms of Article 9, paragraph 1 (c) by the plenipotentiary conference;

(j) determine if necessary the amount of any temporary additional allowances, taking into consideration the fluctuations in the cost of living in the country where the headquarters of the Union are situated and following in this matter, as far as possible, the practice of the Government of that country and the international organizations established there;

(k) arrange for the convening of plenipotentiary and administrative conferences of the Union in accordance with Articles 9 and 10 of this Convention;

(l) offer to the plenipotentiary conference of the Union any suggestions deemed useful;

(m) co-ordinate the activities of the permanent organs of the Union, take such action as it deems appropriate on requests or recommendations made to it by such organs, and fill vacancies ad interim in respect of the Directors of the International Consultative Committees and Vice-Director of the International Radio Consultative Committee;

(n) perform the other functions prescribed for it in this Convention and, within the framework of the Convention and the Regulations, any functions deemed necessary for the proper administration of the Union;

(o) submit a report on its activities and those of the Union for consideration by the plenipotentiary conference.

Article 6—International Frequency Registration Board

1. The essential duties of the International Frequency Registration Board shall be:

(a) to effect an orderly recording of frequency assignments made by the different countries so as to establish, in accordance with the procedure provided for in the Radio Regulations and in accordance with any decisions which may be taken by competent conferences of the Union, the date, purpose and technical characteristics of each of these assignments, with a view to ensuring formal international recognition thereof;

(b) to furnish advice to Members and Associate Members with a view to the operation of the maximum practicable number of radio channels in those portions of the spectrum where harmful interference may occur.

(c) to perform any additional duties, concerned with the assignment and utilization of frequencies, prescribed by a competent conference of the Union, or by the Administrative Council with the consent of the majority of the Members of the Union in preparation for or in pursuance of the decisions of such a conference;

(d) to maintain such essential records as may be related to the performance of its duties.

2. (1) The International Frequency Registration Board shall be a body composed of independent members, all nationals of different countries, Members of the Union.

(2) The members of the Board shall be thoroughly qualified by technical training in the field of radio and shall possess practical experience in the assignment and utilization of frequencies.

(3) Moreover, for the more effective understanding of the problems coming before the Board under paragraph 1 b) above, each member shall be familiar with geographic, economic and demographic conditions within a particular area of the world.

3. (1) At each of its meetings, the ordinary administrative radio conference shall elect the countries, Members of the Union, each of which is to nominate one of its nationals, qualified as provided above, to serve as an independent member of the Board.

(2) The method of this election shall be established by the Conference itself, in such a way as to ensure an equitable distribution of the Members among the various parts of the world.

(3) The countries so elected are eligible for re-election.

(4) The members of the Board shall take up their duties on the date determined by the ordinary administrative radio conference which elected the countries entrusted with the task of nominating them. They shall normally remain in office until the date determined by the following conference for their successors to take up their duties.

(5) If in the period between two ordinary administrative radio conferences, a member of the Board resigns or otherwise abandons his duties without good cause for a period exceeding three months, the Member of the Union which nominated him shall be asked by the Chairman of the Board to nominate a successor as soon as possible. If the Member of the Union concerned does not provide a replacement within a period of three months from the date of this request, it shall lose its right to nominate a person to serve on the Board. The Chairman of the Board shall then request the Member of the Union which had obtained, at the previous election, the largest number of votes among those not elected in the area concerned, to nominate a person to serve on the Board for the unexpired portion of the term.

4. The working arrangements of the Board are defined in the Radio Regulations.

5. (1) The members of the Board shall serve, not as representatives of their respective countries, or of a region, but as custodians of an international public trust.

(2) No member of the Board shall request or receive instructions relating to the exercise of his duties from any Government or a member thereof, or from any public or private organization or person. Furthermore, each Member and Associate Member must respect the international character of the Board and of the duties of its members and shall refrain from any attempt to influence any of them in the exercise of their duties.

(3) No member of the Board or of its staff shall participate in any manner or have any financial interest whatsoever in any branch of telecommunication, apart from the work of the Board. However, the term "financial interest" is not to be construed as applying to the continuation of retirement benefits accruing in respect of previous employment or service.

6. Any person serving on the Board shall be presumed automatically to have resigned his duties from the moment when the country of which he is a national ceases to be a Member of the Union.

Article 7—International consultative committees

1. (1) The duties of the International Telegraph Consultative Committee (C. C. I. T.) shall be to study technical, operating, and tariff questions relating to telegraphy and facsimile and to issue recommendations on them.

(2) The duties of the International Telephone Consultative Committee (C. C. I. F.) shall be to study technical, operating and tariff questions relating to telephony and to issue recommendations on them.

(3) The duties of the International Radio Consultative Committee (C. C. I. R.) shall be to study technical radio questions and operating questions, the solution of which depends principally on considerations of a technical radio character and to issue recommendations on them.

2. The questions studied by each International Consultative Committee, on which it shall issue recommendations, are those submitted to it by the plenipotentiary conference, by an administrative conference, by the Administrative Council, by another Consultative Committee or by the International Frequency Registration Board. A Consultative Committee shall likewise issue its recommendations on questions, the study of which has been decided upon by its Plenary Assembly or requested by at least twelve Members or Associate Members in the interval between two meetings of the Plenary Assembly concerned.

3. The International Consultative Committee shall have as Members:

(a) of right, the administrations of all Members and Associate Members of the Union;

(b) any recognized private operating agency which, with the approval of the Member or Associate Member which has recognized it, expresses a desire to participate in the work of these Committees.

4. Each Consultative Committee shall work through the medium of:

(a) the Plenary Assembly, meeting normally every three years;

(b) study groups, which shall be set up by the Plenary Assembly to deal with questions to be studied;

(c) a Director, who shall be appointed by the Plenary Assembly for an indefinite period, but with the reciprocal right of terminating the appointment; the Director of the Radio Consultative Committee shall be assisted by a Vice-Director specializing in broadcasting, appointed under the same conditions;

(d) a specialized secretariat, which assists the Director;

(e) laboratories or technical installations set up by the Union.

5. The Directors of the Consultative Committee and the Vice-Director of the International Radio Consultative Committee shall all be nationals of different countries.

6. (1) Consultative Committees shall observe the applicable Rules of Procedure of Conferences contained in the General Regulations annexed to this Convention.

(2) The Plenary Assembly of a Consultative Committee may adopt such additional Rules of Procedure provisions as may facilitate the work of the Committee if they do not conflict with the Rules of Procedure of Conferences.

7. The working arrangements of the Consultative Committees are defined in Part II of the General Regulations annexed to this Convention.

Article 8—General Secretariat

1. (1) The General Secretariat shall be directed by a Secretary-General, assisted by two Assistant Secretaries-General, who shall all be nationals of different countries, Members of the Union.

(2) The Secretary-General shall be responsible to the Administrative Council for all duties entrusted to the General Secretariat, and for all the administrative and financial services of the Union. The Assistant Secretaries-General shall be responsible to the Secretary-General.

2. The Secretary-General shall:

(a) organize the work of the General Secretariat and appoint the staff of that Secretariat in accordance with the directives of the plenipotentiary Conference and the rules established by the Administrative Council;

(b) undertake administrative arrangements for the specialized secretariats of the permanent organs of the Union and appoint the staff of those secretariats in agreement with the head of each permanent organ; the appointments shall be made on the basis of the latter's choice, but the final decision for appointment or dismissal shall rest with the Secretary-General;

(c) ensure that in the specialized secretariats all the financial and administrative regulations approved by the Administrative Council are applied;

(d) supervise, for administrative purposes only, the staff of those specialized secretariats who shall work directly under the orders of the heads of the permanent organs of the Union;

(e) undertake secretarial work preparatory to, and following conferences of the Union;

(f) provide, where appropriate in cooperation with the inviting government, the secretariat of every conference of the Union, and, when so requested or provided in the Regulations annexed to the Convention, the secretariat of meetings of the permanent organs of the Union or meetings placed under its auspices; he may also, when so requested, provide the secretariat of other telecommunication meetings on a contractual basis;

(g) keep up to date the official lists, compiled from data supplied for this purpose by the permanent organs of the Union or by Administrations, with the exception of the master registers and such other essential records as may be related to the duties of the International Frequency Registration Board;

(h) publish the recommendations and principal reports of the permanent organs of the Union;

(i) publish international and regional telecommunication agreements communicated to him by the parties thereto, and keep up to date records of these agreements;

(j) publish such data concerning the assignment and utilization of frequencies as are prepared by the International Frequency Registration Board in the discharge of its duties;

(k) prepare, publish and keep up to date with the assistance, where appropriate, of the other permanent organs of the Union:

(1) a record of the composition and structure of the Union;

(2) the general statistics and the official service documents of the Union as prescribed by the Regulations annexed to the Convention;

(3) such other documents as conferences or the Administrative Council may direct;

(l) distribute the published documents;

(m) collect and publish, in suitable form, data both national and international regarding telecommunication throughout the world;

(n) collect and publish such information as would be of assistance to Members and Associate Members regarding the development of technical methods with a view to achieving the most efficient operation of telecommunication services and especially the best possible use of radio frequencies so as to diminish interference;

(o) publish periodically, with the help of information put at his disposal or which he may collect, including that which he may obtain from other international organizations, a journal of general information and documentation concerning telecommunication;

(p) prepare and submit to the Administrative Council annual budget estimates which, after approval by the Council, shall be transmitted for information to all Members and Associate Members;

(q) prepare a financial operating report and accounts to be submitted annually to the Administrative Council and recapitulative accounts immediately preceding each plenipotentiary conference; these accounts, after audit and approval by the Administrative Council, shall be circulated to the Members and Associate Members and be submitted to the next plenipotentiary conference for examination and final approval;

(r) prepare an annual report on the activities of the Union which, after approval by the Administrative Council, shall be transmitted to all Members and Associate Members;

(s) perform all other secretarial functions of the Union.

3. The Secretary-General or one of the two Assistant Secretaries-General may participate, in a consultative capacity, in Plenary Assemblies of International Consultative Committees and in all conferences of the Union; the Secretary-General or his representative may participate in a consultative capacity in all other meetings of the Union.

4. The paramount consideration in the recruitment of the staff and in the determination of the conditions of service shall be the necessity of securing for the Union the highest standards of efficiency, competence, and integrity. Due regard must be paid to the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible.

5. (1) In the performance of their duties, the Secretary-General, the Assistant Secretaries-General and the staff must not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Union. They must refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as international officials.

(2) Each Member and Associate Member shall undertake to respect the exclusively international character of the responsibilities of the Secretary-General, the Assistant Secretaries-General and the staff, and not to seek to influence them in the discharge of their responsibilities.

Article 9—Plenipotentiary conference

1. The plenipotentiary conference shall:

(a) consider the report by the Administrative Council on its activities and those of the Union since the last plenipotentiary conference;

(b) establish the basis for the budget of the Union and determine a fiscal limit for the ordinary expenditure of the Union until the next plenipotentiary conference;

(c) establish the basic salary scales of all of the Union staff and of the members of the International Frequency Registration Board;

(d) finally approve the accounts of the Union;

(e) elect the Members of the Union which are to serve on the Administrative Council;

(f) revise the Convention if it considers this necessary;

(g) conclude or revise, if necessary, agreements between the Union and other international organizations, examine any provisional agreements with such organizations concluded, on behalf of the Union, by the Administrative Council, and take such measures in connection therewith as it deems appropriate;

(h) deal with such other telecommunication questions as may be necessary.

2. The plenipotentiary conference shall normally meet once every five years at a date and place fixed by the preceding plenipotentiary conference.

3. (1) The date or place of the next plenipotentiary conference may be changed:

(a) when at least twenty Members of the Union have proposed a change to the Secretary-General;

(b) on the proposal of the Administrative Council.

(2) In either case a new date or place or both shall be fixed with the concurrence of a majority of the Members of the Union.

Article 10—Administrative conferences

1. Administrative conferences of the Union shall comprise:

(a) ordinary administrative conferences;

(b) extraordinary administrative conferences;

(c) special conferences, which include regional and service conferences.

2. (1) Ordinary administrative conferences shall:

(a) revise the Regulations provided for in Article 12 paragraph 2 of this Convention with which they are respectively concerned;

(b) deal with all other matters deemed necessary within the terms of the Convention and the General Regulations and any directives given by the plenipotentiary conference.

(2) In addition, the ordinary administrative radio conference shall:

(a) elect the members of the International Frequency Registration Board;

(b) review the activities of the Board.

3. Ordinary administrative conferences shall normally meet every five years, preferably at the same time and place as the plenipotentiary conference.

4. (1) The date or place of an ordinary administrative conference may be changed:

(a) when at least twenty Members of the Union have proposed a change to the Secretary-General.

(b) on the proposal of the Administrative Council.

(2) In either case a new date or place or both shall be fixed with the concurrence of a majority of the Members of the Union.

5. (1) An extraordinary administrative conference may be convened:

(a) by a decision of the plentipotentiary conference which shall determine its agenda and the date and place of its meeting; or

(b) when at least twenty Members of the Union have made known to the Secretary-General their desire that such a conference shall be held to consider an agenda proposed by them; or

(c) on the proposal of the Administrative Council.

(2) In the cases specified b) and c) of sub-paragraph (1) above, the date and place of the conference, as well as its agenda, shall be determined with the concurrence of a majority of the Members of the Union.

6. (1) A special conference may be convened:

(a) by a decision of the plenipotentiary conference or an ordinary or extraordinary administrative conference which shall determine its agenda and the date and place at which it shall meet;

(b) when at least twenty Members of the Union in the case of a world conference, or one quarter of the Members of the region concerned in the case of a regional conference, have made known to the Secretary-General their desire that such a conference should be held to consider an agenda proposed by them;

(c) on a proposal by the Administrative Council.

(2) In the cases specified in sub-paragraps (1) b) and (1) c) above, the date and place of the conference as well as its agenda shall be determined with the concurrence of a majority of the Members of the Union for world conferences, or of a majority of the Members in the region concerned for regional conferences.

7. (1) Extraordinary administrative conferences shall be convened to consider certain specific telecommunication matters of an urgent nature. Only items included in their agenda may be discussed by such conferences.

(2) Extraordinary administrative conferences may revise certain provisions of any set of Regulations with which they are concerned, provided that the revision of such provisions is included in the agenda approved by a majority of the Members of the Union in accordance with paragraph 5 (2) above.

8. Special conferences shall only be convened to consider the matters included in their agenda. Their decisions must in all circumstances be in conformity with the terms of the Convention and Administrative Regulations.

9. Proposals for changing the date or place of extraordinary administrative conferences and of special conferences must, to be adopted, have the approval of a majority of the Members of the Union, or of a majority of the Members in the region concerned in the case of regional conferences.

Article 11—Rules of procedure of conferences

For the organization of their work and the conduct of their discussions, administrative conferences shall apply the Rules of Procedure of Conferences contained in the General Regulations annexed to the Convention. However, before starting its deliberations, each conference may adopt such additional provisions as are indispensable.

Article 12—Regulations

1. Subject to the provisions of Article 11, the General Regulations contained in Annex 5 to this Convention shall have the same force and duration as the Convention.

2. (1) The provisions of the Convention are completed by the following sets of Administrative Regulations which shall be binding on all Members and Associate Members:

Telegraph Regulations,
Telephone Regulations,
Radio Regulations,
Additional Radio Regulations.

(2) Members and Associate Members shall inform the Secretary-General of their approval of any revision of these Regulations by administrative conferences. The Secretary-General shall inform Members and Associate Members promptly regarding receipt of such notification of approval.

3. In case of inconsistency between a provision of the Convention and a provision of the Regulations, the Convention shall prevail.

Article 13—Finances of the Union

1. The expenses of the Union shall be classified as ordinary expenses and extraordinary expenses.

2. The ordinary expenses of the Union shall be kept within the limits prescribed by the Plenipotentiary Conference. They shall include, in particular, the expenses pertaining to the meetings of the Administrative Council, the salaries of the staff and other expenses of the General Secretariat, of the International Frequency Registration Board, of the International Consultative Committees, and of the laboratories and technical installations created by the Union. These ordinary expenses shall be borne by all Members and Associated Members.

3. (1) The extraordinary expenses shall include all expenses pertaining to plenipotentiary conferences, administrative conferences and meetings of the International Consultative Committees. They shall be borne by the Members and Associate Members which have agreed to participate in these conferences and meetings or which have actually participated.

(2) Recognized private operating agencies shall contribute to the expenses of the administrative conferences in which they participate or in which they have asked to participate.

(3) International organizations shall contribute to the expenses of plenipotentiary and administrative conferences to which they are admitted.

(4) Recognized private operating agencies shall contribute to the expenses of meetings of the Consultative Committees of which they are members. Similarly, international organizations and scientific or industrial organizations shall contribute to the expenses of meetings of the Consultative Committees to which they are admitted to participate.

(5) Nevertheless the Administrative Council may exempt international organizations from any participation in extraordinary expenses, on condition of reciprocity.

(6) Expenses incurred by laboratories and technical installations of the Union, in measurements, testing, or special research for individual Members or Associate Members, groups of Members or Associate Members, or regional organizations or others, shall be borne by those Members or Associate Members, groups, organizations or others.

4. The scale of contributions to the expenses of the Union shall be as follows:

30-units	class	8-units	class
25-units	"	5-units	"
20-units	"	4-units	"
18-units	"	3-units	"
15-units	"	2-units	"
13-units	"	1-unit	"
10-units	"	½-unit	"

5. Members and Associate Members, recognized private operating agencies, international organizations and scientific or industrial organizations shall be free to choose the class in which they will share in defraying the expenses of the Union.

6. (1) Each Member and Associate Member shall inform the Secretary-General, before the Convention enters into force, of the class it has chosen.

(2) This decision shall be notified to Members and Associate Members by the Secretary-General.

(3) Members and Associate Members may at any time choose a class higher than the one already adopted by them.

(4) Any application submitted after the date of entry into force of the Convention and entailing a reduction in the number of contributory units of a Member or Associate Member shall be referred to the following plenipotentiary conference and shall take effect from a date to be determined by that conference.

7. The sale price of documents sold to administrations, recognized private operating agencies or individuals shall be fixed by the Secretary-General, in collaboration with the Administrative Council, bearing in mind the fact that the cost of publication must be covered by the sale of the documents.

8. Members and Associate Members shall pay in advance their annual contributory shares calculated on the basis of the estimated expenditure of the Union for the following financial year.

9. The amounts due shall bear interest from the beginning of each financial year of the Union with regard to ordinary expenses and from thirty days after the date on which accounts for extraordinary expenses are sent to Members and Associate Members. This interest shall be at the rate of 3% (three per cent.) per annum during the first six months and at the rate of 6% (six per cent.) per annum from the beginning of the seventh month.

Article 14—Languages

1. (1) The official languages of the Union shall be Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish.

(2) The working languages of the Union shall be English, French and Spanish.

(3) In case of dispute, the French text shall be authentic.

2. (1) The final documents of the plenipotentiary and administrative conferences, as well as their final acts, protocols and resolutions shall be drawn up in the official languages of the Union in versions equivalent in form and content.

(2) All other documents of these conferences shall be issued in the working languages of the Union.

3. (1) The official service documents of the Union as prescribed by the Administrative Regulations shall be published in the five official languages.

(2) All other documents for general distribution prepared by the Secretary-General in the course of his duties shall be drawn up in the three working languages.

4. Any of the documents referred to in paragraphs 2 and 3 above may be published in languages other than those there specified, provided that the Members or Associate Members requesting such publication undertake to defray the whole of the cost of translation and publication involved.

5. At conferences of the Union and whenever it is necessary at meetings of its permanent organs, the debates shall be conducted with the aid of an efficient system of reciprocal interpretation between the three working languages.

6. (1) At conferences of the Union and at meetings of its permanent organs, languages other than the three working languages may be used:

(a) if an application is made to the Secretary-General or to the Head of the Permanent organ concerned to provide for the use of an additional language or languages, oral or written, provided that the additional cost so incurred shall be borne by those

Members or Associate Members which have made or supported the application;

(b) if any delegation itself makes arrangements at its own expense for oral translation from its own language into any one of the three working languages.

(2) In the case provided for in paragraph 6 (1) a) above, the Secretary-General or the Head of the permanent organ concerned shall comply to the extent practicable with the application, having first obtained from the Members or Associate Members concerned an undertaking that the cost incurred will be duly repaid by them to the Union;

(3) In the case provided for in paragraph 6 (1) b) above, the delegation concerned may, furthermore, if it wishes, arrange at its own expense for oral interpretation into its own language from one of the three working languages.

CHAPTER II—APPLICATION OF THE CONVENTION AND REGULATIONS

Article 15—Ratification of the Convention

1. This Convention shall be ratified by each of the signatory Governments. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited, in as short a time as possible, with the Secretary-General by diplomatic channel through the intermediary of the Government of the country of the seat of the Union. The Secretary-General shall notify the Members and Associate Members of each deposit of ratification.

2. (1) During a period of two years from the date of entry into force of this Convention, a signatory Government, even though it may not have deposited an instrument of ratification in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article, shall enjoy the rights conferred on Members of the Union in paragraph 3 of Article 1 of this Convention.

(2) After the end of a period of two years from the date of entry into force of this Convention, a signatory Government which has not deposited an instrument of ratification in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 above, shall not be entitled to vote at any conference of the Union or at any meeting of any of its permanent organs until it has so deposited such an instrument.

3. After the entry into force of this Convention in accordance with Article 50, each instrument of ratification shall become effective on the date of its deposit with the General Secretariat.

4. If one or more of the signatory Governments do not ratify the Convention, it shall not thereby be less valid for the Governments which have ratified it.

Article 16—Accession to the Convention

1. The Government of a country, not a signatory of this Convention, may accede thereto at any time subject to the provisions of Article 1.

2. The instrument of accession shall be deposited with the Secretary-General by diplomatic channel through the intermediary of the Government of the country of the seat of the Union. Unless otherwise specified therein, it shall become effective upon the date of its deposit. The Secretary-General shall notify the Members and Associate Members of each accession when it is received and shall forward to each of them a certified copy of the act of accession.

Article 17—Application of the Convention to countries or territories for whose foreign relations Members of the Union are responsible

1. Members of the Union may declare at any time that their acceptance of this Convention applies to all or a group or a single one of the countries or territories for whose foreign relations they are responsible.

2. A declaration made in accordance with paragraph 1 of this Article shall be communicated to the Secretary-General of the Union. The Secretary-General shall notify the Members and Associate Members of each such declaration.

3. The provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article shall not be deemed to be obligatory in respect of any country, territory, or group of territories listed in Annex 1 of this Convention.

Article 18—Application of the Convention to trust territories of the United Nations

The United Nations shall have the right to accede to this Convention on behalf of any territory or group of territories placed under its administration in accordance with a trusteeship agreement as provided for in Article 75 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Article 19—Execution of the Convention and Regulations

1. The Members and Associate Members are bound to abide by the provisions of this Convention and the Regulations annexed thereto in all telecommunication offices and stations established or operated by them which engage in international services or which are capable of causing harmful interference to radio services of other countries, except in regard to services exempted from these obligations in accordance with the provisions of Article 48 of this Convention.

2. They are also bound, in addition, to take the necessary steps to impose the observance of the provisions of this Convention and of the Regulations annexed thereto upon recognized private operating agencies and upon other agencies authorized to establish and operate telecommunication which engage in international services or which operate stations capable of causing harmful interference to the radio services of other countries.

Article 20—Denunciation of the Convention

1. Each Member and Associate Member which has ratified, or acceded to, this Convention shall have the right to denounce it by a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the Union by diplomatic channel through the intermediary of the Government of the country of the seat of the Union. The Secretary-General shall advise the other Members and Associate Members thereof.

2. This denunciation shall take effect at the expiration of a period of one year from the day of the receipt of notification of it by the Secretary-General.

Article 21—Denunciation of the Convention on behalf of countries or territories for whose foreign relations Members of the Union are responsible

1. The application of this Convention to a country, territory or group of territories in accordance with Article 17 may be terminated at any time, and such country, territory or group of territories, if it is an Associate Member, ceases upon termination to be such.

2. The declarations of denunciation contemplated in the above paragraph shall be notified in conformity with the conditions set out in paragraph 1 of Article 20; they shall take effect in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of that article.

Article 22—Abrogation of the earlier Convention

This Convention shall abrogate and replace, in relations between the Contracting Governments, the International Telecommunication Convention of Atlantic City (1947).

Article 23—Validity of Administrative Regulations in force

The Administrative Regulations referred to in Article 12, paragraph 2, shall be regarded as annexed to this Convention and shall remain valid until the time of entry into force of new Regulations drawn up by the competent ordinary, and where the case arises, extraordinary administrative conferences.

Article 24—Relations with non-contracting States

Each Member and Associate Member reserves to itself and to the recognized private operating agencies the right to fix the conditions under which it admits telecommunications exchange with a State which is not a party to this Convention.

If a telecommunication originating in the territory of such a non-contracting State is accepted by a Member or Associate Member, it must be transmitted and, in so far as it follows the telecommunication channels of a Member or Associate Member, the obligatory provisions of the Convention and Regulations and the usual charges shall apply to it.

Article 25—Settlement of differences

1. Members and Associate Members may settle their differences on questions relating to the application of this Convention or of the Regulations contemplated in Article 12, through diplomatic channels, or according to procedures established by bilateral or multilateral treaties concluded between them for the settlement of international disputes, or by any other method mutually agreed upon.

2. If none of these methods of settlement is adopted, any Member or Associate Member party to a dispute may submit the dispute to arbitration in accordance with the procedure defined in Annex 4.

CHAPTER III—RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED NATIONS AND WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Article 26—Relations with the United Nations

1. The relationship between the United Nations and the International Telecommunication Union is defined in the agreement, the text of which appears in Annex 6 of this Convention.

2. In accordance with the provisions of Article XVI of the above-mentioned agreement, the telecommunication operating services of the United Nations shall be entitled to the rights and bound by the obligations of this Convention and of the Regulations annexed thereto. Accordingly, they shall be entitled to attend all conferences of the Union, including meetings of the International Consultative Committees, in a consultative capacity. They shall not be eligible for election to any organ of the Union, the Members of which are elected by a plenipotentiary or administrative conference.

Article 27—Relations with international organizations

In furtherance of complete international coordination on matters affecting telecommunication, the Union will cooperate with international organizations having related interests and activities.

CHAPTER IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO TELECOMMUNICATION

Article 28—The right of the public to use the international telecommunication service

Members and Associate Members recognize the right of the public to correspond by means of the international service of public correspondence. The service, the charges, and the safeguards shall be the same for all private users in each category of correspondence without any priority or preference.

Article 29—Stoppage of telecommunications

1. Members and Associate Members reserve the right to stop the transmission of any private telegram which may appear dangerous to the security of the state or contrary to their laws, to public order or to decency, provided that they immediately notify the

office of origin of the stoppage of any such telegram or any part thereof, except when such notification may appear dangerous to the security of the state.

2. Members and Associate Members also reserve the right to cut off any private telephone or telegraph communication which may appear dangerous to the security of the state or contrary to their laws, to public order or to decency.

Article 30—Suspension of services

Each Member or Associate Member reserves the right to suspend the international telecommunication service for an indefinite time, either generally or only for certain relations and/or for certain kinds of correspondence, outgoing, incoming, or in transit, provided that it immediately notifies such action to each of the other Members and Associate Members through the medium of the General Secretariat.

Article 31—Responsibility

Members and Associate Members accept no responsibility towards users of the international telecommunication services, particularly as regards claims for damages.

Article 32—Secrecy of telecommunication

1. Members and Associate Members agree to take all possible measures, compatible with the system of telecommunication used, with a view to ensuring the secrecy of international correspondence.

2. Nevertheless, they reserve the right to communicate such correspondence to the competent authorities in order to ensure the application of their internal laws or the execution of international conventions to which they are parties.

Article 33—Establishment, operation, and protection of telecommunication installations and channels

1. Members and Associate Members shall take such steps as may be necessary to ensure the establishment, under the best technical conditions, of the channels and installations necessary to carry on the rapid and uninterrupted exchange of international telecommunications.

2. So far as possible, these channels and installations must be operated by the best methods and procedures developed as a result of practical operating experience, maintained in proper operating condition and keep abreast of scientific and technical progress.

3. Members and Associate Members shall safeguard these channels and installations within their jurisdiction.

4. Unless other conditions are laid down by special arrangements, each Member and Associate Member shall take such steps as may be necessary to ensure maintenance of those sections of international telecommunication circuits within its control.

Article 34—Notification of infringements

In order to facilitate the application of the provisions of Article 19, Members and Associate Members undertake to inform each other of infringements of the provisions of this Convention and of the Regulations annexed thereto.

Article 35—Charges and free services

The provisions regarding charges for telecommunication and the various cases in which free services are accorded are set forth in the Regulations annexed to this Convention.

Article 36—Priority of telecommunications concerning safety of life

The international telegraph and telephone services must accord absolute priority to telecommunications concerning safety of life at sea, on land, or in the air, and to epidemiological telecommunications of exceptional urgency of the World Health Organizations.

Article 37—Priority of Government telegrams and telephone calls

Subject to the provisions of Articles 36 and 46, Government telegrams shall enjoy priority over other telegrams when priority is requested for them by the sender. Government telephone calls may also be accorded priority, upon specific request and to the extent practicable, over other telephone calls.

Article 38—Secret language

1. Government telegrams and service telegrams may be expressed in secret language in all relations.

2. Private telegrams in secret language may be admitted between all countries with the exception of those which have previously notified, through the medium of the General Secretariat, that they do not admit this language for those categories of correspondence.

3. Members and Associate Members which do not admit private telegrams in secret language originating in or destined for their own territory must let them pass in transit, except in the case of suspension of service provided for in Article 30.

Article 39—Rendering and settlements of accounts

1. Administrations of Members and Associate Members and recognized private operating agencies which operate international telecommunication services, shall come to an agreement with regard to the amount of their credits and debits.

2. The statements of accounts in respect to debits and credits referred to in the preceding paragraph shall be drawn up in accordance with the provisions of the Regulations annexed to this Convention, unless special arrangements have been concluded between the parties concerned.

3. The settlement of international accounts shall be regarded as current transactions and shall be effected in accordance with the current international obligations of the countries concerned, in those cases where their governments have concluded arrangements on this subject. Where no such arrangements have been concluded, and in the absence of special arrangements made under Article 41 of this Convention, these settlements shall be effected in accordance with the Regulations.

Article 40—Monetary unit

The monetary unit used in the composition of the tariffs of the international telecommunication services and in the establishment of the international accounts shall be the gold franc of 100 centimes, of a weight of 10/31 of a gramme and of a fitness of 0.900.

Article 41—Special arrangements

Members and Associate Members reserve for themselves, for the private operating agencies recognized by them and for other agencies duly authorized to do so, the right to make special arrangements on telecommunication matters which do not concern Members and Associate Members in general. Such arrangements, however, shall not be in conflict with the terms of this Convention or of the Regulations annexed thereto, so far as concerns the harmful interference which their operation might be likely to cause to the radio services of other countries.

Article 42—Regional conferences, agreements and organizations

Members and Associate Members reserve the right to convene regional conferences, to conclude regional agreements and to form regional organizations, for the purpose of settling telecommunication questions which are susceptible of being treated on a regional basis. However, such agreements must not be in conflict with the Convention.

CHAPTER V—SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR RADIO

Article 43—Rational use of frequencies and spectrum space

Members and Associate Members recognize that it is desirable to limit the number of frequencies and the spectrum space used to the minimum essential to provide in a satisfactory manner the necessary services.

Article 44—Intercommunication

1. Stations performing radiocommunication in the mobile service shall be bound, within the limits of their normal employment, to exchange radiocommunications reciprocally without distinction as to the radio system adopted by them.

2. Nevertheless, in order not to impede scientific progress, the provisions of the preceding paragraph shall not prevent the use of a radio system incapable of communicating with other systems, provided that such incapacity is due to the specific nature of such system and is not the result of devices adopted solely with the object of preventing intercommunication.

Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 1, a station may be assigned to a restricted international service of telecommunication, determined by the purpose of such telecommunication, or by other circumstances independent of the system used.

Article 45—Harmful interference

1. All stations, whatever their purpose, must be established and operated in such manner as not to result in harmful interference to the radio services or communications of other Members or Associate Members or of recognized private operating agencies, or of other duly authorized operating agencies which carry on radio service, and which operate in accordance with the provisions of the Radio Regulations.

2. Each Member or Associate Member undertakes to require the private operating agencies which it recognizes and the other operating agencies duly authorized for this purpose, to observe the provisions of the preceding paragraph.

3. Further, the Members and Associate Members recognize the desirability of taking all practicable steps to prevent the operation of electrical apparatus and installations of all kinds from causing harmful interference to the radio services or communications mentioned in paragraph 1 of this article.

Article 46—Distress calls and messages

Radio stations shall be obliged to accept, with absolute priority, distress calls and messages regardless of their origin, to reply in the same manner to such messages, and immediately to take such action in regard thereto as may be required.

Article 47—False or deceptive distress or safety signals, irregular use of call signs

Members and Associate Members agree to take the steps required to prevent the transmission or circulation of false or deceptive distress or safety signals and the use, by a station, of call signs which have not been regularly assigned to it.

Article 48—Installations for national defence services

1. Members and Associate Members retain their entire freedom with regard to military radio installations of their army, naval, and air force.

2. Nevertheless, these installations must, so far as possible, observe regulatory provisions relative to giving assistance in case of distress and to the measures to be taken to prevent harmful interference, and the provisions of the Regulations concerning the types of emission and the frequencies to be used, according to the nature of the services performed by such installations.

3. Moreover, when these installations take part in the service of public correspondence or other services governed by the Regulations

annexed to this Convention, they must, in general, comply with the regulatory provisions for the conduct of such services.

CHAPTER VI—DEFINITIONS

Article 49—Definitions

In this Convention, unless the context otherwise requires,

(a) the terms which are defined in Annex 3 of this Convention shall have the meanings therein assigned to them;

(b) other terms which are defined in the Regulations referred to in Article 12 shall have the meanings therein assigned to them.

CHAPTER VII—FINAL PROVISIONS

Article 50—Effective date of the Convention

The present Convention shall enter into force on January First, 1954 between countries, territories or groups of territories, in respect of which instruments of ratification or accession have been deposited before that date.

In witness whereof, the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the Convention in each of the Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish languages, in a single copy, in which in case of dispute, the French text shall be authentic, and which shall remain deposited in the archives of the Government of the Argentine Republic and one copy of which shall be forwarded to each signatory Government.

Done at Buenos Aires, 22 December, 1952.

[There follow the signatures for the following countries, territories, and groups of territories: Afghanistan, People's Republic of Albania, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Argentine Republic, Commonwealth of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Bolivia, Brazil, People's Republic Bulgaria, Kingdom of Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Vatican City State, Republic of Colombia, Belgian Congo and Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, Republic of Korea, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Spain, United States of America, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Hungarian People's Republic, India, Republic of Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Iceland, State of Israel, Italy, Japan, Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Kingdom of Laos, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Nicaragua, Norway, New Zealand, Pakistan, Paraguay, Netherlands, Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, New Guinea, Peru, Republic of the Philippines, People's Republic of Poland, Portugal, French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia, Federal German Republic, Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, Urkainian Soviet Socialist Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sweden, Swiss Confederation, Syrian Republic, Overseas Territories of the French Republic and Territories administered as such, Portuguese Oversea Territories, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa and Territory of South-West Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Oriental Republic of Uruguay, United States of Venezuela, State of Viet-Nam, Spanish Zone of Morocco and the totality of Spanish Possessions.]

ANNEX 1

(See Article 1, paragraph 2 a))

Afghanistan, Albania (People's Republic of), Saudi Arabia (Kingdom of), Argentine Republic, Australia (Commonwealth of), Austria, Belgium, The Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Burma, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria (People's Republic of), Cambodia (Kingdom of), Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Vatican City State, Colombia (Republic of), Colonies, Protectorates, Overseas Territories and Territories under Mandate or Trusteeship of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Belgian Congo and Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, Korea (Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador (Republic of), Ecuador, Spain, United States of America, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti (Republic of), Honduras (Republic of), Hungarian People's Republic, India (Republic of), Indonesia (Republic of), Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Iceland, Israel (State of), Italy, Japan, Jordan (Hashemite Kingdom of), Laos (Kingdom of), Lebanon, Liberia, Libya (United Kingdom of), Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Nicaragua, Norway, New Zealand, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Netherlands, Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, New Guinea, Peru, Philippines (Republic of the), Poland (People's Republic of), Portugal, French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia, Federal German Republic, Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Southern Rhodesia, Roumanian People's Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sweden, Switzerland (Confederation), Syrian Republic, Czechoslovakia, Territories of the United States of America, Overseas Territories of the French Republic and Territories administered as such, Portuguese Oversea Territories, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa and Territory of South-West Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay (Oriental Republic of), Venezuela (United States of), Viet-Nam (State of), Yemen, Spanish Zone of Morocco and the totality of Spanish Possessions.

ANNEX 2

(See Article 1, paragraph 4 a))

British West Africa, British East Africa.

ANNEX 3

(See Article 49)

DEFINITION OF TERMS USED IN THE INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION CONVENTION AND ITS ANNEXES

Administration: Any governmental department or service responsible for implementing the obligations undertaken in the International Telecommunication Convention and the Regulations annexed thereto.

Private operating agency: Any individual or company or corporation, other than a governmental establishment or agency, which operates a telecommunication installation intended for an international telecommunication service or which is capable of causing harmful interference with such a service.

Recognized private operating agency: Any private operating agency, as defined above, which operates a service of public correspondence or of broadcasting and upon which the obligations provided for in Article 19 are imposed by the Member or Associate Member in whose territory the head office of the agency is situated.

Delegate: A person sent by the government of a Member or Associate Member of the Union to a Plenipotentiary Conference, or a person representing a government or an administration of a Member or Associate Member of the Union at an Administrative Conference, or at a meeting of an International Consultative Committee.

Representative: A person sent by a recognized private operating agency to an Administrative Conference, or to a meeting of an International Consultative Committee.

Expert: A person sent by a national scientific or industrial organization authorized by the government or the administration of its country to attend meetings of study groups of an International Consultative Committee.

Observer: A person sent by:

the United Nations in accordance with Article 26 of the Convention;

the Government of a country not a party to the Convention;

one of the international organizations invited or admitted in accordance with the provisions of the General Regulations to participate in the work of a Conference;

the Government of a Member or Associate Member of the Union participating in a nonvoting capacity in a special conference of a regional character held under the terms of Article 10 of the Convention.

Delegation: The totality of the delegates and, should the case arise, any representative, attachés or interpreters sent by the same country.

Each Member and Associate Member shall be free to make up its delegation as it wishes. In particular it may include in its delegation in the capacity of delegates or advisers, persons belonging to private operating agencies which it recognizes or persons belonging to other private enterprises interested in the field of telecommunication.

International Service: A telecommunication service between any combination of offices or fixed, land or mobile stations which are in different countries or are subject to different countries.

Mobile Service: A service of radiocommunication between mobile and land stations, or between mobile stations.

Broadcasting Service: A radiocommunication service of transmissions to be received directly by the general public. This service may include transmissions of sounds, or transmissions by television, facsimile or other means.

Telecommunication: Any transmission, emission or reception of signs, signals, writing, images and sounds or intelligence of any nature by wire, radio, visual or other electromagnetic systems.

Telegraphy: A system of telecommunication for the transmission of written matter by the use of a signal code.

Telephony: A system of telecommunication set up for the transmission of speech or, in some cases, other sounds.

Telegram: Written matter intended to be transmitted by telegraphy. This term also includes radiotelegram unless otherwise specified.

Government Telegrams and Government Telephone Calls: These are telegrams or telephone calls originating with any of the authorities specified below:

the Head of a State;

the Head of a Government and members of a Government;

the Head of a colony, protectorate, overseas territory or territory under suzerainty, authority, trusteeship or mandate of a Member or Associate Member or of the United Nations;

Commanders-in-Chief of military forces, land, sea or air;

diplomatic or consular agents;

the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Heads of the principal organs and the Heads of the subsidiary organs of the United Nations;

the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

Replies to Government telegrams as defined herein shall also be regarded as Government telegrams.

Service Telegrams: See the Telegraph Regulations currently in force.

Private Telegrams: Telegrams other than service or Government telegrams.

Service Telephone Calls: See the Telephone Regulations currently in force.

Public Correspondence: Any telecommunication which the offices and stations, must, by reason of their being at the disposal of the public, accept for transmission.

Radiocommunication: Any telecommunication by means of Hertzian waves.

Hertzian waves: Electromagnetic waves of frequencies between 10 kc/s and 3,000,000 Mc/s.

Radio: A general term applied to the use of Hertzian waves.

Harmful Interference: Any radiation or any induction which endangers the functioning of a radionavigation service or of a

safety service,[1] or obstructs or repeatedly interrupts a radio service operating in accordance with the Radio Regulations.

ANNEX 4

(See Article 25)

ARBITRATION

1. The party which appeals to arbitration shall initiate the arbitration procedure by transmitting to the other party to the dispute a notice of the submission of the dispute to arbitration.

2. The parties shall decide by agreement whether the arbitration is to be entrusted to individuals, administrations or governments. If within one month after notice of submission of the dispute to arbitration, the parties have been unable to agree upon this point, the arbitration shall be entrusted to governments.

3. If arbitration is to be entrusted to individuals, the arbitrators must neither be nationals of the parties involved in the dispute, nor have their domicile in the countries parties to the dispute, nor be employed in their service.

4. If arbitration is to be entrusted to governments, or to administrations thereof, these must be chosen from among the Members or Associate Members which are not parties to the dispute, but which are parties to the agreement, the application of which caused the dispute.

5. Within three months from the date of receipt of the notification of the submission of the dispute to arbitration, each of the two parties to the dispute shall appoint an arbitrator.

6. If more than two parties are involved in the dispute, an arbitrator shall be appointed in accordance with the procedure set forth in paragraphs 4 and 5 above, by each of the two groups of parties having a common position in the dispute.

7. The two arbitrators thus appointed shall choose a third arbitrator who, if the first two arbitrators are individuals and not governments or administrations, must fulfill the conditions indicated in paragraph 3 above, and in addition must not be of the same nationality as either of the other two arbitrators. Failing an agreement between the two arbitrators as to the choice of a third arbitrator, each of these two arbitrators shall nominate a third arbitrator who is in no way concerned in the dispute. The Secretary-General of the Union shall then draw lots in order to select the third arbitrator.

8. The parties to the dispute may agree to have their dispute settled by a single arbitrator appointed by agreement; or alternatively each party may nominate an arbitrator, and request the Secretary-General of the Union to draw lots to decide which of the persons so nominated is to act as the single arbitrator.

9. The arbitrator or arbitrators shall be free to decide upon the procedure to be followed.

10. The decision of the single arbitrator shall be final and binding upon the parties to the dispute. If the arbitration is entrusted to more than one arbitrator, the decision made by the majority vote of the arbitrators shall be final and binding upon the parties.

11. Each party shall bear the expense it shall have incurred in the investigation and presentation of the arbitration. The costs of arbitration other than those incurred by the parties themselves shall be divided equally between the parties to the dispute.

12. The Union shall furnish all information relating to the dispute which the arbitrator or arbitrators may need.

[1] Any radio service, the operation of which is directly related, whether permanently or temporarily, to the safety of human life and the safeguarding of property, shall be considered as a safety service.

ANNEX 5

GENERAL REGULATIONS ANNEXED TO THE INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION CONVENTION

Part I—General provisions regarding Conference

Chapter 1—Invitation and Admission to Plenipotentiary Conference

1. The inviting government, in agreement with the Administrative Council, shall fix the definitive date and the exact place of the Conference.

2. (1) One year before this date, the inviting government shall send an invitation to the government of each country Member of the Union and to each Associate Member of the Union.

(2) These invitations may be sent directly or through the Secretary-General or through another government.

3. The Secretary-General shall send an invitation to the United Nations in accordance with Article 26 of the Convention.

4. The inviting government, in agreement with or on a proposal by the Administrative Council, may invite such specialized agencies in relationship with the United Nations as grant to the Union reciprocal representation at their conferences, to send observers to take part in the conference in an advisory capacity.

5. The inviting government, in agreement with or on a proposal by the Administrative Council, may invite non-contracting governments to send observers to take part in the conference in an advisory capacity.

6. The replies of the Members and Associate Members must reach the inviting government not later than one month before the date of opening of the conference, and should include whenever possible full information on the composition of the delegation.

7. Any permanent organ of the Union shall be entitled to be represented at the conference in an advisory capacity when the conference is discussing matters coming within its competence. In case of need, the conference may invite an organ which has not considered it necessary to be represented.

8. The following shall be admitted to plenipotentiary conferences:

(a) delegations as defined in Annex 3 to the Convention;

(b) observers of the United Nations;

(c) observers of the specialized agencies in conformity with paragraph 4 above;

(d) according to circumstances, observers referred to in paragraph 5 above.

Chapter 2—Invitation and Admission to Administrative Conferences

1. (1) The provisions of paragraphs 1 and 6 of Chapter 1 above shall be applicable to administrative conferences.

(2) However, as regards extraordinary administrative conferences, the time-limit for the despatch of invitations may be reduced to six months.

(3) Members and Associate Members of the Union may inform the private operating agencies recognized by them of the invitation they have received.

2. (1) The inviting government, in agreement with or on a proposal by the Administrative Council, may notify the international organizations which are interested in sending observers to participate in the work of the conference in an advisory capacity.

(2) The interested international organizations shall make applications for admission to the inviting government within a period of two months from the date of the notification.

(3) The inviting government shall assemble the requests and the conference itself shall decide whether the organizations concerned are to be admitted or not.

3. (1) The following shall be admitted to administrative conferences:

(a) delegations as defined in Annex 3 to the Convention;

(b) observers of the United Nations;

(c) observers of the specialized agencies in conformity with Chapter 1 paragraph 4;

(d) observers from international organizations admitted in accordance with paragraph 2;

(e) accordance to circumstances, observers from non-contracting governments;

(f) representatives of recognized private operating agencies, duly authorized by the Member-country to which they belong;

(g) permanent organs of the Union, subject to the conditions set forth in Chapter 1 paragraph 7.

(2) Moreover, observers from Members and Associate Members which do not belong to the region concerned shall be admitted to special conferences of a regional character.

Chapter 3—Time-Limits for Presentation of Proposals to Conferences and Conditions of Submission

1. Immediately after the inviting government has despatched invitations, the Secretary-General shall ask Members and Associate Members to send him, within four months, their proposals for the work of the conference.

2. All proposals submitted, the adoption of which will involve revision of the text of the Convention or Regulations, must carry references identifying by chapter, article or paragraph number those parts of the text which will require such revision.

3. The Secretary-General shall assemble and coordinate the proposals received, and shall communicate them, at least three months before the opening of the conference, to all Members and Associate Members.

Chapter 4—Special Provisions for Conferences Meeting at the Seat of the Union

1. When a conference is to be held without an inviting government, the Secretary-General shall take the necessary steps to convene it at the seat of the Union, after agreement with the Government of the Swiss Confederation.

2. In such cases, the Secretary-General shall himself perform the tasks of organization normally incumbent upon the inviting government.

Chapter 5—Credentials for Conferences

1. (1) Delegations sent by Members of the Union to take part in a conference must be duly accredited to exercise their right to vote and must be furnished with the necessary powers for the signing of the Final Acts.

(2) Delegations sent by Associate Members of the Union to take part in the conference must be duly accredited to participate therein in accordance with Article 1, paragraph 6 of the Convention.

2. For plenipotentiary conferences:

(1) (a) delegations shall be accredited by instruments signed by the Head of State or by the Head of the Government or by the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

(b) However, they may be provisionally accredited by the Head of the diplomatic mission accredited to the government of the country in which the conference is held.

(2) In order to sign the Final Acts of the conference, delegations must be furnished with full powers signed by the authorities mentioned in sub-paragraph (1) (a) above.

3. For administrative conferences:

(1) the provisions of paragraph 2 above are applicable.

(2) In addition, a delegation may be accredited and furnished with full powers signed by the Minister responsible for the matters dealt with at the conference.

4. A special committee shall be entrusted with the verification of the credentials of each delegation; this committee shall reach its conclusions within the period specified by the Plenary Assembly.

5. (1) The delegation of a Member of the Union shall exercise its right to vote from the moment when it begins to take part in the work of the conference.

(2) However, a delegation shall no longer have the right to vote from the time that the Plenary Assembly decides that its credentials are not in order until this state of affairs has been rectified.

6. As a general rule, Member countries should endeavour to send their own delegations to the conferences of the Union. Nevertheless, if, for exceptional reasons, a Member is unable to send its own delegation it may accredit the delegation of another Member of the Union and give this delegation powers to act and sign on its behalf.

7. A duly accredited delegation may give a mandate to another duly accredited delegation to exercise its vote at one or more sessions at which it is unable to be present. In this case it must notify the Chairman of the conference.

8. A delegation may not exercise more than one proxy vote in any of the cases referred to in paragraphs 6 and 7 above.

Chapter 6—Procedure for Calling Extraordinary Administrative Conferences at the Request of Members of the Union or on a Proposal of the Administrative Council

1. Any Member of the Union wishing to have an extraordinary administrative conference convened shall so inform the Secretary-General, indicating the proposed agenda, place and date of the conference.

2. On receipt of twenty similar requests, the Secretary-General shall inform all Members and Associate Members thereof by telegram, asking the Members to indicate, within six weeks, whether or not they agree to the proposal.

3. If a majority of the Members agree to the proposal as a whole, that is to say, if they accept the agenda, date and place of the proposed meeting, the Secretary-General shall so inform the Members and Associate Members of the Union by circular telegram.

4. (1) If the proposal accepted is for a conference elsewhere than at the seat of the Union, the Secretary-General shall ask the government of the country concerned whether it agrees to act as inviting government.

(2) If the answer is in the affirmative, the Secretary-General, with the assent of the government concerned, shall take the necessary steps to convene the conference.

(3) If the answer is in the negative, the Secretary-General shall request the Members desiring the conference to make alternative suggestions for the place of the conference.

5. Where the proposal accepted is for a conference at the seat of the Union, the provisions of Chapter 4 shall apply.

6. (1) If the proposal as a whole (agenda, time, and place) is not accepted by a majority of the Members, the Secretary-General shall inform the Members and Associate Members of the Union of the replies received, requesting the Members to give a final reply on the point or points under dispute.

(2) Such points shall be regarded as adopted when they have been approved by a majority of the Members.

7. The procedure indicated above shall be applicable when the proposal to convene an extraordinary administrative conference is initiated by the Administrative Council.

Chapter 7—Procedure for Convening Special Administrative Conferences at the Request of Members of the Union or on a Proposal by the Administrative Council

1. The provisions of Chapter 6 shall be applicable in their entirety to special conferences of a world-wide character.

2. In the case of a special conference of a regional character, the procedure described in Chapter 6 shall be applicable only to the Members of the region concerned. If the conference is to be convened on the initiative of the Members of the region, it will suffice for the Secretary-General to receive concordant requests from a quarter of the total number of Members in that Region.

Chapter 8—Provisions Common to All Conferences—Change in the Time or Place of a Conference

1. The provisions of Chapters 6 and 7 above shall apply, by analogy, when a change in the time or place of a conference is requested by Members of the Union or is proposed by the Administrative Council. However, such changes shall only be made if a majority of the Members concerned have pronounced in favour.

2. Where the issue arises, the Secretary-General shall indicate, in the communication referred to in Chapter 6, paragraph 2 the probable financial consequences of a change in the time or place, as, for example, when there has been an outlay of expenditure in preparing for the Conference at the place initially chosen.

Chapter 9—Rules of Procedure of Conferences

Rule 1—Inauguration of the Conference

The conference shall be opened by a person appointed by the inviting government. When there is no inviting government, it shall be opened by the Chairman of the Administrative Council or in his absence by the Secretary-General.

Rule 2—Order of seating

At meetings of the Plenary Assembly, delegations shall be seated in the alphabetical order of the French names of the countries represented.

Rule 3—Election of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman; Constitution of the Secretariat

At the first meeting of the Plenary Assembly:

(a) The Chairman and Vice-Chairmen of the conference shall be elected;

(b) the Conference Secretariat, made up of staff of the General Secretariat of the Union, and, in case of need, of staff provided by the administration of the inviting government, shall be constituted.

Rule 4—Powers of the Chairman of the Conference

1. The Chairman, in addition to performing any other duties incumbent on him under these Rules of Procedure, shall open and close the meetings of the Plenary Assembly, direct its deliberations, ensure that the Rules of Procedure are applied, give the floor to speakers, put questions to the vote, and announce the decisions adopted.

2. He shall have the general direction of all the work of the conference, and shall ensure that order is maintained at meetings of the Plenary Assembly. He shall give his ruling on motions of order and points of order, and in particular, he shall be empowered to propose that discussion on a question be postponed or closed, or that a meeting be suspended or adjourned. He may also decide to postpone the convening of a Plenary Assembly or meeting thereof should he consider it necessary.

3. It shall be the duty of the Chairman to protect the right of each delegation to express its opinion freely and fully on the point at issue.

4. He shall ensure that discussion is limited to the point at issue, and he may interrupt any speaker who departs therefrom and request him to confine his remarks to the subject under discussion.

Rule 5—Appointment of committees

The Plenary Assembly may appoint committees to consider matters referred to the conference. These committees may in turn appoint sub-committees. Committees and sub-committees may, if necessary, form working groups.

Rule 6—Composition of committees

1. Plenipotentiary Conference: Committees shall be composed of the delegates of Members and Associate Members and the observers referred to in Chapter 1 paragraph 8 of the General Regulations, who have so requested or who have been designated by the Plenary Assembly.

2. Administrative Conferences: Committees shall be composed of the delegates of Members and Associate Members, and the observers and representatives referred to in Chapter 2 paragraph 3 of the General Regulations, who have so requested or who have been designated by the Plenary Assembly.

Rule 7—Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen, and reporters of committees

1. The Chairmen of the conference shall submit for the approval of the Plenary Assembly the choice of the Chairmen, and of the Vice-Chairmen or Vice-Chairmen of each committee.

2. The Chairman of each committee shall propose to his committee the nomination of the reporters and the choice of the chairmen, vice-chairmen, and reporters of the sub-committees which may be set up.

Rule 8—Summons to meetings

Meetings of the Plenary Assembly, committees, sub-committees and working groups shall be announced in good time in the meeting place of the conference.

Rule 9—Proposals presented before the opening of the Conference

Proposals presented before the opening of the conference shall be allocated by the Plenary Assembly to the appropriate committees appointed in accordance with Rule 5 of these Rules of Procedure. Nevertheless the Plenary Assembly itself shall be entitled to deal directly with any proposal.

Rule 10—Proposals or amendments presented during the Conference

1. Proposals or amendments presented after the opening of the conference must be delivered to the Chairman of the conference, or to the Chairman of the appropriate committee, as the case may be. They may also be handed to the secretariat of the conference for publication and distribution as conference documents.

2. No proposal or amendment may be presented unless signed or approved by the head of the delegation concerned or by his deputy.

3. Every proposal or amendment shall give, in precise and exact terms, the text to be considered.

4. (1) The Chairman of the conference or the Chairman of the appropriate committee shall decide in each case whether a proposal or amendment shall be presented to delegations in writing or orally.

(2) In general, the texts of all major proposals to be put to the vote at a meeting of the Plenary Assembly shall be distributed, in good time, in the working languages of the Conference, in order that they may be studied before discussion.

(3) In addition, the Chairman of the conference on receiving proposals or amendments referred to in paragraph 1 of this Rule, shall refer them to the appropriate committee or to the Plenary Assembly as the case may be.

5. Any authorized person may read, or may ask to have read, at a meeting of the Plenary Assembly, any proposal or amendment submitted by him during the conference, and he shall be allowed to explain his reasons therefor.

Rule 11—Conditions required for discussion of, and vote on, any proposal or amendment

1. No proposal or amendment submitted prior to the opening of the conference or by a delegation during the Conference may be discussed unless it is supported by at least one other delegation when it comes to be considered.

2. Each proposal or amendment duly supported shall be submitted to a vote after discussion.

Rule 12—Proposals or amendments passed over or postponed

When a proposal or an amendment has been passed over or when its examination has been postponed, the delegation sponsoring it shall be responsible for seeing that it is considered later.

Rule 13—Rules for debates of the Plenary Assembly

1. Quorum: For a valid vote to be taken at a meeting of the Plenary Assembly, more than half of the delegations accredited to the Conference and having the right to vote must be present or represented at the meeting.

2. Order of debates:

(1) Persons desiring to speak must first obtain the consent of the Chairman. As a general rule, they shall begin by announcing in what capacity they speak.

(2) Any person speaking must express himself slowly and distinctly, separating his words and pausing as necessary in order that everybody may understand his meaning.

3. Motions of order and points of order:

(1) During debate, any delegation may, when it thinks fit, submit a motion of order or raise a point of order, which shall at once be settled by the Chairman in accordance with these Rules of Procedure. Any delegation may appeal against the Chairman's ruling, which shall however stand unless a majority of the delegations present and voting are against it.

(2) A delegation submitting a motion of order shall not, during its speech, discuss the substance of the matter in question.

4. Priority of motions of order and points of order: The motions and points of order mentioned in paragraph 3 of this Rule shall be dealt with in the following order:

(a) any point of order regarding the application of those Rules of Procedure;

(b) suspension of a meeting;

(c) adjournment of a meeting;

(d) postponement of debate on the matter under discussion;

(e) closure of debate on the matter under discussion;

(f) any other motions of order or points of order that may be submitted, in which case it shall be for the Chairman to decide the relative order in which they shall be considered.

5. Motion for suspension or adjournment of a meeting: During the discussion of a question, a delegation may move that the meeting be suspended or adjourned, giving reasons for its proposal. If the proposal is seconded, the floor shall be given to two speakers to oppose the suspension of adjournment and solely for that purpose, after which the motion shall be put to the vote.

6. Motion for postponement of debate: During discussion of any question, a delegaton may propose that the debate be postponed for a stated period. Once such a proposal has been made, any discussion thereon shall be limited to no more than three speakers, not counting the person submitting the proposal: one for the motion, and two against.

7. Motion for closure of debate: A delegation may at any time propose that discussion on the point at issue be closed when the list of speakers whose names have so far been recorded has been exhausted. In such cases, before a vote is taken on the proposal, the floor may be given to not more than two speakers opposing the motion.

8. Limitation of speeches:

(1) The Plenary Assembly may, if necessary, decide how many speeches any one delegation may make on any particular point, and how long they may last.

(2) However, as regards questions of procedure, the Chairman shall limit the time allowed for a speech to a maximum of five minutes.

(3) When a speaker has exceeded the time allowed, the Chairman shall notify the Assembly and request the speaker to conclude his remarks briefly.

9. Closing the list of speakers:

(1) During the debate, the Chairman may rule that the list of speakers wishing to take the floor be read. He shall add the names of other delegations who indicate that they wish to speak and he may then, with the assent of the Assembly, rule that the list be closed. Nevertheless, as an exceptional measure, the Chairman may rule, if he thinks fit, that a reply may be made to any previous statement, even after the list of speakers has been closed.

(2) The list of speakers having been exhausted, the Chairman shall declare discussion on the matter closed.

10. Question of competence: Any questions of competence that may arise shall be settled before a vote is taken on the substance of the matter under discussion.

11. Withdrawal and re-submission of a motion: The author of a motion may withdraw it before it is put to a vote. Any motion, whether it be amended or not, which has been withdrawn from debate may be resubmitted or taken up by the author of the amendment or by another delegation.

Rule 14—Right to vote

1. At all meetings of the conference, the delegation of a Member of the Union duly accredited by that Member to take part in the work of the conference shall be entitled to one vote in accordance with Article 1 of the Convention.

2. The delegation of a Member of the Union shall exercise the right to vote under the conditions described in Chapter 5 of the General Regulations.

Rule 15—Voting

1. Definition of a majority:

(1) A majority shall consist of one more than half the delegations present and voting.

(2) In computing a majority, delegations abstaining shall not be taken into account.

(3) In case of a tie, a proposal or amendment shall be considered rejected.

(4) For the purpose of these Rules of Procedure, a "delegation present and voting" shall be a delegation voting for or against a proposal.

(5) The delegations present which do not participate in a particular vote or which expressly declare their unwillingness to participate therein shall not be considered absent for the purposes of determining the quorum, nor as abstaining for the purposes of paragraph 3 of this Rule.

2. Special majority: In cases where Members of the Union are to be admitted, the majority described in Article 1 of the Convention shall apply.

3. Abstentions of more than fifty per cent: When the number of abstentions exceeds half the number of votes cast (for, against, abstentions), consideration of the matter under discussion shall be postponed to a later meeting, at which time abstentions shall not be taken into account.

4. Voting procedure:

(1) The following voting procedures shall be adopted except in the case provided for in paragraph 5 of this Rule:

(a) by a show of hands, as a general rule;

(b) by roll call, if the above-mentioned procedure shows no clear majority or if so requested by a delegation.

(2) Votes by roll call shall be taken in the alphabetical order of the French names of the Members represented.

5. Secret ballot: Voting shall be by secret ballot when at least five of the delegations present and entitled to vote so request. In such cases, the Secretariat shall at once take steps to ensure the secrecy of the vote.

6. Prohibition of interruptions during votes: No delegation may interrupt once a vote has been begun, unless to raise a point of order in connection with the way in which the vote is being taken.

7. Reasons for votes: The Chairman shall authorize any delegations which so request to give the reasons for their vote, after the vote has been taken.

8. Voting on parts of a proposal:

(1) When the author of a proposal so requests, or when the Assembly thinks it fit, that proposal shall be subdivided and its various sections put to the vote separately. The parts of the proposal which have been adopted shall then be put to the vote as a whole.

(2) If all the sections of a proposal are rejected the proposal shall be regarded as rejected as a whole.

9. Order of voting on concurrent proposals:

(1) When there are two or more proposals on any one matter, they shall be put to the vote in the order in which they were presented, unless the Assembly decides to the contrary.

(2) After each vote, the Assembly shall decide whether or not the following proposal shall be voted on.

10. Amendments:

(1) Any proposal for modification consisting only of a deletion from, an addition to, or a change in a part of the original proposal shall be considered an amendment.

(2) Any amendment to a proposal accepted by the delegation submitting the proposal shall at once be embodied in the original proposal.

(3) No proposal for modification shall be regarded as an amendment if the Assembly considers it to be incompatible with the original proposal.

11. Voting on amendments:

(1) When an amendment is submitted to a proposal, a vote shall first be taken on the amendment.

(2) When two or more amendments are submitted to a proposal, the amendment furthest from the original text shall be put to the vote first; of the remainder, that furthest from the proposal shall then be put to the vote and the same procedure shall be followed until all the amendments submitted have been considered.

(3) If one or more amendments are adopted, the proposal thus amended shall then be put to the vote.

(4) If no amendment is adopted, the original proposal shall be put to the vote.

Rule 16—Committees and subcommittees; rules for debates and voting procedures

1. The chairmen of all committees and subcommittees shall have powers similar to those conferred by Rule 4 on the Chairman of the Conference.

2. The provisions set forth in Rule 13 for the conduct of debates in the Plenary Assembly shall also apply to the discussions of committees and subcommittees, except in the matter of the quorum.

3. The provisions set forth in Rule 15 shall also apply to votes taken in committees and subcommittees, except as regards paragraph 2.

Rule 17—Reservations

1. As a general rule, any delegation whose views are not shared by the remaining delegations shall endeavour, as far as possible, to conform to the opinion of the majority.

2. However, if any decision appears to a delegation to be of such a nature as to prevent its Government from ratifying the Convention or from approving the revision of the Regulations, the delegation may make reservations, final or provisional, regarding this decision.

Rule 18—Minutes of Plenary Assemblies

1. The minutes of Plenary Assemblies shall be drawn up by the secretariat of the conference, which shall endeavour to ensure their distribution to delegations as early as possible before the date on which they are to be considered.

2. After the minutes have been distributed, delegations may submit in writing to the secretariat of the conference the corrections they consider to be justified; this shall be done in the shortest possible time. This shall not prevent them from presenting amendments orally during the meeting at which the minutes are approved.

3. (1) As a general rule, the minutes shall contain proposals and conclusions, together with the principal arguments for them, presented in terms as concise as possible.

(2) However, any delegation shall have the right to require the insertion in the minutes, either summarized or in full, of any statement it has made during the debates. In this case, the delegation should, as a general rule, announce this at the beginning of its statement in order to facilitate the work of the reporters and must itself hand in the text to the secretariat of the conference within two hours after the end of the meeting.

4. The right accorded in paragraph 3 (2) regarding the insertion of statements in the minutes shall in all cases be used with discretion.

Rule 19—Summary records and reports of committees and subcommittees

1. (1) The debates of committees and subcommittees shall be summarized, meeting by meeting, in summary records, in which shall be brought out the essential points of the discussion, and the various opinions of which note ought to be taken, together with any proposals or conclusions resulting from the debate as a whole.

(2) Nevertheless, any delegation shall be entitled to invoke Rule 18, paragraph 3 (2).

(3) The right referred to above shall in all circumstances be used with discretion.

2. Committees and subcommittees may prepare any interim reports they deem necessary and, if circumstances warrant, they may submit, at the end of their work, a final report recapitulating in concise terms the proposals and conclusions resulting from the studies entrusted to them.

Rule 20—Approval of minutes, summary records, and reports

1. (1) As a general rule, at the beginning of each meeting of the Plenary Assembly, committee, or subcommittee, the Chairman shall inquire whether there are any comments on the minutes of the previous meeting, or, in the case of committees or subcommittees, on the summary record of the previous meeting. These documents shall be considered approved if no amendments have been handed in to the Secretariat and no objection is made orally. Otherwise, the appropriate amendments shall be made in the minutes or summary record as the case may be.

(2) Any interim or final report must be approved by the committee or subcommittee concerned.

2. (1) The minutes of the last Plenary Assembly shall be examined and approved by the Chairman of the Assembly.

(2) The summary record of the last meeting of each committee or subcommittee shall be examined and approved by the Chairman of the committee or subcommittee.

Rule 21—Editorial committee

1. The texts of the Convention, the Regulations and other Final Acts of the Conference, which shall be worded as far as practicable in their definitive form by the various committees, taking account of the views expressed, shall be submitted to an editorial committee charged with perfecting their form without altering the sense and with combining them with those parts of former texts which have not been altered.

2. The texts shall be submitted by the editorial committee to the Plenary Assembly of the conference, which shall approve them, or refer them back to the appropriate committee for further examination.

Rule 22—Numbering

1. The numbers of the chapters, articles and paragraphs of the texts subjected to revision shall be preserved until the first reading in Plenary Assembly. The passages added shall bear provisionally the numbers bis, ter, etc. and the numbers of deleted passages shall not be used.

2. The definitive numbering of the chapters, articles and paragraphs shall be entrusted to the editorial committee after their adoption at the first reading.

Rule 23—Final approval

The texts of the Convention, the Regulations and other Final Acts shall be considered final when they have been approved at the second reading in Plenary Assembly.

Rule 24—Signature

1. The final texts approved by the conference shall be submitted for signature, in the alphabetical order of the French names of their countries, to the delegates provided with the full powers defined in Chapter 5 of the General Regulations.

Rule 25—Press notices

Official releases to the press about the work of the Conference shall be issued only as authorized by the Chairman or a Vice-Chairman of the conference.

Rule 26—Franking privileges

During the conference, members of delegations, members of the Administrative Council, senior officials of the permanent organs of the Union, and the staff of the Secretariat of the Union seconded to the Conference shall be entitled to postal, telegraph and telephone franking privileges to the extent arranged by the government of the country in which the conference is held in agreement with the other governments and recognized private operating agencies concerned.

Part II—International Consulative Committees

Chapter 10—General Provisions

1. The provisions of Part II of the General Regulations supplement Article 7 of the Convention defining the duties and structure of the International Consultative Committees.

2. The Consultative Committees shall also observe the applicable Rules of Procedure of Conferences contained in Part I of the General Regulations.

Chapter 11—Conditions for Participation

1. (1) The International Consultative Committees shall have as Members:

(a) of right, the administrations of all Members and Associate Members of the Union,

(b) any recognized private operating agency which, with the approval of the Member or Associate Member which has recognized it, subject to the procedure prescribed below, expresses a desire to participate in the work of the Committees.

(2) The first request from a recognized private operating agency to take part in the work of a Consultative Committee shall be addressed to the Secretary-General who shall inform all the Members and Associate Members and the Director of the Consultative Committee concerned. A request from a recognized private operating agency must be approved by the Member or Associate Member recognizing it.

2. (1) International organizations which coordinate their work with the International Telecommunication Union and which have related activities may be admitted to participate in the work of the Consultative Committees in an advisory capacity.

(2) The first request from an international organization to take part in the work of a Consultative Committee shall be addressed to the Secretary-General who shall inform by telegram all the Members and Associate Members and invite Members to say whether the request should be granted; the request shall be granted if the majority of the replies of the Members received within a period of one month are favourable. The Secretary-General shall inform all the Members and Associate Members and the Director of the Consultative Committee concearned of the result of the consultation.

(3) The conditions under which any administration, recognized private operating agency or international organization may withdraw from participation in the work of a Consultative Committee are laid down in Chapter 20, paragraph 5 of these Regulations.

3. (1) Scientific or industrial organizations, which are engaged in the study of telecommunication problems or in the design or manufacture of equipment intended for telecommunication services, may be admitted to participate in an advisory capacity in meetings of the study groups of the Consultative Committees, provided that their participation has received the approval of the administrations of the countries concerned.

(2) The first request from a scientific or industrial organization for admission to meetings of study groups of a Consultative Committee shall be addressed to the Director of the Consultative Committee; such a request must be approved by the administration of the country concerned.

Chapter 12—Duties of the Plenary Assembly

The Plenary Assembly shall:

(a) consider the reports of study groups and aprove, modify or reject the draft recommendations contained in these reports;

(b) decide new questions to be studied in conformity with the provisions of Article 7 paragraph 2 of the Convention; and if need be, establish a study programme;

(c) so far as necessary, maintain existing study groups and set up new study groups;

(d) allocate to study groups the questions to be studied;

(e) consider and approve the report of the Director on the activities of the Committee since the last meeting of the Plenary Assembly;

(f) approve a report on the financial needs of the Committee until the next Plenary Assembly, for submission by the Director to the Administrative Council;

(g) consider any other matters deemed necessary within the provisions of Article 7 of the Convention and Part II of the General Regulations.

Chapter 13—Meetings of the Plenary Assembly

1. The Plenary Assembly shall normally meet every three years.

2. The date of the meeting of the Plenary Assembly may be changed with the approval of the majority of the Members of the Union which participated in the previous meeting of the Plenary Assembly, or which, not having so participated, have informed the Secretary-General of their wish to take an active part in the work of the Consultative Committee concerned.

3. (1) So far as possible meetings of the Plenary Assembly shall be held at the seat of the Union.

(2) However, each meeting of the Plenary Assembly may fix another place for the following meeting. This place may subsequently be changed by application of the procedure described in paragraph 2 above.

4. At each of these meetings, the Plenary Assembly shall be presided over by the Head of the delegation of the country in which the meeting is held or, in the case of a meeting held at the seat of the Union by a person elected by the Plenary Assembly itself; the Chairman shall be assisted by Vice-Chairman elected by the Plenary Assembly.

5. The secretariat of the Plenary Assembly of a Consultative Committee shall be composed of the specialized secretariat of that Committee, with the help, if necessary, of the personnel of the administration of the invit-

ing Government and of the General Secretariat.

Chapter 14—Languages and Method of Voting in Plenary Assemblies

1. The languages used in the Plenary Meetings and in the official documents of the Consultative Committees shall be as provided in Article 14 of the Convention.

2. The countries which are authorized to vote at sessions of Plenary Assemblies of the Consultative Committees are those to which reference is made in Article 1, paragraph 3 (2) and Article 15, paragraph 2 of the Convention. However, when a country is not represented by an administration, the representatives of the recognized private operating agencies of that country shall, as a whole, and regardless of their number, be entitled to a single vote.

Chapter 15—Composition of Study Groups

1. The Plenary Assembly shall set up the necessary study groups to deal with questions to be studied. The administrations, recognized private operating agencies and international organizations admitted in accordance with paragraph 2 of Chapter 11 which wish to take part in the work of the study groups shall give in their names either at the meeting of the Plenary Assembly or, at a later date, to the Director of the Consultative Committee concerned.

2. In addition, and subject to the provisions of paragraph 3 of Chapter 11 of these Regulations, experts of scientific or industrial organizations may be admitted to take part in an advisory capacity in any meeting of any study group.

3. The Plenary Assembly shall appoint the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of each study group. If, in the interval between two meetings of the Plenary Assembly, a Group Chairman is unable to carry out his duties, the Vice-Chairman shall take his place, and the study group concerned shall elect, from among its members, a new Vice-Chairman.

Chapter 16—Treatment of Business of Study Groups

1. Study groups shall normally conduct their work by correspondence.

2. (1) However, the Plenary Assembly may give directives concerning the convening of any meetings of the study groups that may appear necessary to deal with large groups of questions.

(2) Moreover, if, after a Plenary Assembly, a Group Chairman considers it necessary for his study group to hold a meeting not provided for by the Plenary Assembly to discuss orally questions which could not be solved by correspondence, he may, with the approval of his administration and after consultation with the Director concerned and the members of his study group, suggest a meeting at a convenient place bearing in mind the need to keep expenses to a minimum.

3. However, in order to avoid unnecessary journeys and prolonged absences, the Director of a Consultative Committee, in agreement with the Group Chairman of the various study groups concerned, shall draw up the general plan of meetings of groups of study groups which are to meet in the same place during the same period.

4. The Director shall send the final reports of the study groups to the participating administrations, to the recognized private operating agencies of the Consultative Committee and, as occasion may demand, to such international organizations as have participated. These shall be sent as soon as possible and, in any event, in time for them to be received at least one month before the date of the next meeting of the Plenary Assembly. Questions which have not formed the subject of a report furnished in this way shall not appear on the agenda for the meeting of the Plenary Assembly.

Chapter 17—Duties of the Director. Specialized Secretariat

1. (1) The Director of a Consultative Committee shall coordinate the work of the Consultative Committee, including its Plenary Assembly and study groups, and shall be responsible for the organization of the work of the Consultative Committee.

(2) He shall be responsible for the documents of the Committee.

(3) The Director shall be assisted by a secretariat composed of a specialized staff to work under his direction and to aid him in the organization of the work of the Committee.

(4) The Director of the International Radio Consultative Committee shall also be assisted by a Vice-Director in accordance with Article 7 of the Convention.

2. The Director shall choose the technical and administrative members of the secretariat within the framework of the budget as approved by the Plenipotentiary Conference or the Administrative Council. The appointment of the technical and administrative personnel is made by the Secretary-General in agreement with the Director.

3. The Director shall participate as of right, but in an advisory capacity, in meetings of the Plenary Assembly and of the study groups. He shall make all necessary preparations for meetings of the Plenary Assembly and of the study groups.

4. The Vice-Director of the International Radio Consultative Committee shall participate as of right in an advisory capacity in meetings of the Plenary Assembly and of the study groups when questions in which he is concerned are on the agenda.

5. The Director shall submit to the Plenary Assembly a report on the activities of the Consultative Committee since the last meeting of the Plenary Assembly. After approval, this report shall be sent to the Secretary-General for submission to the Administrative Council.

6. The Director shall submit for the approval of the Plenary Assembly a report on the financial needs of the Consultative Committee up to the next meeting of the Plenary Assembly; this report, after approval by the Plenary Assembly, shall be sent to the Secretary-General for appropriate action.

Chapter 18—Preparation of Proposals for Administrative Conferences

One year before the appropriate administrative conference, representatives of the interested study groups of each Consultative Committee shall correspond with or meet with representatives of the General Secretariat in order to extract from the recommendations issued by it since the proceeding administrative conference proposals for modification of the relative set of Regulations.

Chapter 19—Relations of Consultative Committes Between Themselves and With Other International Organizations

1. (1) Plenary Assemblies of Consultative Committees may set up joint study groups to study and make recommendations on questions of common interest.

(2) The Directors of Consultative Committees may, in collaboration with the Group Chairmen, organize joint meetings of study groups of different Consultative Committees, to study and prepare draft recommendations on questions of common interest. Such draft recommendations shall be submitted to the next meeting of the Plenary Assembly of each Consultative Committee concerned.

2. The Plenary Assembly or the Director of a Consultative Committee may invite a representative of the Committee to attend, in an advisory capacity, meetings of other Consultative Committees or of other international organizations to which that Consultative Committee has been invited.

3. The Secretary General of the Union, or one of the two Assistant Secretaries-General, the representatives of the International Frequency Registration Board, and the Directors of the other Consultative Committees of the Union or their representatives may attend meetings of the Consultative Committees in an advisory capacity.

Chapter 20—Finances of Consultative Committees

1. The salaries of the Directors of the Consultative Committees, including the salary of the Vice-Director of the International Radio Consultative Committee, and the ordinary expenses of the specialized secretariats shall be included in the ordinary expenses of the Union in accordance with the provisions of Article 13 of the Convention.

2. The totality of the extraordinary expenses of each Consultative Committee, which shall include the extraordinary expenses of the Directors, the Vice-Director of the International Radio Consultative Committee and of the whole of the secretariat employed at any meetings of the study groups or of the Plenary Assembly, and the cost of all working documents of the study groups and the Plenary Assembly, shall be borne in the manner prescribed in Article 13, paragraphs 3 and 6, of the Convention by:

(a) the administrations which have advised the Secretary-General that they wish to take an active part in the work of the Consultative Committee even if they have not attended the meeting of the Plenary Assembly;

(b) the administrations which, while not having advised the Secretary-General that they wished to take part in the work of the Consultative Committee, have nevertheless attended the meeting of the Plenary Assembly or a meeting of a study group;

(c) the recognized private operating agencies which have, in accordance with Chapter 11 paragraph 1 (2), made a request to take part in the work of the Consultative Committee even if they have not attended the meeting of the Plenary Assembly;

(d) those international organizations which have, in accordance with Chapter 11 paragraph 2 (2), been admitted to take part in the work of the Consultative Committee and which have not been excused payment in accordance with Article 13 paragraph 3 (2) of the Convention;

(e) the scientific and industrial organizations which have, in accordance with Chapter 11 paragraph 3, attended meetings of study groups of the Consultative Committee.

3. The recognized private operating agencies, international organizations and scientific or industrial organizations, referred to in subparagraphs c), d) and e) of paragraph 2 above shall declare the class, from among those mentioned in paragraph 4 of Article 13 of the Convention, according to which they will contribute to the extraordinary expenses of the Consultative Committee.

4. The expenses of study groups shall be included in the extraordinary expenses of the next meeting of the Plenary Assembly. However, where meetings of study groups take place more than one year before the date of the next meeting of the Plenary Assembly, the Secretary-General shall render to the administrations, agencies and organizations concerned, interim accounts in respect of the extraordinary- expenditure incurred.

5. The administrations, recognized private operating agencies, international organizations and scientific or industrial organizations referred to in paragraph 2 above shall be under an obligation to contribute to the extraordinary expenses as from the date of the close of the preceding meeting of the Plenary Assembly. This obligation shall remain in force until terminated. A notice of termination shall take effect as from the

close of the meeting of the Plenary Assembly following the date of reception of such notice, but shall not affect the right to receive all documents pertaining to that meeting of the Plenary Assembly.

6. Each administration, recognized private operating agency, international organization and scientific or industrial organization shall defray the personal expenses of its own participants.

7. However, the personal expenses of the representative of a Consultative Committee incurred as a result of his participation in a meeting in the circumstances envisaged in paragraph 2 of Chapter 19 shall be borne by the Committee which he represents.

ANNEX 6

(See Article 26)

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION

(Preamble)

In consideration of the provisions of Article 57 of the Charter of the United Nations and of Article 26 of the Convention of the International Telecommunication Union of Atlantic City 1947, the United Nations and the International Telecommunication Union agree as follows:

Article I

The United Nations recognizes the International Telecommunication Union (hereinafter called "the Union") as the specialized agency responsible for taking such action as may be appropriate under its basic instrument for the accomplishment of the purposes set forth therein.

Article II—Reciprocal representation

1. The United Nations shall be invited to send representatives to participate, without vote, in the deliberations of all the Plenipotentiary and Administrative Conferences of the Union. It shall also, after appropriate consultation, be invited to send repsentatives to attend international consultative committees or any other meetings convened by the Union with the right to participate without vote in the discussion of items of interest to the United Nations.

2. The Union shall be invited to send representatives to attend meetings of the General Assembly of the United Nations for the purposes of consultation on telecommunication matters.

3. The Union shall be invited to send representatives to be present at the meetings of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and of the Trusteeship Council and of their commissions or committees, and to participate, without vote, in the deliberations thereof with respect to items on the agenda in which the Union may be concerned.

4. The Union shall be invited to send representatives to attend meetings of the main committees of the General Assembly when matters within the competence of the Union are under discussion and to participate, without vote, in such discussions.

5. Written statements presented by the Union shall be distributed by the Secretariat of the United Nations to the members of the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and its commissions, and the Trusteeship Council as appropriate. Similarly, written statements presented by the United Nations shall be distributed by the Union to its members.

Article III—Proposal of agenda items

After such preliminary consultation as may be necessary, the Union shall include on the agenda of Plenipotentiary or Administrative Conferences or meetings of other organs of the Union, items proposed to it by the United Nations. Similarly, the Economic and Social Council and its commissions and the Trusteeship Council shall include on their agenda items proposed by the Conferences or other organs of the Union.

Article IV—Recommendations of the United Nations

1. The Union, having regard to the obligation of the United Nations to promote the objectives set forth in Article 55 of the Charter and the function and power of the Economic and Social Council under Article 62 of the Charter to make or initiate studies and reports with respect to international economic, social, cultural, educational, health and related matters and to make recommendations concerning these matters to the specialized agencies concerned and having regard also to the responsibility of the United Nations, under Articles 58 and 63 of the Charter; to make recommendations for the co-ordination of the policies and activities of such specialized agencies, agrees to arrange for the submission, as soon as possible, to its appropriate organ for such action as may seem proper of all formal recommendations which the United Nations may make to it.

2. The Union agrees to enter into consultation with the United Nations upon request with respect to such recommendations, and in due course to report to the United Nations on the action taken by the Union or by its members to give effect to such recommendations or on the other results of their consideration.

3. The Union will co-operate in whatever further measures may be necessary to make co-ordination of the activities of specialized agencies and those of the United Nations fully effective. In particular, it agrees to co-operate with any body or bodies which the Economic and Social Council may establish for the purpose of facilitating such coordination and to furnish such information as may be required for the carrying out of this purpose.

Article V—Exchange of information and documents

1. Subject to such arrangements as may be necessary for the safeguarding of confidential material, the fullest and promptest exchange of appropriate information and documents shall be made between the United Nations and the Union to meet the requirements of each.

2. Without prejudice to the generality of the provisions of the preceding paragraph:

(a) the Union shall submit to the United Nations an annual report on its activities;

(b) the Union shall comply to the fullest extent practicable with any request which the United Nations may make for the furnishing of special reports, studies or information;

(c) the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall, upon request, consult with the appropriate authority of the Union with a view to providing to the Union such information as may be of special interest to it.

Article VI—Assistance to the United Nations

The Union agrees to co-operate with and to render all possible assistance to the United Nations, its principal and subsidiary organs, in accordance with the United Nations Charter and the International Telecommunication Convention, taking fully into account the particular position of the individual members of the Union who are not members of the United Nations.

Article VII—Relations with the International Court of Justice

1. The Union agrees to furnish any information which may be requested by the International Court of Justice in pursuance of Article 34 of the Statute of the Court.

2. The General Assembly authorizes the Union to request advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice on legal questions arising within the scope of its competence other than questions concerning the mutual relationships of the Union and the United Nations or other specialized agencies.

3. Such request may be addressed to the Court by the Plenipotentiary Conference or the Administrative Council acting in pursuance of an authorization by the Plenipotentiary Conference.

4. When requesting the International Court of Justice to give an advisory opinion the Union shall inform the Economic and Social Council of the request.

Article VIII—Personnel arrangements

1. The United Nations and the Union agree to develop as far as practicable common personnel standards, methods and arrangements designed to avoid serious discrepancies in terms and conditions of employment, to avoid competition in recruitment of personnel, and to faciliate any mutually desirable intercharge of personnel in order to obtain the maximum benefit from their services.

2. The United Nations and the Union agree to co-operate to the fullest extent possible in achieving these ends.

Article IX—Statistical services

1. The United Nations and the Union agree to strive for maximum co-operation the elimination of all undesirable duplication between them, and the most efficient use of their technical personnel in their respective collection, analysis, publication, standardization, improvement, and dissemination of statistical information. They agree to combine their efforts to secure the greatest possible usefulness and utilization of statistical information and to minimize the burdens placed upon national governments and other organizations from which such information may be collected.

2. The Union recognizes the United Nations as the central agency for the collection, analysis, publication, standardization, improvement and dissemination of statistics serving the general purposes of international organizations.

3. The United Nations recognizes the Union as the central agency responsible for the collection, analysis, publication, standardization, improvement and dissemination of statistics within its special sphere without prejudice to the rights of the United Nations to concern itself with such statistics so far as they may be essential for its own purposes or for the improvement of statistics throughout the world. All decisions as to the form in which its service documents are compiled rest with the Union.

4. In order to build up a central collection of statistical information for general use, it is agreed that data supplied to the Union for incorporation in its basic statistical series or special reports should so far as practicable be made available to the United Nations upon request.

5. It is agreed that data supplied to the United Nations for incorporation in its basic statistical series or special reports should so far as practicable and appropriate be made available to the Union upon request.

Article X—Administrative and technical services

1. The United Nations and the Union recognize the desirability in the interests of the most efficient use of personnel and resources, of avoiding, whenever possible, the establishment of competitive or overlapping services and when necessary to consult thereon to achieve these ends.

2. Arrangements shall be made between the United Nations and the Union in regard to the registration and deposit of official documents.

Article XI—Budgetary and financial arrangements

1. The budget or the proposed budget of the Union shall be transmitted to the United Nations at the same time as such budget is transmitted to the Members of the Union and the General Assembly may make recommendations thereon to the Union.

2. The Union shall be entitled to send representatives to participate without vote, in the deliberations of the General Assembly or any committee thereof at all times when the budget of the Union is under consideration.

Article XII—Financing of special services

1. In the event of the Union being faced with the necessity of incurring substantial extra expense as a result of any request which the United Nations may make for special reports, studies or assistance in accordance with Article VI or with any other provisions of this agreement, consultation shall take place with a view to determining the most equitable manner in which such expense shall be borne.

2. Consultation between the United Nations and the Union shall similarly take place with a view to making such arrangements as may be found equitable for covering the costs of central administrative, technical or fiscal services or facilities or other special assistance requested by the Union and provided by the United Nations.

Article XIII—United Nations laissez-passer

Officials of the Union shall have the right to use the laissez-passer of the United Nations in accordance with special arrangements to be negotiated between the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the competent authorities of the Union.

Article XIV—Inter-agency agreements

1. The Union agrees to inform the Economic and Social Council of the nature and scope of any formal agreement contemplated between the Union and any other specialized agency or other intergovernmental organization or international non-governmental organization, and further will inform the Economic and Social Council of the details of any such agreement, when concluded.

2. The United Nations agrees to inform the Union of the nature and scope of any formal agreement contemplated by any other specialized agencies on matters which might be of concern to the Union and further will inform the Union of the details of any such agreement, when concluded.

Article XV—Liaison

1. The United Nations and the Union agree to the foregoing provisions in the belief that they will contribute to the maintenance of effective liaison between the two organizations. They affirm their intention of taking whatever measures may be necessary to this end.

2. The liaison arrangements provided for in this agreement shall apply, as far as appropriate, to the relations between the Union and the United Nations, including its branch and regional offices.

Article XVI—United Nations telecommunication services

1. The Union recognizes that it is important that the United Nations shall benefit by the same rights as the Members of the Union for operating telecommunications services.

2. The United Nations undertakes to operate the telecommunication services under its control in accordance with the terms of the International Telecommunication Convention and the regulations annexed thereto.

3. The precise arrangements for implementing this article shall be dealt with separately.

Article XVII—Implementation of agreement

The Secretary-General of the United Nations and the appropriate authority of the Union may enter into such supplementary arrangements for the implementation of this agreement as may be found desirable.

Article XVIII—Revision

On six months' notice given on either part, this agreement shall be subject to revision by agreement between the United Nations and the Union.

Article XIX—Entry into force

1. This agreement will come into force provisionally after approval by the General Assembly of the United Nations and the Plenipotentiary Telecommunication Conference at Atlantic City in 1947.

2. Subject to the aforementioned approval, the agreement will formally enter into force at the same time as the International Telecommunication Convention concluded at Atlantic City in 1947 or at some earlier date as may be arranged for by a decision of the Union.

FINAL PROTOCOL TO THE INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION CONVENTION, BUENOS AIRES, 1952

At the time of signing the International Telecommunication Convention of Buenos Aires, the undersigned plenipotentiaries take note of the following statements:

I

For the People's Republic of Albania:

1. In signing the International Telecommunications Convention, Buenos Aires, the Delegation of the People's Republic of Albania hereby declares:

(a) The Kuomintang representatives are not in reality representatives of China and hence the decision taken by the Plenipotentiary Conference to allow them to sign the Convention is illegal. Only representatives appointed by the Government of the People's Republic of China are entitled to sign the Convention on behalf of China.

(b) Signature of the International Telecommunication Convention, on behalf of Germany, by the representatives of the Bonn authorities, is illegal, since the Bonn authorities do not represent the whole of Germany. The Government of the German Democratic Republic legally acceded to the International Telecommunication Convention of 1947, and hence the German Democratic Republic is a party to the 1947 Convention, and a full Member of the International Telecommunication Union.

(c) The decision taken by the Plenipotentiary Conference to accord the right to sign the International Telecommunication Convention to the representatives of Bao-Dai Viet-Nam and South Korea is illegal, since those representatives do not in fact represent Viet-Nam and Korea.

2. The new International Frequency List mentioned in Article 47 of the Radio Regulations of Atlantic City has not yet been prepared and approved. Hence the decisions taken by the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference run counter to the Radio Regulations and are, accordingly illegal.

In view of the above, the Delegation of the People's Republic of Albania hereby declares that Resolution No. 30, adopted by the Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference, to the effect that those illegal E. A. R. C. decisions should be considered as replacing the provisions of the Regulations, runs counter to the International Telecommunication Convention in force and constitutes a breach in the procedure for revision of the Regulations. It is, thus, unacceptable for the People's Republic of Albania.

For the above reasons, the People's Republic of Albania reserves the right, in matters concerning the registration and utilization of radio frequencies to act in accordance with Article 47 of the Radio Regulations in force.

It also reserves the right to abide, or not to abide, by the provisions of Article 6 of the Convention.

II

For Saudi Arabia:

1. The Delegation of Saudi Arabia, formally declares its disagreement with Article 5 paragraph 12 (b) 1, and signature of this Convention on behalf of Saudi Arabia is subject to the reservation that Saudi Arabia will not be bound by such agreements it considers against its interest, which may be provisionally concluded on behalf of the Union by the Administrative Council.

2. The Delegation of Saudi Arabia, by signature of this Convention on behalf of Saudi Arabia, reserves for its Government the right to accept or not to accept any obligation in respect of the Telegraph Regulations or the Additional Radio Regulations referred to in Article 12 of this Convention.

III

For Australia:

The Delegation of Australia declares that signature by Australia of this Convention is subject to the reservation that Australia does not agree to be bound by the Telephone Regulations referred to in Article 12 of the Buenos Aires Convention.

IV

For the Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:

Taking into account the fact that under Article 47 of the Radio Regulations, supplementing the Telecommunication Convention, the entry into force of the most substantial part of those Regulations is made dependent on the decisions to be taken by the future Special Administrative Conference, mentioned in that Article; and bearing in mind that in adoption of the decisions taken in 1951 by the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference (E. A. R. C.), the provisions of Article 47 of the Radio Regulations were infringed and that hence the said E. A. R. C. decisions are illegal; and also considering that the Plenipotentiary Conference (1952), in adopting a resolution according to which those illegal E. A. R. C. decisions are to be considered as replacing the provisions of the Radio Regulations, thereby infringed the provisions of Article 13 of the Telecommunication Convention, relative to the binding character of the Regulations; the Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic in these circumstances leaves open the question of accepting the provisions of the Telecommunication Convention relative to the International Frequency Registration Board, as also the question of accepting the Radio Regulations.

V

For the People's Republic of Bulgaria:

On signing the Buenos Aires Telecommunication Convention, the Delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria states:

1. The decision of the Plenipotentiary Conference giving the representatives of the Kuomintang the right to sign the Telecommunication Convention is illegal since in reality they do not represent China. Only the representatives nominated by the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic are entitled to sign the Convention.

The Bonn authorities do not represent the whole of Germany and therefore the signature of the Telecommunication Convention by its representatives is illegal. The Government of the German Democratic Republic has acceded to the Atlantic City Convention in accordance with the procedure established in Additional Protocol II to that Convention. In these circumstances, the German Democratic Republic is a participant in the Atlantic City Convention and has full Membership of the International Telecommunication Union.

The decision of the Plenipotentiary Conference to the effect that the representatives of Bao-Dai Viet-Nam and South Korea are entitled to sign the Telecommunication Convention is illegal since the said representatives do not in reality represent Viet-Nam and Korea.

2. The new International Frequency List referred to in Article 47 of the Radio Regulations (Atlantic City) has not yet been

prepared and approved. In the circumstances, the decisions of the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference are illegal, since they are contrary to the Radio Regulations.

In view of the foregoing, the Delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria states that Resolution No. 30 of the Plenipotentiary Conference, Buenos Aires, according to which the illegal decisions of the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference are considered to replace the provisions of the Radio Regulations, is contrary to the provisions of the Convention in force, violates the normal procedure for revising the regulations and consequently is unacceptable to the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

This being the case, the People's Republic of Bulgaria declares that the question of adopting the Radio Regulations remains open.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria also reserves the right to accept or reject the provisions of Article 6 of the Convention.

VI

For Canada: The signature of Canada to this Convention is subject to the reservation that Canada does not accept of Article 12 paragraph 2 (1) of the Buenos Aires Telecommunication Convention. Canada agrees to be bound by the Radio Regulations and Telegraph Regulations annexed to this Convention but does not at present agree to be bound by the Additional Radio Regulations or the Telephone Regulations.

VII

For China: The Delegation of the Republic of China to the Plenipotentiary Conference of the International Telecommunication Union at Buenos Aires is the only legitimate representation of China therein and is recognized as such by the Conference. Any Declarations or Reservations made in connection with or attached to the present Convention by the several Members of the Union, incompatible to the position of the Republic of China as set forth above, are illegal and therefore null and void. To those Members of the Union, the Republic of China does not, by signature of this Convention, accept any obligation arising out of the Buenos Aires Convention as well as all the Protocols in relation thereto.

VIII

For the Republic of Colombia: The Republic of Colombia hereby formally declares that its signature of this Convention in no way implies acceptance of any obligation as regards the Telegraph and Telephone Regulations mentioned in Article 12 of the Buenos Aires Convention.

IX

For the Republic of Cuba: In view of the provisions of Article 12 of the Buenos Aires Convention and considering its stipulations therein, the Republic of Cuba hereby makes a formal reservation as regards its acceptance of the Telegraph and Telephone Regulations.

X

For the United States of America: Signature of this Convention for and in the name of the United States of America constitutes, in accordance with its constitutional processes, signature also on behalf of all territories of the United States of America.

The United States of America formally declares that the United States of America does not, by signature of this Convention on its behalf, accept any obligation in respect of the Telephone Regulations or the Additional Radio Regulations referred to in Article 12 of the Buenos Aires Convention.

XI

For Greece: The Hellenic Delegation formally declares that in signing this Convention it maintains the reservations made by Greece when the Administrative Regulations mentioned in Article 12 of the Buenos Aires Convention were signed.

XII

For Guatemala: The fact of signing this Convention in the name of the Republic of Guatemala does not impose any obligation on my Government to ratify it as a whole, in its final form and in its application, it being understood that the National Congress of my country can make such reservations as it may judge necessary at the time of ratification.

* * * * *

I declare in the name of my Government that it will not accept any financial repercussions that may result from the reservations made by countries participating in this Conference.

XIII

For the Hungarian People's Republic: When signing the International Telecommunication Convention, the Delegation of the Hungarian Peoples' Republic states the following:

Considering that the Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference has adopted a Resolution in accordance with which the illegal decisions of the E. A. R. C. replace the provisions of the Convention relating to the revision of the Regulations,

the Hungarian People's Republic, being in disagreement with Resolution No. 30 adopted by the Plenipotentiary Conference, reserves the right to regard the adoption of the Radio Regulations and the position of the I. F. R. B. as open questions.

* * * * *

The Delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic, on signing the International Telecommunication Convention, makes the following statement:

1. The decision taken by the Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference to grant the right of signing the Convention to the representatives of the Kuomintang is illegal, since the only legitimate representatives are those nominated by the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic and they alone are entitled to sign on behalf of China.

2. The so-called representatives of Bao-Dai Viet-Nam and South Korea do not in reality represent Viet-Nam and Korea and, by this fact, their participation in the work of the Conference and the decision to authorize them to sign the International Telecommunication Convention are illegal.

3. The Government of the German Democratic Republic, having acceded to the Atlantic City International Telecommunication Convention in accordance with the established procedure, is indisputably a Member of the Union as of right.

The Bonn authorities do not represent the whole of Germany and consequently the signing of the Buenos Aires International Telecommunication Convention by the representatives of these authorities is illegal.

XIV

For the Republic of Indonesia: In signing the present Convention on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Indonesia, the Indonesian Delegation to the Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference reserves its rights with respect to the mentioning in documents of the Union and in Annex 1 of this Convention of the name "New Guinea" after and under the heading of "The Netherlands", in view of the fact that (Western) New Guinea is still a disputed territory.

XV

For Iraq: The Delegation of Iraq makes the following reservations:

1. Reserves the right of its Government to accept or not to accept the Telephone Regulations, the Telegraph Regulations and the Additional Radio Regulations, referred to in Article 12 of the Buenos Aires Convention.

2. Reserves the right to its Government either to accept its association with or to reject its implication in any provisional agreement concluded by the Administrative Council in accordance with provisions of Article 5, paragraph 12 (b) 1, and Article 9, paragraph 1 (g).

XVI

For the State of Israel: The Delegation of the State of Israel cannot accept the reservation made by the Delegations of Afghanistan, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Pakistan, Syria and Yemen concerning Israel and reserves the right of its Government to take any appropriate measure it may deem necessary to safeguard the interests of the State of Israel in the application of this Convention and the Regulations annexed thereto, as far as the above Member countries are concerned.

XVII

For Italy and Austria: Italy and Austria reserve the right to take all steps which they consider necessary to safeguard their interests if the Members or Associate Members do not contribute to the expenses of the Union on the basis of the provisions of the International Telecommunication Convention of Buenos Aires (1952) and if the reservations of other countries could compromise their telecommunication services.

XVIII

For Jordan (Hashemite Kingdom of): The Delegation of Jordan makes the following reservations:

1. Reserves the right of its Government to accept or not to accept the Telephone Regulations, the Telegraph Regulations and the Additional Radio Regulations, referred to in Article 12 of the Buenos Aires Convention.

2. Reserves the right of its Government either to accept its association with or to reject its implication in any provisional agreement concluded by the Administrative Council in accordance with provisions of Article 5, paragraph 12 (b) 1, and Article 9, 1 (f).

XIX

For Mexico: The Mexican Delegation, in signing the International Telecommunication Convention of Buenos Aires, hereby declares:

1. That such signature implies no obligations for its Government with respect to the Telegraph Regulations, Telephone Regulations, or Additional Radio Regulations mentioned in Article 12, Section 2, paragraph (1) and (2) of the said Convention.

2. That it accepts no reservations from any country which, directly or indirectly, might lead to an increase in Mexico's contribution above that laid down in the said Convention.

XX

For Pakistan: The Delegation of Pakistan formally declares that Pakistan does not, by signature of this Convention on its behalf, accept any obligation in respect of the Telephone Regulations referred to in Article 12 of the Buenos Aires Convention.

Furthermore, it reserves the right of its Government to accept or not to accept the provisions of the Convention relating to the I. F. R. B.

XXI

For the Republic of the Philippines: The Republic of the Philippines formally declares upon signing the present Convention that it cannot currently accept any obligations with reference to the Telephone and Telegraph Regulations mentioned in paragraph 2 of Article 12 of that Convention.

XXII

For the People's Republic of Poland: In signing the International Telecommunication Convention of Buenos Aires, the Dele-

gation of the People's Republic of Poland is authorized to make the following statement:

1. The Delegation of the People's Republic of Poland considers that participation of Kuomintang representatives in the Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference, and the grant to them of the right to sign the International Telecommunication Convention, is illegal, since the only legitimate representatives of China are those appointed by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

Participation in the Conference by representatives of Bao-Dai Viet-Nam and of South Korea is likewise illegal, as is the fact that they have been allowed to sign the Convention, since they do not in fact represent Viet-Nam and Korea.

2. The Delegation of the People's Republic of Poland also considers that participation in the Conference by, and the grant of the right to sign the Convention to, the representatives of the Bonn authorities, which do not represent the whole of Germany and hence are not entitled to act on its behalf, is illegal.

The right to sign the Buenos Aires Convention should also be accorded to the representatives of the German Democratic Republic, which is a party to the Atlantic City Convention and a Member of the I. T. U.

3. At the time of signing the International Telecommunication Convention in Buenos Aires, the question of acceptance of the Radio Regulations remains open for the People's Republic of Poland.

4. The Delegation of the People's Republic of Poland cannot agree with the contents of Article 6 of the Buenos Aires Convention, and with the assignment of new duties to the I. F. R. B.

Until such a time as this matter is finally considered and settled at the Ordinary Radio Conference, the People's Republic of Poland leaves open the question of accepting Article 6 of the International Telecommunication Convention of Buenos Aires.

5. The People's Republic of Poland will not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 5, paragraph 12, subparagraph b) 1, if, on the basis of this Article, the Administrative Council concludes any agreements running counter to the interests of the People's Republic of Poland.

6. In signing this International Telecommunication Convention, the Delegation of the People's Republic of Poland reserves for its Government the right to make any future additional reservations which may appear necessary with regard to the Convention and all its annexes, before final ratification thereof by the People's Republic of Poland.

XXIII

For the Federal German Republic: In regard to the reservations of some delegations concerning Germany, the Delegation of the Federal German Republic formally declares that the Government of the Federal German Republic is the only legally constituted Government able to speak in the name of Germany and to represent the German people in international affairs.

XXIV

For the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic: Taking into account the fact that under Article 47 of the Radio Regulations, supplementing the Telecommunication Convention, the entry into force of the most substantial part of those Regulations is made dependent on the decisions to be taken by the future Special Administrative Conference, mentioned in that Article; and bearing in mind that in adoption of the decisions taken in 1951 by the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference (E. A. R. C.), the provisions of Article 47 of the Radio Regulations were infringed and that hence the said E. A. R. C. decisions are illegal; and also considering that the Plenipotentiary Conference (1952), in adopting a resolution according to which those illegal E. A. R. C. decisions are to be considered as replacing the provisions of the Radio Regulations, thereby infringed the provisions of Article 13 of the Telecommunication Convention, relative to the binding character of the Regulations; the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in these circumstances leaves open the question of accepting the provisions of the Telecommunication Convention relative to the International Frequency Registration Board, as also the question of accepting the Radio Regulations.

XXV

For the Roumanian People's Republic: On signing the present Convention on behalf of the Roumanian People's Republic, the Delegation of the Roumanian People's Republic states the following:

1. (1) The Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference has illegally decided to give the right to sign the Telecommunication Convention to the so-called Delegation of China, sent by the Kuomintang.

The only legitimate representatives of China entitled to sign the Telecommunication Convention are the representatives designated by the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic.

(2) The Government of the German Democratic Republic has legally acceded to the Atlantic City Telecommunication Convention, 1947, and is thus a party to the 1947 Telecommunication Convention and enjoys a full Membership of the Union.

The Bonn authorities do not represent Germany as a whole and consequently the decision of the Conference which has given the right of signing the Convention to its representatives is illegal.

(3) The right to sign the Buenos Aires Telecommunication Convention attributed to the representatives of Bao-Dai Viet-Nam and South Korea is illegal since they were sent by puppet governments which do not in reality represent Viet-Nam and Korea.

2. The Plentipotentiary Conference, Buenos Aires, 1952, having violated the procedure established by the Convention in force for the revision of the Regulations, has adopted a resolution in accordance with which the illegal decisions of the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference, 1951—reached in violation of Article 47 of the Radio Regulations annexed to the Convention—replace the provisions of these Regulations.

The Delegation of the Roumanian People's Republic, in these circumstances, reserves the right of its Government to accept or not to accept the Radio Regulations, Article 6 of the Convention and other provisions concerning the I. F. R. B.

It also reserves the right not to take into consideration Resolution No. 30 of the Buenos Aires Plentipotentiary Conference.

XXVI

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northrn Ireland: We declare that our signatures in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland cover the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man, and also cover British East Africa.

XXVII

For Czechoslovakia: On signing the International Telecommunication Convention, the Delegation of Czechoslovakia makes the following formal statement:

1. The presence of the representatives of the Kuomintang at the Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference of the International Telecommunication Union and the signing of the International Telecommunication Convention by the representatives of the Kuomintang on behalf of China are not legal since the only legitimate representatives of China are the representatives designated by the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic.

Czechoslovakia also disputes the right of the representatives of South Korea and Bao-Dai Viet-Nam to sign the present International Telecommunication Convention on behalf of the countries of Korea and Viet-Nam respectively since they do not actually represent those countries.

Czechoslovakia does not accept the signing of the International Telecommunication Convention by the representatives of the Bonn authorities on behalf of the whole of Germany and states that the German Democratic Republic which duly acceded to the International Telecommunication Convention, Atlantic City, 1947, must be regarded as a Member of the International Telecommunication Union as of right.

2. Czechosovakia does not accept the decisions of the Plenipotentiary Conference of the International Telecommunication Union, Buenos Aires, relative to the Agreement of the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference, Geneva, 1951, since these decisions are aimed at legalizing the said Agreement which is in contradiction with Article 47 of the Atlantic City Radio Regulations, 1947, and reserves the right to adhere strictly to Article 47 of those Regulations.

3. Czechoslovakia is not in agreement with the decisions of the Plenipotentiary Conference of the International Telecommunication Union, Buenos Aires, relative to the International Frequency Registration Board and reserves the right to accept or not to accept Article 6 of the International Telecommunication Convention in whole or in part.

XXVIII

For Turkey:

1. In view of the provisions of Article 12 of the New Buenos Aires Convention, I formally declare in the name of my Delegation that the reservations made previously in the name of the Turkish Government with reference to the regulations mentioned in that Article continue to be valid.

2. Upon signing the Final Acts of the Buenos Aires Convention, I formally declare in the name of the Government of the Republic of Turkey, that my Government cannot accept any financial implications resulting from any reservations or counter-reservations that might be made by any Delegation participating in the present Conference.

For the Union of South Africa and the Territory of South-West Africa: The Delegation of the Union of South Africa and the Territory of South-West Africa, declares that the signature of the Union of South Africa and the Territory of South-West Africa to this Convention is subject to the reservation that the Union of South Africa and the Territory of South-West Africa does not agree to be bound by the Telephone Regulations referred to in Article 13 of the Buenos Aires Convention.

XXX

For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Taking into account the fact that under Article 47 of the Radio Regulations, supplementing the Telecommunication Convention, the entry into force of the most substantial part of those Regulations is made dependent on the decisions to be taken by the future Special Administrative Conference, mentioned in that Article; and bearing in mind that in adoption of the decisions taken in 1951 by the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference (E. A. R. C.), the provisions of Article 47 of the Radio Regulations were infringed, and that hence the said E. A. R. C. decisions are illegal; and also considering that the Plenipotentiary Conference (1952), in adopting a resolution according to which those illegal E. A. R. C. decisions are to be considered as replacing the provisions of the Radio Regulations, thereby infringed the provisions of Article 13 of the Telecommunication Convention, relative to the binding character of the Regulations; the Union of Soviet Socialist

Republics in these circumstances leaves open the question of accepting the provisions of the Telecommunication Convention relative to the International Frequency Registration Board, as also the question of accepting the Radio Regulations.

XXXI

For Viet-Nam: In signing the present Convention on behalf of the State of Viet-Nam, the Delegation of Viet-Nam reserves the right of its Government to accept or not to accept:

any obligation deriving from the Telephone Regulations mentioned in Article 12, particularly should those Regulations be extended to the extra-European system;

any provisional agreement concluded by the Administrative Council with international organizations which my Government considers contrary to its interests.

Furthermore, it formally considers as unfounded from the juridical point of view and as in flagrant contradiction with the Convention, the declarations made by the Delegations of:

Bulgaria (People's Republic of)
Hungarian People's Republic
Roumanian People's Republic
Albania (People's Republic of)
Poland (People's Republic of)
The Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic
Czechoslovakia
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

contesting the right of the representative of the Government of Viet-Nam, present in this Assembly, to sign with perfect legality, the International Telecommunication Convention, in conformity with the decision taken by the Plenipotentiary Conference of Buenos Aires.

XXXII

Belgium, Cambodia (Kingdom of), China, Colombia (Republic of), Belgian Congo and Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, Costa Rica, Cuba, Egypt, France, Greece, India (Republic of), Iran, Iraq, Israel (State of), Japan, Jordan (Hashemite Kingdom of), Lebanon, Monaco, Portugal, French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia, Federal German Republic, Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, Sweden, Switzerland (Confederation), Syrian Republic, Overseas Territories of the French Republic and Territories administered as such, Portuguese Oversea Territories, Viet-Nam (State of): The undersigned Delegations declare, in the name of their respective governments, that they accept no consequences for reserves resulting in an increase of their contributory share in the expense of the Union.

Belgium, Cambodia (Kingdom of), China, Colombia (Republic of), Belgian Congo and Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, Costa Rica, Cuba, Egypt, France, Greece, India (Republic of), Iran, Iraq, Israel (State of), Japan, Jordan (Hashemite Kingdom of), Lebanon, Monaco, Portugal, French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia, Federal German Republic, Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, Sweden, Switzerland (Confederation), Syrian Republic, Overseas Territories of the French Republic and Territories administered as such, Portuguese Oversea Territories, Viet-Nam (State of).

XXXIII

For Afghanistan, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Pakistan, Syria, Yemen: The above mentioned Delegations declare that the signature and possible subsequent ratification by their respective Governments to the Buenos Aires Convention, are not valid with respect to the Member appearing in Annex I to this Convention under the name of Israel, and in no way imply its recognition.

XXXIV

For Egypt and Syria: The Delegations of Egypt and Syria declare on behalf of their Governments their disagreement with Article 5, paragraph 12, sub-paragraph b) 1 and with Article 9, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph g), which authorise the Administrative Council to conclude agreements with international organizations on behalf of the Union. Any such agreements which they will consider against their interest shall not be binding on them.

XXXV

For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic: In signing the Telecommunication Convention, the Delegations of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic hereby declare:

1. The decision taken by the Plenipotentiary Conference to grant the Kuomintang representatives the right to sign the Telecommunication Convention is illegal, since the only legal representatives of China are the representatives appointed by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, and they alone are entitled to sign the Telecommunication Convention on behalf of China;

2. The representatives of Bao-Dai Viet-Nam and South Korea do not in reality represent Viet-Nam and Korea; hence their participation in the work of the Plenipotentiary Conference, and the grant to them of the right to sign the Telecommunication Convention on behalf of Viet-Nam and Korea, is illegal;

3. The Government of the German Democratic Republic has acceded to the Telecommunication Convention (Atlantic City, 1947) in accordance with the procedure laid down in Additional Protocol to that Convention, and hence the German Democratic Republic is a party to the Telecommunication Convention of 1947 and a full Member of the I. T. U. The Bonn authorities do not, and cannot, represent the whole of Germany, with the result that signature by their representatives of the Telecommunication Convention adopted by the Plenipotentiary Conference of Buenos Aires, is illegal.

XXXVI

For Australia (Commonwealth of), Canada, China, United States of America, India (Republic of), Iraq, Jordan (Hashemite Kingdom of), Mexico, New Zealand, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: In view of the fact that certain countries have reserved the right to accept or not to accept the provisions of Article 6 of the Convention, the following countries reserve the right to take such measures as may be necessary, where appropriate in conjunction with other Members of the Union, to ensure the proper functioning of the International Frequency Registration Board, should the reserving countries in the future not accept the provisions of Article 6 of the Convention: Australia (Commonwealth of), Canada, China, United States of America, India (Republic of), Iraq, Jordan (Hashemite Kingdom of), Mexico, New Zealand, Netherlands, Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, New Guinea, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

In witness whereof, the respective plenipotentiaries have signed this Final Protocol in each of the Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish languages, in a single copy, which shall remain deposited in the archives of the Government of the Argentine Republic and one copy of which shall be forwarded to each signatory government.

Done at Buenos Aires, 22 December 1952.

[Here follow the signatures for the following countries, territories, and groups of territories: Afghanistan, People's Republic of Albania, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Argentine Republic, Commonwealth of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Bolivia, Brazil, People's Republic Bulgaria, Kingdom of Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Vatican City State, Republic of Colombia, Belgian Congo and Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, Republic of Korea, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Spain, United States of America, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Hungarian People's Republic, India, Republic of Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Iceland, State of Israel, Italy, Japan, Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Kingdom of Laos, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Nicaragua, Norway, New Zealand, Pakistan, Paraguay, Netherlands, Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, New Guinea, Peru, Republic of the Philippines, People's Republic of Poland, Portugal, French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia, Federal German Republic, Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sweden, Swiss Confederation, Syrian Republic, Overseas Territories of the French Republic and Territories administered as such, Portuguese Oversea Territories, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa and Territory of South-West Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Oriental Republic of Uruguay, United States of Venezuela, State of Viet-Nam, Spanish Zone of Morocco and the totality of Spanish Possessions.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the convention.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have a brief statement to place in the RECORD for a background history. The facts are, substantially, these: At Atlantic City, under the leadership of a distinguished former member of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Honorable Wallace White, there was negotiated the original International Telecommunications Convention. That was 5 years ago.

In 1952 a conference was held in Buenos Aires, which led to the conclusion of a new Telecommunications Convention known as the Buenos Aires convention. It is that instrument which is now before the Senate. It differs in no important respect from the Atlantic City convention under which we have been operating since 1948 and which has given rise to no complaints.

The changes in the Atlantic City convention are set forth in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD purely and wholly for background purposes.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GEORGE IN SUPPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS CONVENTION (EXECUTIVE R, 83D CONG.)

On March 1, 1955, the Committee on Foreign Relations, without objection, reported the International Telecommunications Convention to the Senate and recommended that it give its advice and consent to ratification. The action of the committee was taken after an open hearing during which representatives of the executive branch testified in support of the convention. The committee has received no indication whatsoever of opposition to the Telecommunications Convention, which has been before the Senate since July 1953.

With the rapid development of international telegraphic and radio communications in recent years, it has become necessary to

establish regulations to simplify international telecommunications. At Madrid in 1932, and at Cairo in 1938, regulations were adopted relating to the international allocation of radio frequencies. After the war a conference was held at Atlantic City which led to the adoption of the Atlantic City International Telecommunications Convention. The United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate, ratified the Atlantic City Convention in 1948. By that action, we became a member of the International Telecommunications Union (ITU). That Union has responsibility for preparing regulations in the field of radio, telegraph, and telephone in order to facilitate international telecommunications with these facilities.

By way of illustration, regulations with respect to telegraphic communications cover such matters as the method of counting words, the hours of operation, the collection of charges for international messages, the transmission of signals, the handling of special messages, and so forth. In the field of radio, provision is made for the registration of radio frequencies used by facilities in member countries, the receipt of distress calls, and similar matters.

The late Senator White who reported to the Senate in 1948 on the Atlantic City Convention observed that it was no reflection upon the Senate to suggest that the technical details embodied in these regulations were not within the knowledge of the membership. Under those circumstances, the Senate must accept the advice of the technical representatives of this Government and of private agencies with respect to the acceptability of the regulations to American interests.

The convention signed in Atlantic City provided for its reconsideration after 5 years. Thus in 1952, a conference was held in Buenos Aires which led to the conclusion of a new telecommunications convention known as the Buenos Aires Convention. It is that instrument which is before us. It differs in no important respects from the Atlantic City Convention under which we have been operating since 1948 and which has given rise to no complaints. The changes in the Atlantic City Convention made by the Buenos Aires Convention are detailed in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The President in submitting this convention to the Senate recommended that in giving advice and consent to ratification we should do so with two understandings. These understandings are described in the report of the committee.

The first understanding is to make clear that the United States is signing the convention on behalf of all territories of the United States. It was felt this action was necessary so that there would be no doubt but that the United States would retain two votes in the I. T. U., one on behalf of the continental United States and one on behalf of the territories.

The second understanding is for the purpose of indicating that the telephone regulations and certain additional radio regulations are not accepted as applicable to the United States. It was stated by representatives of the executive branch that the telephone regulations, as annexed to the convention, were of principal interest to the European area and not particularly applicable to the United States. If it should seem wise in the future to have these regulations extended to the United States, the committee has been assured that they will be submitted to the Senate for appropriate action.

The committee concluded after hearing testimony in connection with the Buenos Aires Convention that it would be in the interests of the United States to continue its membership in the Telecommunications Union which costs the United States about $130,000 per year.

I hope the Senate will give its advice and consent to the convention.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Foreign Relations Committee found no objection to this convention. It has been unanimously reported, and I think the Senate need not hesitate to approve it. It takes the name of the Buenos Aires Convention because a conference was held there, and our friends in that area of the world wish to be identified with the convention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, without objection, the pending convention will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages, up to the point of the consideration of the resolution of ratification with the understandings.

The clerk will read the resolution of ratification, with the understandings.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive R, 83d Congress, 1st session, the International Telecommunication Convention, with annexes, and the final protocol to the Convention, which were signed at Buenos Aires on December 22, 1952, by the delegates of the United States of America and delegates of other countries represented at the International Telecommnications Conference, Buenos Aires, 1952, with the following understandings:

Ratification of this Convention for and in the name of the United States of America constitutes, in accordance with its constitutional processes, ratification also on behalf of all Territories of the United States of America;

The United States of America does not, by ratification of this Convention on its behalf, accept any obligation in respect of the Telephone Regulations or the Additional Radio Regulations referred to in article 12 of the Buenos Aires Convention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the understandings.

The understandings were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification, with the understandings?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], if present and voting, would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senators from Utah [Mr. BENNETT and Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senators from South Dakota [Mr. CASE and Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], are detained on official business and, if present and voting, would each vote "yea."

I also announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senators from Utah [Mr. BENNETT and Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senators from South Dakota [Mr. CASE and Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 74, nay 1, as follows:

YEAS—74

Allott	Hill	Murray
Anderson	Holland	Neely
Barkley	Hruska	Neuberger
Barrett	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Beall	Ives	Pastore
Bible	Jackson	Payne
Bricker	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Purtell
Clements	Kefauver	Robertson
Cotton	Kilgore	Russell
Curtis	Knowland	Saltonstall
Daniel	Kuchel	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Langer	Scott
Douglas	Lehman	Smathers
Duff	Long	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Mansfield	Sparkman
Flanders	Martin, Iowa	Stennis
Frear	Martin, Pa.	Symington
Fulbright	McCarthy	Thurmond
George	McClellan	Thye
Goldwater	McNamara	Wiley
Gore	Millikin	Williams
Green	Monroney	Young
Hickenlooper	Morse	

NAY—1

Malone

NOT VOTING—21

Aiken	Capehart	Hennings
Bender	Carlson	Jenner
Bennett	Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy
Bridges	Chavez	Kerr
Bush	Eastland	Mundt
Butler	Ervin	Watkins
Byrd	Hayden	Welker

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification, with the understandings, is ageed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the

President be informed that the Senate has advised and consented to the ratification of the convention and protocol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

SALE OF WATER FROM CLARK HILL RESERVOIR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 129, S. 1217.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1217) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to contract with the city of McCormick, S. C., for the sale of water from Clark Hill Reservoir.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1217) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to contract with the city of McCormick, S. C., for the sale of water from Clark Hill Reservoir which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment, on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out:

That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to contract with the city of McCormick, S. C., upon such terms and for such period not to exceed 50 years as he may deem reasonable, for the sale of not to exceed 600 acre-feet of water annually from the Clark Hill Reservoir, and is further authorized to grant to the city of McCormick at no cost an easement over Government lands at Clark Hill for the sole purpose of constructing necessary pipelines and a pumping station to obtain such water.

And insert, in lieu thereof, the following:

That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to contract with the city of McCormick, S. C., for the use of storage space in Clark Hill Reservoir for the purpose of providing said city a regulated water supply in an amount of not to exceed 600 acre-feet annually: *Provided*, That such contract shall provide for repayment of allocable costs in not to exceed 50 years from the date of beginning the use of water, and payments of construction costs shall include interest on unamortized balance at a rate equal to the average rate paid by the United States on long-term loans. He is further authorized to grant to the city of McCormick at no cost an easement over Government lands at Clark Hill for the sole purpose of constructing necessary pipelines and a pumping station to obtain such water.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to contract with the city of McCormick, S. C., for the use of storage space in Clark Hill Reservoir for the purpose of providing said city a regulated water supply in an amount of not to exceed 600 acre-feet annually: *Provided*, That such contract shall provide for repayment of allocable costs in not to exceed 50 years from the date of beginning the use of water, and payments of construction costs shall include interest on unamortized balance at a rate equal to the average rate paid by the United States on long-term loans. He is further authorized to grant to the city of McCormick at no cost an easement over Government lands at Clark Hill for the sole purpose of constructing necessary pipelines and a pumping station to obtain such water.

SEC. 2. The project for Clark Hill Reservoir authorized by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, is hereby modified in accordance with this act.

SEC. 3. All moneys received under any contract authorized by this act shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall affect water rights under State law.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 4436 may be substituted for Senate bill 1217 and be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the House bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4436) relating to the use of storage space in the Clark Hill Reservoir for the purpose of providing the city of McCormick, S. C., a regulated water supply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4436) relating to the use of storage space in the Clark Hill Reservoir for the purpose of providing the city of McCormick, S. C., a regulated water supply.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for an inquiry?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is my understanding correct that the House bill is identical in every particular with the bill reported by the Senate committee?

Mr. THURMOND. It is not identical, but it is very similar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. When the matter was discussed with me by the distinguished majority leader, I conferred with the ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Public Works. I wish to be certain that there is no difference in substance between the House bill and the Senate bill, because the bill I discussed with Members on this side of the aisle was the Senate bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say to the Senator from South Carolina that my understanding with the minority leader was based on the Senate bill. If there is any substantial difference between the Senate bill and the House bill, I hope the Senator from South Carolina will point it out.

Mr. THURMOND. The only changes in the Senate bill are in section 1. I will read them for the information of the Senator from California:

That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to contract with the city of McCormick, S. C., for the use of storage space in Clark Hill Reservoir for the purpose of providing said city a regulated water supply in an amount of not to exceed 600 acre-feet annually: *Provided*, That such contract shall provide for repayment of allocable costs in not to exceed 50 years from the date of beginning the use of water, and payments of construction costs shall include interest on unamortized balance at a rate equal to the average rate paid by the United States on long-term loans He is further authorized to grant to the city of McCormick at no cost an easement over Government lands at Clark Hill for the sole purpose of constructing necessary pipelines and a pumping station to obtain such water.

The bill will cost the Government no money. At the same time, a critical shortage of water in the area concerned, caused by a recent drought in the Southeast, will be alleviated. It is imperative that the measure be acted upon swiftly in order that the additional water may be supplied to the city, and in order to prevent a shutdown by a large cotton mill, upon which the entire community is dependent.

It is for that reason that I have asked unanimous consent that the House bill, which was passed by the House on Wednesday, be substituted for Senate bill 1217. The bills are very similar, and the House bill will serve the same purpose. By substituting H. R. 4436, further delay in securing final action on this measure can be obviated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is a little difficult to understand what is involved by the amendment just read. The only assurance I wish to have from the Senator from South Carolina is that the language of the House bill has the approval of the various Government agencies which may have been consulted about the Senate bill, even though there be no change in substance from the Senate bill.

Mr. THURMOND. The Corps of Engineers, with whom the city of McCormick, S. C., has contracted, has approved the bill identically as passed by the House, as has the Secretary of the Army.

The Bureau of the Budget recommended some little change in wording, that is the only difference between the two bills. There is no difference of any importance; merely a slight change in wording which was suggested by the Budget Bureau.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 4436) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1217 is indefinitely postponed.

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, MR. ERIC SEVAREID, AND FORMOSA

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the purpose of this intrusion upon the time and patience of the Senate is to confess judgment on my long overdue debt of unlimited gratitude to the Columbia Broadcasting System for its nightly contribution of the matchless analysis and interpretation of the news by the eminent Mr. Eric Sevareid. In my opinion, he is one of the three most sagacious,

logical, eloquent, and felicitous of American radio commentators. In his daily broadcasts he habitually demonstrates complete conformity with Mark Twain's monitory observation that the difference between the "almost right" word and the "right" word is the difference between the lightning bug and the lightning. In corroboration of the foregoing appraisal of Mr. Sevareid, his typical broadcast of the 3d of March is presented to the Senate. It is as follows:

Good evening. There is an old story about Lord Wellington inspecting his new recruits on the battlefield. He said to an associate, "I don't know if they frighten the enemy, but gad sir, they frighten me."

At the moment we are witnessing a somewhat analagous picture in our China policy. It is now a month since the President's declaration on the Formosa Straits; the attempts to clarify it, so-called, have gone on every day until it is now probably fair to say that whether or not these clarifications confuse the Chinese enemy, they are most surely confusing the American people.

Item one: Some days ago Secretary Dulles said we would not move in to defend the offshore islands, as such, but implied we would reserve the right to do so if an attack on them was part of a campaign for Formosa itself. This left our intentions about those islands unclear, but privately here in Washington it was said repeatedly that unless the Reds previously guaranteed a cease-fire in the straits, an attack on the offshores could not be construed, in military terms, as anything but a first step to Formosa; therefore, we would have to help defend them. Corollary to this was the understanding, made quite clear behind the scenes, that if the Reds did guarantee a cease-fire in the region, we would have no choice but to get the Nationalists out of those islands to avoid perpetual threat of a broken armistice. Realistically then, the offshores would be part of the price for a cease-fire.

But item two comes today from Formosa: Dispatches saying Mr. Dulles has assured Chiang that the offshores will not be pawns in a cease-fire negotiation. Dulles' associates there, however, simultaneously tell the reporters that we would consider abandoning the offshores if that could guarantee peace in Asia; so, they are pawns again, only in a much larger deal, involving all of Asia; but then the thing really gets complicated; they would be surrendered, in return for peace, only if the Nationalists themselves agreed. That is something new.

Item three developed yesterday at the President's news conference, when he was asked if we would give any help to a Nationalist attempt to invade mainland China. He said the United States is not going to be a party to an aggressive war.

Well, that statement resulted in more confusion, including contradictory interpretations by Members of Congress. Some took it to mean that a Chiang attempt to fight into the mainland would be regarded as aggression by us. If that is so, it seemed to mean we regard the Communist regime as the rightful government of China proper. Senator HUMPHREY, for one, assumed this is correct and that America has now adopted the official view that two legal Chinas exist. That could lead to all kinds of things, including recognition of Red China's right to be in the U. N. But others thought the President did not mean this, at all, that he simply meant we reserve the right, after the fact, to decide what is aggression and what is not.

Suppose, after all, that Red China started general war, in Korea, in Vietnam, against Formosa; to use the Nationalist troops to counter this would not necessarily be aggression.

The list of confusing "clarifications" could be extended. The realities remain: We will defend the offshores this side of a cease fire; the other side of one, we will try to get the Nationalists out of them. And we will not permit or aid Chiang to try to invade the mainland. Yesterday the President said he thought the whole thing had been discussed so thoroughly there could be no misunderstanding. The trouble is that officials have made everything clear in private, but not in public.

In public they have tried to keep the enemy guessing. A good case can be made for that; but the price of it must always be, and is today, that you keep your own people guessing, too.

This is Eric Sevareid in Washington.

Mr. Sevareid, bless you and the Columbia Broadcasting System! may you both live a thousand years,
To sort of keep things lively in this vale of human tears;
And may I live a thousand, too—no, a thousand less a day,
For I shouldn't like to be on earth to hear that either of you had passed away.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE CANADIAN PARLIAMENT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States is deeply honored today to have present on the floor of the Senate six members of the Canadian Parliament. Their names are: H. A. Bryson, Tisdale, Saskatchewan; Scotty Brice, Selkirk, Manitoba; Ed McCullock, Moose Mountain, Saskatchewan; Hazen Argue, Assiniboia, Saskatchewan; Claude Ellis, Regina, Saskatchewan; G. K. Caseldon, Yorkton, Saskatchewan.

These gentlemen have been members of the Canadian Parliament for a long time. I am going to ask that they stand in order that Senators may see and greet them. I hope the Members of the Senate will shake hands with these distinguished representatives of our neighbors to the North. They are from provinces located directly north of Minnesota and North Dakota. I know the gentlemen will be delighted to shake hands with Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is glad to welcome our distinguished guests from Canada and, of course, Senators may greet them on the floor.

THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on March 23, 1955, 16 Senators joined with me in presenting to the Finance Committee suggestions for 3 proposed amendments to H. R. 1, the reciprocal trade agreements bill, and I had previously appeared before the committee, on March 17, to present our reasons for seeking such changes in H. R. 1.

My colleagues in advocating these amendments to the committee, which we requested the committee to adopt as its own, were Senators ERVIN, SPARKMAN, HILL, PURTELL, AIKEN, PASTORE, STENNIS, SCOTT, GREEN, BRIDGES, COTTON, PAYNE, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, DANIEL, SMITH of Maine, and FLANDERS.

I now ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement containing some information relating to this joint proposal made on behalf of my colleagues and myself.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THURMOND

THE AMENDMENTS

1. On page 4, line 13; page 6, line 20; page 6, line 22; page 7, line 10; and page 10, line 9: Strike out the word "July" and insert in lieu thereof the word "January."

2. On page 4, line 14: Strike out line 14 through line 25 on page 4 and line 1 through line 2 on page 5 and renumber clause "(iii)" on page 5, line 3 as "(ii)."

3. On page 5, line 24: Strike out the subparagraph lettered "(E)" in its entirety.

Basically, all three amendments are aimed at the same objective: To make the bill what its proponents advertise it to be—a 3-year extension of the President's authority to enter into trade agreements, with new power to cut existing tariff rates by up to 5 percent during each of the next 3 years. Actually, as passed by the House, H. R. 1 makes it possible to cut existing tariff rates on cotton textiles by as much as 57½ percent.

AMENDMENT NO. 1

The House bill sets July 1, 1955, as the base date for figuring tariff reductions under its 15-percent duty cutting authority. But between now and that date, rates subject to change in the current tariff negotiations at Geneva may be cut by amounts ranging up to 50 percent. Some 90 percent of the cotton textile industry's production is subject to possible tariff reductions at Geneva of 50 percent. No one knows what cotton textile tariff rates will be on next July 1. Other major industries are not involved in the Geneva negotiations to a comparable extent and so know what their tariffs will be on July 1 and hence can calculate the effect of H. R. 1 on them. Amendment No. 1 is designed to correct this inequity by changing the base date from July 1, 1955 to January 1, 1955.

AMENDMENT NO. 2

The provision in H. R. 1 authorizing the President, through trade agreements, to cut by as much as 50 percent the tariff rates of January 1, 1945, on these items being imported not at all or in negligible quantities is vast in its scope, although little publicity has been given this section of the bill. Under such provision, for example, practically all textile tariff rates might well fall.

Who is to determine what is a negligible quantity? And even if this provision is strictly interpreted by the administrators of H. R. 1, is it not quite possible, nevertheless, that a cut of 50 percent in such rates will lead to a tenfold expansion in imports of the items involved?

Amendment No. 2 is designed to correct this inequity by eliminating this provision from the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 3

The general rule in H. R. 1 grants authority to reduce existing duties by 15 percent (5 percent per year) but an exception is made in sub-paragraph (E) of section 3 (a). It authorizes the President on and after June 12, 1955, to reduce duties by 50 percent of those existing on January 1, 1945, on those articles which are on the list of items being negotiated with Japan at Geneva.

The principal industry now being negotiated at Geneva is the textile industry and, by and large, the whole 50 percent reduction is available. It is unfair to segregate an industry which is unfortunate enough to be currently on the bargaining table and authorize a much greater cut in its duties than

is allowed for the rest of the American industry.

The exception goes even further, however, than merely discriminating in the amount of reductions. Subparagraph (E) contains a different test to guide the President. It grants authority to reduce rates by 50 percent "if the President determines that such decrease is necessary in order to provide expanding export markets for products of Japan (including such markets in third countries)."

It is apparent that the test of subparagraph (E) is designed exclusively to aid Japan without reference to the welfare of our domestic industry and hence is contrary to the general principles of this legislation. As a matter of statutory construction, the specific controls the general. It is patently obvious that decreases in our duties would provide expanding export markets for the products of Japan. It can also be argued that this special test in subparagraph (E) nullifies both the "escape" and "peril-point" provisions of the current act and leaves the textile industry exposed to great damage and unemployment.

Amendment No. 3 is designed to correct this inequity by striking the provision from the bill.

ADMISSION CHARGE TO HOME WHERE LINCOLN DIED—THE LINCOLN MUSEUM

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, 90 years ago on the 14th of this month, millions were gladdened by the thought that the tragedy of an unfortunate controversy was at an end. The day was one of brilliant sunshine, and the whole Nation was thankful; but in the midst of this great thanksgiving, suddenly came the awful news that the President of our Republic, Abraham Lincoln, loved and honored as few men ever were, had been foully murdered. There was a change from great joy to deep sorrow.

We recall the forgiveness of Lincoln; we remember that he always sent forth the flag with every one of its stars intact in the field. He had saved the Union; he asked that we "bind up the Nation's wounds," and that "this Government of the people, by the people, and for the people must not perish from the earth."

It was the great Kentuckian, Henry Watterson, who said:

> But let no Southern man point finger at me because I canonize Abraham Lincoln, for he was the one friend we had at court when friends were most in need; he was the one man in power who wanted to preserve us intact, to save us from the wolves of passion and plunder that stood at our door.

Ninety years ago, a few yards from this Senate Chamber, the body of the martyred Lincoln lay underneath the dome of the Capitol. Again to quote Henry Watterson:

> I see him lying dead there in the Capitol of the Nation, to which he had rendered "the last full measure of his devotion," the flag of his country around him, the world in mourning; and asking myself how could any man have hated that man, I ask you, how can any man refuse his homage to his memory?

Mr. President, Henry Watterson asked how any man could refuse homage to Abraham Lincoln's memory. I regret, Mr. President, that there is one man who, in official capacity, can refuse this homage; I refer to the ticket taker who demands 10 cents from those who wish to bow their heads in silent prayer in the room where Lincoln died.

Mr. President, is 10 cents so important to us that we must make a dime museum of that historic spot? Mr. President, I have sat on the floor of the Senate when, without a moment's hesitation, we have appropriated for various purposes millions and millions of dollars. May I remind the Members of the Senate that for each million it would take the contributions of 10 million children, at 10 cents each, to make that amount.

When the body of the martyred Lincoln lay underneath the dome of the Capitol, thousands upon thousands of grieving Americans passed by his bier. Suppose a ticket seller had then been at the door of the Capitol, collecting 10 cents from each of the grieving persons who entered. How humiliated all Americans would have been. Such a situation is little different, Mr. President, from the one we have today, when a ticket seller stands at the home where Lincoln died, to collect 10 cents from each of the conscientious, inspired Americans who visit that historic place. One of the saddest sights I have ever seen was the bewildered face of a little boy, motivated by the highest of ideals, who—because he did not have 10 cents—was turned away from the door of the home where Lincoln died.

Nearly a year ago, I introduced a joint resolution, which was passed and was signed by the President, calling on the Department of the Interior to estimate what it would cost to restore the stage and boxes and scenery of Ford's Theater as it was 90 years ago when the tragedy occurred. The disappointment of visitors in seeing only a warehouse museum is acute; and certainly their impression of that tragic scene would be formalized if they could see a reconstruction of the stage and the box where Lincoln sat, his chair, the torn flag which caught the boot of the assassin, and the door through which the murderer peered on the fatal night. That, Mr. President, was a mandate of Congress; yet it has been treated with contempt by the Department of the Interior. The Department has not even replied. I think it would be appropriate on the 90th anniversary of the death of Lincoln, to rebuke the officials of the Department of the Interior for ignoring that mandate of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, let this be a day of dedication to a great memory. Let us respect the dignity of patriotic Americans. Let us open the doors of these shrines.

ALLEGATIONS OF CORRUPT CONDITIONS IN THE MANAGEMENT OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT ENTERPRISES IN ALASKA

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, late in 1953, and throughout the early part of 1954, congressional committees were raising serious questions regarding possible corrupt conditions existing at the management level of certain Government enterprises in the Territory of Alaska.

In this connection, I received a specific allegation to the effect that Mr. John P. Johnson, as General Manager of the Alaskan Railroad, had been involved in some of these irregularities. The report was that Mr. Johnson in his official capacity had used his position to divert business to companies in which he had a specific interest or control.

In this connection, on April 2, 1954, I submitted to the Honorable Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, the substance of this allegation, and asked that the charges be investigated, and that I be advised as to their conclusions. At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD my letter of April 2, 1954, addressed to Mr. Young, and his replies thereto of April 20 and May 14, 1954.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1954.

Hon. PHILIP YOUNG,
Chairman, Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. YOUNG: The following is an excerpt from a letter which I have just received and I would appreciate your investigating the charge and advising me as to your findings:

"J. P. Johnson, who was the general manager of the Alaska Railroad (under Interior) from January 1946 to June 1953 was fired after the Republican victory on the basis of all types of corruption and mismanagement of the railroad. Throughout his term of office he was investigated numerous times by the FBI and at one time came close to grand jury indictment. All the occasions mentioned were whitewashed by the Democrats in the Interior Department from Oscar Chapman down to James Davis who was head of Territories and Island possessions. When the Republicans came into power Johnson was ousted after considerable effort by party leaders up here.

"In dismissing him after his repudiation, discredit, and disgrace, the holdovers in Government arranged a neat little plan to perpetuate Johnson on the public payroll as a pensioner when he reaches the age of eligibility. He was actually fired from office on June 1, 1953 but carried on the payroll until August 1, 1953 under the false premise of going to Washington on Government business. In reality he went to Washington to make connections for another job obtained through contacts in the Internationl Bank for Reconstruction and Development formerly headed by a crony, General Wheeler. According to local reports Johnson was then to be placed on 'terminal leave,' which he certainly never earned, until October 1953, to 'round out' a certain period of time that would make him eligible for a proportionate pension at the attained age. This is sheer manipulation and dishonesty to favor a man who is now a fugitive from justice.

"On September 26, 1953, Johnson was indicted by a secret grand jury on nine counts and is now in Bogotá, Colombia, on a fat job secured through a quasi-Government agency, that lends taxpayers' money, in part, to participating countries. A current session of the grand jury is endeavoring to change indictments to make them extraditable so he can be brought to trial. In the meantime it is believed here on the railroad that the machinery has been set in motion to assure

this miscreant a partial pension after he has been discredited by the Government which he expects to contribute to his support by pension at some later date."

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

UNITED STATES
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1954.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate:

I have carefully read your letter of April 2 in regard to the case of John P. Johnson, formerly general manager of the Alaska Railroad.

The retirement record shows Mr. Johnson was first appointed Assistant General Manager of the Alaska Railroad on November 21, 1945, and was promoted to General Manager on January 1, 1946, resigning October 27, 1953. At the time of his separation he had completed 7 years, 8 months, and 17 days of service. Under the terms of the Retirement Act he had title to annuity upon his attainment of age 62 after 5 years of service. However, all service beyond the minimum of 5 years will increase his annuity rate.

On the basis of the present record he will be entitled to a life annuity of $3,012 a year commencing January 1, 1964. He was born on January 1, 1902. This computation of his annuity includes in addition to his service with the Alaska Railroad, 4 years and 1 month unverified military service.

The facts surrounding Mr. Johnson's separation have not been submitted to the Commission by the Alaska Railroad. However, based upon the retirement record, it appears that title to annuity was not the primary consideration in continuing him in service on leave without pay from August 7 to October 27, 1953.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP YOUNG,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1954.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: As I indicated in my letter of April 20, our record of Mr. John P. Johnson's Federal service is confined to the individual retirement record for him certified to us by the Alaska Railroad. In response to your letter of May 6, the details of Mr. Johnson's service history as shown by this retirement record are recited below:

Nature of action	Position and grade	Basic pay, per annum	Effective date	Department and official station
Executive appointment	Assistant general manager	$7,500	Nov. 21, 1945	Alaska R. R., Anchorage.
Promotion	General manager	14,400	Jan. 1, 1946	Do.
Do	do	18,000	Nov. 1, 1949	Do.
Leave without pay			Aug. 7, 1953	Do.
Resignation			Oct. 27, 1953	Do.

U. S. Army Oct. 10, 1941, to Nov. 30, 1945 (not verified).

The information you request on any lump-sum accumulated annual leave payment Mr. Johnson may have received is not of record in this Commission. Such matters are handled by the particular employing agency and the records are maintained accordingly. The facts you desire in this regard may be obtained from Mr. Paul Shelmerdine, Director of Personnel, the Alaska Railroad, Anchorage, Alaska.

No verification is being made of Mr. Johnson's claimed military service at this time. As a general rule in this type of case, we do not put ourselves and other agencies to the expense involved in securing the official record of such alleged service and in determining its retirement creditability, until the potential annuitant files formal claim for his annuity at age 62. If verification shows Mr. Johnson's military service to have been active, honorable service, not forming the basis for certain types of military retired pay, it will count toward retirement. In such case his annuity at 62, based on present service will be as previously stated—approximately $3,012 per year. Should it develop that the military time is not creditable toward retirement, Mr. Johnson's annuity at 62 would be based on his civilian service only. On present service his annuity in such case would be about $1,968 per year commencing January 1, 1964.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP YOUNG,
Chairman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, while Mr. Young submitted information regarding Mr. Johnson's employment record and retirement credits, he suggested that information regarding Mr. Johnson's official conduct be obtained from Mr. Paul Shelmerdine, director of personnel, the Alaska Railroad, Anchorage, Alaska.

Accordingly, on May 17, 1954, I directed an inquiry to Mr. Shelmerdine; and on July 30, 1954, I received a reply to certain of the questions raised in my inquiry, along with the suggestion that further information should be requested from the Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD my letter of May 17, 1954, addressed to Mr. Paul Shelmerdine, director of personnel, the Alaska Railroad; and his reply thereto of July 30, 1954.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1954.

Mr. PAUL SHELMERDINE,
Director of Personnel,
The Alaska Railroad,
Anchorage, Alaska.

DEAR MR. SHELMERDINE: Mr. John P. Johnson resigned as general manager of the Alaska Railroad on October 27, 1953. Will you please advise me:

1. Did Mr. Johnson upon his separation or just prior thereto receive a lump-sum payment for accumulated annual leave?

(a) If so, please give the date and amount.

2. Was Mr. Johnson's separation voluntary?

3. Was there any investigation conducted as to his official activities?

(a) If so, please furnish a report of the allegations and the conclusions of such investigation.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
THE ALASKA RAILROAD,
Anchorage, Alaska, July 30, 1954.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Will you please refer to your letter of May 17, 1954 concerning Col. John P. Johnson, formerly General Manager of the Alaska Railroad.

We regret that so much time has elapsed before replying to your communication; however, the press of our intensely busy summer season, along with Secretary McKay's official inspection tour of the Territory, has precluded our replying sooner.

With respect to your specific inquiries concerning Colonel Johnson, please be advised that on June 4, 1953, Colonel Johnson tendered his resigation to become effective October 21, 1953. Colonel Johnson had accumulated a total of 27 days annual leave, and on July 1, 1953, he started on this annual leave, which carried him through until August 6, 1953, for which period he was paid a total of $1,868.40 annual leave. Starting August 7, 1953 and continuing through to October 21, 1953, Colonel Johnson was on leave without pay from the Alaska Railroad.

With respect to your inquiries concerning whether or not Colonel Johnson's separation was voluntary and whether or not there was any investigation conducted as to his official activities, wish to advise that we do not have this information available at Anchorage, and would suggest that inquiry be made of the Department of Interior in Washington, D. C.

Sincerely yours,

F. E. KALBAUGH,
General Manager.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, Mr. Shelmerdine in his reply suggested that I contact the Washington office of the Department of the Interior for this information; however, I had already, under date of May 6, 1954, directed an inquiry to the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; and on June 22, 1954, I received a reply signed by Mr. William C. Strand, Director of the Office of Territories in the Interior Department.

Mr. Strand suggested that the information I requested should be obtained from the Department of Justice. I am not incorporating into the RECORD my correspondence with the Interior Department, since the information furnished duplicates that which had already been received from the Civil Service Commission.

Accordingly, on July 12, 1954, I directed an inquiry to the Honorable Herbert Brownell, Jr., the Attorney General, and outlined to him these allegations as to irregular activities on the part of Mr. John P. Johnson. The Attorney General's attention was called to the report that as far back as January 17, 1949, Mr. Johnson had been under intensive investigation on serious charges, and that both the then Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Krug, and Attorney General Clark had been advised, but that apparently no action had been taken. In fact, Mr. Johnson had received a $3,600 increase in salary a few months after this investigation was dropped.

In the same letter I mentioned the fact that Mr. Elroy Hinman, an assistant to Mr. Johnson, had already been indicted on charges of bribery and fraud, and that the rumor was that a similar sealed indictment had been returned against Mr. Johnson, who by this time was out of the country.

On July 28, 1954, I received from the Department of Justice a reply signed by Mr. Warren Olney, III, Assistant Attorney General, confirming the fact that

Mr. Hinman, the assistant to Mr. Johnson, had been indicted by the Federal Grand Jury in Anchorage, Alaska. He also confirmed that since 1949, three separate FBI investigations had been conducted regarding Mr. Johnson's activities, but that while nothing had been done with the FBI report, they had no proof of improper interference.

In answer to the question regarding the sealed indictment pending against Mr. Johnson, or what other action had been taken, Mr. Olney replied:

The Criminal Division is not aware whether Interior Department took administrative action upon receipt of copies of the FBI reports concerning these 1949 allegations. Upon completion of the 1949 FBI investigation, the Criminal Division evaluated the evidence presented by the FBI and concurred with Mr. Cooper in his decision that prosecution was not warranted and the Alaska Katmalite stock matter was accordingly considered closed. The Criminal Division file also reflects that the FBI in July 1953 commenced a wide scale investigation of additional charges different from the 1949 allegations mentioned above. That investigation has not been concluded.

We are informed Johnson is in Bogotá, Colombia, which presents apparent difficulties. The problem is, however, receiving active consideration by the United States attorney at Anchorage, Alaska, and in this office.

This week, under date of March 29, I received from Mr. Olney a supplementary report in which he now confirms that a sealed indictment had been pending against Mr. John P. Johnson since September 15, 1953.

Mr. Olney explains that the reason this indictment was kept secret was that the defendant, Mr. Johnson, had left the country, and was understood to be in Bogotá, Colombia, South America; and the Department had withheld publication of the indictment in the hope that he would return to the United States. However, since the trial of Mr. Hinman, former assistant to Mr. Johnson, is scheduled in the near future, the information regarding the indictment has been released.

Mr. Johnson's indictment involves several charges that he had improperly used the prestige of his office to award contracts to companies with which he was a substantial beneficiary.

Specifically these indictments were as follows:

The indictment returned September 15, 1953, charges John P. Johnson with violating section 434 of title 18, United States Code. Section 434 makes it a felony for an officer or agent of the United States, in the scope of his employment, to transact business on behalf of the United States with any firm of which he is an officer or agent, or in the profits or contracts of which he has a pecuniary interest. The indictment alleges that in 1950 and 1951, at Anchorage, Alaska, John P. Johnson, General Manager of the Alaska Railroad, was a stockholder in the Houston Coal Mining Co., then being operated by the Duck Flat Co. under a contract by which Houston received royalty payments on all coal mined by Duck Flat. Counts 1 and 2 charge that on or about November 15, 1950, and July 6, 1951, Johnson, acting as General Manager of the Alaska Railroad, negotiated for and approved contracts between the Alaska Railroad and the Duck Flat Co. for the purchase of quantities of coal and that as a stockholder in the Houston Coal Mining Co., Johnson had a pecuniary interest in the contracts awarded to Duck Flat. The remaining 7 counts allege that on several dates between April 6 and July 24, 1951, the defendant, under the circumstances and in the capacity above-stated, negotiated for and approved the leasing or furnishing to the Duck Flat Co. of various items to be used in the operation of the coal mine, including a bulldozer, four Reo trucks, a Turnapull unit, a single roll primary crusher, a cookstove, and a flatcar for use as a freight depot at the mine, and other miscellaneous items of mining equipment.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD my letter of July 12, 1954, addressed to the Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, along with the 2 letters referred to above, signed by Mr. Warren Olney III, under dates of July 28, 1954, and March 29, 1955.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., July 12, 1954.

Hon. HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,
The Attorney General,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL: Under date of May 6, 1954, I placed an inquiry with the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, regarding certain allegations as to irregular activities on the part of Mr. John P. Johnson, former General Manager of the Alaskan Railroad. On June 22, 1954, I received a reply, signed by Mr. William C. Strand, Director, Office of Territories, Department of the Interior, in which he confirmed that an investigation had been started by their Department on the allegations to which I referred but that they had withdrawn at the Justice Department's request, at which time the FBI took over the investigation. Mr. Strand therefore suggested that I contact you for the information which I am seeking.

The story as I received it is that in 1948 or early in 1949 the FBI began an investigation of certain allegations regarding the activities of John P. Johnson which had been called to the attention of the Department of Justice. On January 17, 1949, allegedly, Mr. Julius A. Krug, then Secretary of the Interior, directed a confidential letter to the then Attorney General Tom C. Clark, the substance of which was to insist upon his stopping the investigation and allowing the Department of the Interior to conduct it. Apparently this was agreed to, and the investigation was stopped in Justice; I find no record of its having been picked up by Interior at that time.

Apparently these charges were ignored until April 15, 1953, at which time the Department of the Interior began their investigation; however, this investigation was suspended on May 11, 1953, on the basis that the Interior investigators had received notice that the FBI was also investigating the same charges.

A part of the charges were that Mr. Johnson while serving as the manager of the railroad had a financial interest in a coal-mining corporation which was mining an inferior grade of coal, but as the manager of the railroad he lowered the standards of procurement and diverted the railroad's business to this corporation. Another charge was that Mr. Johnson allowed this coal-mining corporation with which he was connected to store their coal in the freight cars owned by the railroad without any demurrage charges being made. Allegedly Mr. Johnson had financial interests in several other companies doing business with the railroad, including the Northern Stevedore Corp. He was also alleged to have padded the payrolls of the Alaskan Railroad. There was a question that Mr. Johnson might have been connected with a housing project along with Mr. Kenneth Kadow; however, that allegation was rather vague in my records.

Mr. Johnson resigned from the Department of the Interior effective October 21, 1953. It is my understanding that the assistant to Mr. Johnson, Mr. Elroy Hinman, has been indicted on charges of bribery and fraud and that a similar indictment, but sealed, was returned against Mr. Johnson but that nothing further has as yet been done. Mr. Johnson is now out of the country.

Will you please advise me:

1. Whether or not an investigation was made by your department?

a. If so, the conclusions reached.

2. Did Mr. Krug in 1949 arrange with Attorney General Clark to stop the investigation on substantially these same charges?

3. What further action is contemplated by the Department of Justice at this time?

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., July 28, 1954.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This refers to your letter of June 11, 1954, requesting information concerning an indictment returned against Elroy F. Hinman, formerly auditor and assistant to the general manager of the Alaska Railroad, and to your letter of July 12, 1954, concerning John P. Johnson, formerly general manager of the Alaska Railroad.

I shall reply first to your inquiries concerning Mr. Hinman. United States Attorney William T. Plummer, Anchorage, Alaska, informs us that an indictment alleging four counts of violation of 18 U. S. C. 434 against Hinman was returned by the grand jury on March 31, 1954.

That indictment charges that Mr. Hinman, while a Government officer, transacted Government business with private business firms known as Houston Coal Mining Co. and Duck Flat Co., in which concerns Mr. Hinman allegedly had a direct or indirect pecuniary interest by reason of ownership of approximately $500 worth of stock. A trial date has not yet been set for tactical reasons suggested by the United States attorney and concurred in by this office.

With respect to your inquiries concerning Mr. Johnson, we wish to advise that three separate FBI investigations of Johnson were conducted in 1949, 1952, and 1953–54. Enclosed is a copy of the Krug letter of January 17, 1949, adverted to in the second paragraph of your letter of July 12, 1954, to this Department, which we obtained from Interior Department. A careful examination of the criminal division file in this matter discloses no apparent hindrance to or interference with the Federal Bureau of Investigation in its 1949 investigation into the alleged receipt by Johnson of Alaska Katmalite stock. Further, that upon the completion of such FBI investigation the then United States Attorney J. Earl Cooper declined to prosecute for bribery because the investigation failed to disclose evidence that Johnson's judgment was influenced within the proof requirements of 18 U. S. C. 202.

The Criminal Division is not aware whether Interior Department took administrative action upon receipt of copies of the FBI reports concerning these 1949 allegations. Upon completion of the 1949 FBI investigation, the Criminal Division evaluated the evidence presented by the FBI and concurred with Mr. Cooper in his decision that prosecution was not warranted and the Alaska Katmalite stock matter was accord-

ingly considered closed. The Criminal Division file also reflects that the FBI in July 1953 commenced a wide-scale investigation of additional charges different from the 1949 allegations mentioned above. That investigation has not been concluded.

We are informed Johnson is in Bogotá, Colombia, which presents apparent difficulties. The problem is, however, receiving active consideration by the United States attorney at Anchorage, Alaska, and in this office. I trust that the foregoing answers your questions as fully as I may in a pending matter.

Sincerely,

WARREN OLNEY III,
Assistant Attorney General.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1955.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to your letter of July 12, 1954, and our partial reply of July 28, 1954, relative to alleged irregularities on the part of John P. Johnson, former general manager, Alaska Railroad, Anchorage, Alaska.

This office on March 22, 1955, received a telegram from United States Attorney William T. Plummer, Anchorage, Alaska, stating that there had just been unsealed an indictment against John P. Johnson which was returned by a Federal grand jury in Anchorage on September 15, 1953, and impounded by order of the United States district judge. The order of secrecy imposed upon the indictment by the court made it impossible for this office to make a full reply to your inquiry of July 12, 1954, but since the indictment has now been unsealed we take this first possible occasion to respond more fully to your letter.

The indictment returned September 15, 1953, charges John P. Johnson with violating section 434 of Title 18, United States Code. Section 434 makes it a felony for an officer or agent of the United States, in the scope of his employment, to transact business on behalf of the United States with any firm of which he is an officer or agent, or in the profits or contracts of which he has a pecuniary interest. The indictment alleges that in 1950 and 1951, at Anchorage, Alaska, John P. Johnson, general manager of the Alaska Railroad, was a stockholder in the Houston Coal Mining Co., then being operated by the Duck Flat Co. under a contract by which Houston received royalty payments on all coal mined by Duck Flat. Counts 1 and 2 charge that on or about November 15, 1950, and July 6, 1951, Johnson, acting as general manager of the Alaska Rrailroad, negotiated for and approved contracts between the Alaska Railroad and the Duck Flat Co. for the purchase of quantites of coal and that as a stockholder in the Houston Coal Mining Co. Johnson had a pecuniary interest in the contracts awarded to Duck Flat. The remaining 7 counts allege that on several dates between April 6 and July 24, 1951, the defendant, under the circumstances and in the capacity above stated, negotiated for and approved the leasing or furnishing to the Duck Flat Co. of various items to be used in the operation of the coal mine, including a bulldozer, 4 Reo trucks, a Turnapull unit, a single roll primary crusher, a cook stove, and a flatcar for use as a freight depot at the mine, and other miscellaneous items of mining equipment.

This indictment was requested to be impounded because the defendant was then understood to be in Bogotá, Colombia, South America, and it was thought advisable not to publicize it until his return to the United States. The defendant, however, has not returned to this country, and apparently has no present intention of returning. The offenses alleged are not ones for which the defendant can be extradited. It has therefore been decided to unseal the indictment and to take such steps as are properly available to effect the defendant's return to answer the charges. These steps are now being taken. It is desired that the Johnson case be tried together with a companion case against Elroy F. Hinman, former assistant to the general manager of the Alaska Railroad, which has been set for trial in Anchorage, Alaska, on May 23, 1955.

We regret the necessity for the delay in submitting the foregoing information to you and trust that it answers your inquiry.

Sincerely,

WARREN OLNEY III,
Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I commend Mr. Olney, the Assistant Attorney General, for the efficient manner in which he has handled this case. From this correspondence, it is evident that the present Department of Justice began investigating this case soon after taking office, and it is apparent that they have continued to follow through in an aggressive manner.

Under normal circumstnaces, with an indictment's having been returned by a Federal grand jury against Mr. Johnson, I would not be commenting on this case in the Senate; however, the present situation is that Mr. Johnson has apparently "skipped the country" and remained out of the United States for the past 18 months in an effort to avoid prosecution.

I fully respect the presumed innocence of anyone until after he has actually been convicted in the courts; however, in Mr. Johnson's case the presumption of guilt will stand until he returns to the United States and stands trial in answer to these charges involving his conduct as a public official. Any man who has held such a highly responsible position with the United States Government should recognize this responsibility. However, since Mr. Johnson has not, I thought the matter should be called to the attention of the Senate, with the suggestion that the appropriate congressional committee having jurisdiction over our Alaskan affairs give it their attention. With both of the former top officials of the government-owned Alaska Railroad now under indictment, question might well arise as to what loss the Government sustained as a result of their corrupt acts and mismanagement.

There is another phase to this report upon which I wish to comment; that is the eligibility of Mr. Johnson to draw retirement from a Government fund upon reaching the age of 62, notwithstanding the fact that he may never return to the United States for trial.

Last year I was a cosponsor of legislation which repealed retirement benefits for any Government employee convicted of treason, bribery, and certain other crimes while in public office. However, under the present law, should Mr. Johnson refuse to return to the United States and stand trial, he will be eligible for full retirement benefits. Therefore, to correct this loophole, I intend to introduce proposed legislation repealing the retirement benefits of any ex-Government employee who, having been indicted in our Federal courts, refuses to return to the United States and answer the charges.

As one possible explanation as to why nothing developed from the 1949 investigation, I am incorporating in the RECORD a letter dated January 17, 1949, signed by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. J. A. Krug, and addressed to the Attorney General, Mr. Tom C. Clark. This letter indicates that the investigation then started was developing into a jurisdictional dispute between the Departments.

The record does show that nothing developed from this investigation, except that a few months later Mr. Johnson received a $3,600 increase in salary.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a copy of the letter to which I have just referred.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 17, 1949.

Hon. TOM C. CLARK,
The Attorney General.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have been advised that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been requested by the United States district attorney at Anchorage, Alaska, to initiate an investigation of certain allegations of irregular official conduct on the part of Col. John P. Johnson, general manager of the Alaska Railroad.

This investigation has been initiated without any previous notice to or any discussion of the allegations with any officer of this Department. I, therefore, request that you will kindly arrange to have the full report of this investigation made available to me at the earliest possible moment in order that I may take any administrative action which the circumstances may require. To that end I should also appreciate very much a report from the district attorney as to the grounds on which he initiated the investigation.

Since Colonel Johnson is administering the entire railroad rehabilitation program which will involve expenditure of at least $60 million Federal funds, you can appreciate the importance of prompt clarification of any question in regard to his official conduct.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

DEDICATION OF LEE MANSION IN ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY AS A PERMANENT MEMORIAL TO ROBERT E. LEE

Mr. JOHNSTON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from the further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 62, dedicating the Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee, and that the joint resolution be immediately considered. The joint resolution was introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] on March 30, 1955. I have discussed this subject with the minority leader, and it is our desire that the joint resolution be considered and acted upon at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62), which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States, at this anniversary time, does hereby pay honor and tribute to the everlasting memory of Robert E. Lee, whose name will ever be bright in our history as a great military leader, a great educator, a great American, and a truly great man through the simple heritage of his personal traits of high character, his grandeur of soul, his unfailing strength of heart; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States does hereby express its humble gratitude to a kind Providence for blessing our Nation with leaders of true greatness who, like Robert E. Lee, have been able to see beyond their times, and by whose vision, guidance, and wisdom this Nation has gone forward to a place of world leadership as the unfaltering and powerful champion of peace, liberty, and justice; and be it further

Resolved, That the Lee Mansion in the Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia, is hereby dedicated as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to erect on the aforesaid premises a suitable memorial plaque.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the pending joint resolution is a companion measure to one introduced by Representative BROYHILL, who represents the Virginia district in which the Arlington Memorial Cemetery and the Lee Mansion are located.

April 5 is the 90th anniversary of the cessation of hostilities in the War Between the States, at Appomattox Court House. The War Department was directed to restore the Lee Mansion, but it never has been officially dedicated as a memorial to Robert E. Lee. That is what the joint resolution would do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

RELEASE OF YALTA PAPERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, under date of March 23, 1955, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of State, Hon. John Foster Dulles, relating to the manner in which the Yalta papers were released. I asked the Secretary of State a number of questions, particularly questions relating to whether or not the release of these papers violated the security or administrative regulations of the Department. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 23, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You are undoubtedly aware of the concern that I and other Members of the Congress have expressed with regard to the fact that one newspaper, the New York Times, was given access to the Yalta Papers for publication before they were actually released by the State Department. I write to request you to undertake an investigation of that apparently unauthorized "leak."

This is a matter of serious concern to the Congress and to the Government. On Monday of last week, the official custodian of the Yalta Papers declared that the publication of the papers would adversely affect our Nation's security. It is my understanding that when you discussed the question of publication with the distinguished minority leadership of the Senate following the Monday announcement, you expressed astonishment at the fact that the New York Times had received a copy of the Yalta Papers and were planning to publish them. It is also my understanding that the papers were classified. It thus appears on its face that someone in the State Department was responsible for turning over without authorization classified Government documents to an unauthorized person, namely, the representative of the New York Times. This is indeed serious and throws into question the entire security system of the State Department.

I would be interested in ascertaining from you what your plans are with regard to investigating this most serious security leak. I am interested in knowing whether you have discovered who is responsible for violating the security regulations and what steps you are taking in connection with that violation. I refer specifically to section 7 of Executive Order 10501, and to section 195 of the Department of State Regulations issued January 1955.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Under date of March 28, 1955, I received from the Assistant Secretary of State, Hon. Thruston B. Morton, a reply to my letter of March 23. His reply did not deal with the specific items or questions which were presented in my letter of March 23. I think my colleagues would be interested to note that the State Department, in its reply, dwells at length upon the approval of the so-called Paris accords, the treaties with Germany. It states—believe it or not—that one of the reasons why the Yalta papers were released was so that the release would be timed appropriately with the approval of the treaties of Paris.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Assistant Secretary of State be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, March 28, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of March 23 dealing with the release for publication of the papers relating to the Malta-Yalta Conferences.

You refer to a so-called "leak" as involving a question of security under Executive Order 10501. You are misinformed as regards this. Prior to, and at the time of, the incident you refer to, the papers did not have any security classification under the Executive order and there was no violation of that order. Not only so, but publication had no consequences because of overtaking events. The Secretary of State had independently decided upon early general release of the documents. Actual publication occurred simultaneously in the press generally on March 17 after publication had been duly authorized on March 16.

The Yalta papers have been in course of preparation for nearly 2 years as part of a 4-year publication program requested by the Senate Appropriations Committee. The Congress has appropriated funds for this publication program.

The papers had been substantially completed by early December 1954. However, the views of the Government of the United Kingdom had not yet been received and also the timing of the publication had to be judged in the light of the current international situation.

By the middle of March, the Department had come to the conclusion that publication would not have an unfavorable impact upon the pending ratification of the Paris Accord by the German Bundesrat and the French Council. It showed, to Germans, the awful abyss from which they had been rescued by enlightened postwar policies. It dramatized, to the French, the danger of the "empty chair"; for France was not represented at Yalta. However, certain matters had not yet been cleared with the Government of the United Kingdom, so on March 14, 1955, I advised the chairmen of various congressional committees that "it is deemed inadvisable at this time to issue these papers in volume for public distribution."

However, almost immediately thereafter, the United Kingdom agreed to publication. As the Prime Minister said to the Commons on March 17, although the British Government had certain reservations, "when the United States Government asked if we would nevertheless agree to publication, Her Majesty's Government gave their consent." This consent was foreshadowed to the Secretary of State on March 15 and officially confirmed on March 16.

In view of the foregoing the Secretary had made up his mind on March 15 to authorize publication and he officially confirmed this on March 16.

On March 18 the German Bundesrat voted ratification of the Paris accords by a vote of 29 to 9. This was a larger favorable vote than had been anticipated. Chancellor Adenauer himself connected the vote with Yalta. He said "the vote of the Bundesrat signifies the burial of the Yalta agreements."

The French Council of State on March 27 approved of the treaties by an overwhelming vote. The treaty admitting Germany to NATO was adopted by a vote of 200 to 114, and the vote admitting Germany to the Brussels Treaty Organization by 184 to 110. This was a much larger vote than had been generally anticipated when the Secretary made his decision to publish the Yalta papers. A factor in the French vote was determination to preserve for France a position such that she would not again be excluded from conferences that concerned France, as had been the case at Yalta.

Another factor which influenced the timing of the publication was that it was certain that German and French ratifications of the Paris accords would lead to more intensive consideration of another conference with the Russians. It was obvious that the full story of Yalta illuminates graphically the dangers, as well as the possible values, of such talks;

the need of adequate prior preparations, and the importance of a clear definition of principles which will not be sacrificed to secure agreement.

These are the considerations which led the Department to make the publication.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Under date of March 30, 1955, I replied to the Assistant Secretary of State and stated, in part:

I must say quite frankly that I regretfully regard your reply as inadequate in that some questions raised in my letter remain unanswered.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my letter of March 30 be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 30, 1955.

Mr. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary of State,
State Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORTON: Thank you for your letter of March 28 responding to my inquiry about the release of the Yalta papers. I must say quite frankly that I regretfully regard your reply as inadequate in that some questions raised in my letter remain unanswered.

I was interested in your assurances that the information in question was not classified. You seemingly base your reply on a contention that the documents were not classified under the President's Executive Order 10501. My letter, however, was not limited to that order and it also referred specifically to section 195 of the State Department security regulations of January 1955. That section, you will recall, refers to "administratively controlled information." The question still remains whether the material in question was "administratively controlled information" as that term is used in section 195; and if so whether or not the leak of this material to the New York Times constituted a violation of security regulations.

I call your attention to paragraph 1, on page 2, of your letter wherein you state, concerning the British Government's position on the release of the Yalta papers, the following: "This consent was foreshadowed to the Secretary of State on March 15 and officially confirmed on March 16." It is my understanding that the Yalta papers were in the hands of the New York Times on the date of March 15, before the British Government officially confirmed its agreement to the release and before the State Department had announced that any such release was to be made.

The question still remains, Who is responsible for this untimely release to the New York Times?

There appears to me to be a discrepancy between your comments concerning the manner in which the British Government concurred in the release of these documents and the explanation that was given by Prime Minister Churchill to the House of Commons approximately a week after the release. I recall, according to the press reports in this country, that Mr. Churchill stated to the House of Commons in effect that he had been informed by the United States that publication would take place because the Secretary of State was no longer able to withstand the pressure for the release of these documents. May I suggest that you carefully check the statement of the Prime Minister. I believe I have accurately reported the word and meaning of his remarks.

My question is, Pressure from whom? What was the source of this pressure?

Your reply likewise does not satisfactorily answer my question as to whether the State Department is undertaking an investigation of the alleged unauthorized leak of the Yalta papers. The advance release to the New York Times was either authorized or unauthorized. If it was authorized, I am interested in ascertaining who authorized it. If it was unauthorized, the question still remains who did it, and what—if anything—is being done about it.

Your letter attempts to justify the subsequent public disclosure of the Yalta papers and to refute the contention of unfavorable reaction internationally caused by the disclosure. I assume that the State Department considers such a justification as necessary in view of its March 14 statement to the effect that the release of the papers was undesirable "for reasons which involve our national security and our relations with other powers."

I would be less than candid with you if I did not comment on the State Department's attempt to justify the apparently unauthorized disclosure by saying it "had no consequences because of overtaking events." I reject such a contention. Is the course of future "overtaking events" a new criteria for judging unauthorized acts in the State Department?

I look forward to hearing from you. Thank you for your prompt and courteous reply to my earlier communication.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senate is now aware, of course, that the Secretary of State will appear before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to participate in an inquiry relating to these documents, and the incredible manner in which they were released. My only point in rising today is to say to the State Department that when I receive a letter from them in reply to a specific question or series of questions, I would appreciate it if the reply represented at least an endeavor to come near the questions. I did not need advice and counsel upon the reaction of the French Council of State in approving the treaties with West Germany. I did not need to be informed that the release of these documents was important in terms of the imminent or future Big Four Power Conference, because none of those subjects had been discussed at the time those documents were released.

I personally feel that the letter which I received from the Department of State was not only inadequate, but was a bit of effrontery to a Senator and to the United States Senate, which seeks honest answers to some honest questions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it true that the Secretary of State sent some 25 copies of the Yalta papers to strategic Members of the Senate, and that the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] refused to accept them on the ground that they would unavoidably cause leaks?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is my understanding that the Senator from Georgia refused to accept them. Other Senators likewise refused to accept them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it be ungenerous to say that it is quite possible that those documents were sent to Capitol Hill with the intention that there should be leaks?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not wish to impugn the motives of anyone. However, I should like to make one correction. There were not 25 copies sent to the Senate. There were 24. One was sent to the New York Times, making a total of 25.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was the copy for the New York Times released at the same time copies were sent to Senators?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to my distinguished friend from Illinois that that is one of the questions I should like to have answered. That is one of the questions which the junior Senator from Minnesota asked the Department of State.

The relationships between the executive branch of the Government and the legislative branch will be much improved if there is a forthright, honest effort made to answer inquiries which are propounded in a gentlemanly and considerate spirit.

There was no intention on the part of the junior Senator from Minnesota to embarrass anyone, or to conduct a major investigation, with television, radio, and reporters. All I wanted was some simple answers. I must say to the State Department that since its attitude did not comport with that pattern, it may very well be subjected to a rather extensive inquiry, because we intend to get the facts.

Mr. President, I now wish to discuss another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SUGAR ACT OF 1948

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier in the day the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER] introduced a bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948. The State of Minnesota is deeply interested in this subject.

Mr. President, I have been happy to associate myself with the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and many of our colleagues in sponsoring a bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, providing for a greater share of the domestic sugar market for domestic producers.

In Minnesota substantial increases in acreage are needed for the Red River Valley and two smaller areas. Sugar beets provide one of our most neded and dependable rotation crops.

I am proud to be able to say that when Minnesota's interests are at stake, business, labor, and agriculture work hand in hand.

Both the Minnesota State Federation of Labor and the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce are supporting the appeal of

our sugar-beet producers for expanded allocations.

I ask consent for a resolution from the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce, accompanied by a letter from Fred E. Sperling, general secretary, a letter from William D. Gunn, president of the Minnesota Federation of Labor, and a resolution from the Commercial Club of Frost, Minn., to appear at this point in the RECORD in support of this bill.

There being no objection, the resolutions and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
St. Paul, Minn., February 22, 1955.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senator From Minnesota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: As you know, sugar beets are a very valuable part of Minnesota's agricultural production; and the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, has been given serious consideration by our agricultural committee who prepared the attached resolution concerning it.

The resolution was approved by our executive committee; and we send it to you for your information and use when the act comes before the present Congress.

No doubt you have given this matter some consideration and we would be glad to know your position on it after you have read the resolution attached.

Sincerely yours,

FRED SPERLING,
General Secretary.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENT AND REENACTMENT

Whereas the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, now in force, expires December 31, 1956, and its protective provisions apply, therefore, to sugar refined from beets grown in 1955 and sold in 1956, but no subsequent crop; and

Whereas sugar refined from beets planted in the fall of 1955 and in 1956 for marketing in 1957, consequently, would have no protection from the unbridled competition of world-glutted sugar markets; and

Whereas reenactment of the present law with revision of its protective quota provisions, as well as those designed to produce a parity price for sugar produced in the United States, is therefore imperative in the 84th Congress; and

Whereas during a period of either worldwide armed conflict or political upheaval, in sugar-exporting nations, this country would face a perilous situation in meeting its sugar requirements, with barely 27 percent supplied from within the continental boundaries of this country; and

Whereas the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce has heretofore recognized the essentiality of the sugar-beet crop in rotation programs in the Red River Valley and believes the American farmers have the right to supply the sugar requirements of this country to the extent of their ability; and

Whereas present severe quota limitations in the present act restrict beet acreage on established Minnesota farms and make it impossible to secure additional acreage needed for existing plants to process: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce hereby urges the 84th Congress to enact legislation which will—

A. Reenact the major provisions of the 1948 Sugar Act as amended on a permanent basis;

B. Provide yearly sales quotas for sugar derived from beets or cane grown in continental United States on an escalator basis, increasing yearly as consumptive requirements increase;

C. Provide for the relief of the immediate problems of disposing of above-quota sugar produced in 1953 and 1954 in continental beet and cane areas by granting them sugar sales quotas in 1957 based on the percentage of the American market which they enjoyed at the time of passage of the 1948 act; be it further

Resolved, That chambers of commerce in States concerned with sugar-beet production be urged to give their full support to the proposed reenactment and amendatory legislation.

Submitted by the agricultural committee January 19, 1955.

Approved by the executive committee February 1, 1955.

FRED E. SPERLING,
General Secretary.

MINNESOTA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
St. Paul, Minn., March 10, 1955.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States, Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: We are informed by the International Council of Sugar Workers and Allied Industries Unions that the existing provision of the United States sugar law, discriminates against producers of domestic sugar and their employees because it has deprived them of the proper share of the domestic sugar market.

We were instructed to call this matter to your attention at a recent meeting of the executive council of the Minnesota State Federation. We hope you will do what you can to correct this situation.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM D. GUNN.

DRAFT OF RESOLUTION FOR USE OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Whereas the sugar industry is a vital and necessary part of the agricultural and industrial life of Minnesota; and

Whereas quota provisions incorporated in the Sugar Act of 1948 as temporarily expedient still are in force, denying the historic right of this industry to grow with our Nation; and

Whereas the domestic sugar industry has, through important technological progress, increased its own productivity per acre by some 20 percent since establishment of fixed marketing quotas in the Sugar Act of 1948; and

Whereas the combination of rigid marketing restrictions and increased productivity per acre is forcing injurious acreage reductions and other sharp constrictions of the domestic sugar industry; and

Whereas these pressures not only are acting to the severe and unwarranted detriment of the domestic sugar industry, but also are having a depressing effect upon the economic life of Minnesota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is petitioned to provide for immediate quota increases for the domestic industry and restoration to the domestic industry of its historic right to share in all future increases in United States sugar requirements; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Commercial Club is hereby instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives elected to the Congress by the people of Minnesota, and to the Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Interior.

Passed by the Commercial Club of Frost, Minn., on March 28, 1955.

SELMER MATHESON, *President.*
LESTER STOLL, *Secretary.*

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also ask consent to have appear in the RECORD at this point a press statement I have issued containing some of my views in connection with this bill.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HUMPHREY SEEKS EXPANDED QUOTAS FOR DOMESTIC SUGAR PRODUCERS

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, today joined Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the Agriculture Committee and 46 other Senators in sponsorship of a bill to extend the Sugar Act of 1948 and amend it to provide expanded quotas for domestic producers of sugar beets and sugarcane.

Aim of the bill is to give domestic producers a larger share of the market brought about by expanded sugar consumption in the United States, instead of allowing almost all the increase to go to Cuba, as under existing law.

At present, out of any increase beyond the base estimated consumption, 96 percent goes to Cuba and only 4 percent to domestic producers. Under the amendment proposed, 55 percent of any increase in consumption would be passed along in form of expanded allotments for domestic producers with the remainder going to Cuba.

"Sugar consumption in the United States during 1954 totaled 8,250,000 tons. The domestic sugar beet quota was only 1,800,000 tons, and the domestic cane sugar quota was only 500,000 tons," Senator HUMPHREY explained. "In 1955, it is expected that consumption will increase to at least 8,500,000 tons. But under the existing law, domestic beet and cane sugar producers would be held to their 1954 quota figures. If they produce more than their quotas, they cannot sell the excess. As the use of sugar in the United States increases, the percentage share reserved for domestic sugar producers shrinks. And that is in spite of the fact that sugar is the only important food which the United States produces in quantities far less than it uses.

"The beet sugar quota was fixed at 1,800,000 tons a year in 1948. Consumption in the United States that year amounted to 6,332,000 tons. Even though consumption increased to 8,250,000 tons in 1954 and is expected to rise to 8,500,000 tons in 1955, the beet sugar quota is frozen at 1,800,000 tons.

"A fixed annual quota of 1,800,000 tons for beet sugar may have been all right in 1948. But it is grossly unfair now. That figure should be the minimum now. As American sugar consumption rises, both beet sugar and domestic cane sugar producers should be given a reasonable share of the increased market," Senator HUMPHREY said.

Senator HUMPHREY revealed that the Minnesota State Federation of Labor and the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce were both supporting requests of Red River Valley beet growers for the amendment, "showing how business, labor, and farmers work together for the best interests of Minnesota."

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY AND FOR ADJOURNMENT ON THAT DAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send an order to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The Secretary will read the order.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That at the conclusion of its business today the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, April 4, 1955, and that immediately after the convening of the Senate on said day the Presiding Officer shall,

without the transaction of any business or debate, declare the Senate adjourned, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 103, until Wednesday, April 13, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order be considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the order was considered and agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE AND TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING THE EASTER ADJOURNMENT PERIOD

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment period from today, and the period authorized by House Concurrent Resolution 103, the Secretary be authorized to receive messages from the House and the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions passed by the two Houses.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORTS DURING RECESS OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Appropriations was authorized to file reports during the recess of the Senate.

A VICTORY FOR TEXAS SCHOOLS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it has just come to my attention that the Supreme Court of Texas has decided a lawsuit filed by my colleague, Senator PRICE DANIEL, while he was attorney general of Texas, which will result in the recovery of 67 producing oil wells and 4,000 acres of minerals for the public school fund of our State.

I take this occasion to congratulate my colleague and his present administrative assistant, Jake Jacobsen, who also served as his assistant in the filing of this important lawsuit in 1951.

As attorney general, PRICE DANIEL instituted some of the most important lawsuits in the history of our State. The case to which I now refer, State against the Texas Co., was among those which other lawyers thought could not be won. However, my colleague and his assistant, Jake Jacobson, and his former assistant, Charles D. Mathews of Austin, decided otherwise. On February 22, 1951, they filed suit against the Texas Co. alleging that 4,000 acres of minerals and 67 producing oil wells in Duval County held and operated by the company, actually belonged to the State's public school fund. It was the last lawsuit prepared for trial by PRICE DANIEL, but was continued on motion of the defendant until after he took his seat in the Senate. His assistant, Mr. Mathews, remained in the case and participated in the trial and appeals under Attorney General Sheppard.

I commend the manner in which this case has been handled, and especially congratulate my colleague on the foresight which led him to bring the action while serving as attorney general of Texas. It has resulted in a victory which will mean millions of dollars to our public schools.

THE DANGERS OF PROPOSED FURTHER REDUCTIONS IN MILITARY STRENGTH

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the policy of this administration to cut ever deeper into our already heavily reduced military forces, while at the same time a line may be being drawn as to where the Communists shall and shall not go—is leading us to the brink of nuclear war.

Today the United States is confronted by the steadily increasing strength of an enemy whose avowed intentions to seek a Communist world order, directed from Moscow, remain unchanged.

Because of the consistent hostility demonstrated by the Communist bloc, we must make a concentrated defense effort, over an indefinite period of tension—and therefore must devote a large part of our wealth and energy to defense buildup, along with other programs designed to stabilize the world situation—and along with our effort to achieve foolproof world disarmament.

In recent years we have heard much about how the free world plans to defend itself against possible attack from the Communist bloc; and especially with respect to the military power and plans of the United States.

Our military policy is now geared to the nuclear-jet age. We know this demands radical changes in previous concepts of national defense.

The military program now before the Congress carries out the philosophy outlined some 15 months ago, January, 1954, by Secretary of State Dulles, and reaffirmed only last January by the President.

The implications of this military program are clear. Definite priority is given to the delivery of nuclear weapons by air.

But such a policy can only be practical, and therefore logical, if all the services—Army, Navy, and Marines, as well as Air Force—are at the same time modernized in recognition of the nuclear age which now surrounds us.

Conventional forces are for World War II. Today a B-36 is just as obsolescent as a B-29 was yesterday; and an airborne army, with bazookas throwing nuclear weapons, is a far cry from the Army we sent to fight in World War II, or even in Korea.

In the past all wars have been won with knives, whether put on the end of rifle as bayonets or carried in the hand. Men moving to land where they are not wanted, supported with that weapon along with more modern weapons, have always been a prerequisite of victory; and I believe they always will be.

Even the most confirmed optimist would agree that the relative position of the United States in the world today, along with that of the other free nations, has deteriorated.

Today we have fewer effective allies, and another rapidly growing member of the Communist conspiracy striving to equal the strength of Russia.

Two questions are now uppermost in the minds of the American people.

The first is, are we going to participate in a war in the Far East? And the second—if we do, are nuclear weapons going to be used?

If we continue to reduce our Army and Marine Corps, and then are attacked, what chance have we to defend ourselves, unless we start an atomic-hydrogen war?

The President has pledged the Congress that he alone will make the decision whether or not to use nuclear weapons in the defense of Formosa.

As things are going, that decision can only be to use such weapons, unless we agree to further retreat.

If General Ridgway opposed our participating in the defense of Indochina because of the weakness of the American Army, how would he now feel about our now taking on Communist China, in a supposedly limited war, a very few miles from the China mainland.

Let us remember that only last year we cut Army appropriations over $5 billion.

This year, despite the obvious increased world tension, we are now asked to approve an even further heavy reduction in our combat divisions.

This latest request comes on the heels of the President asking the Congress for authority to go to war against the largest army in the world.

Aside from what these military reductions do to the morale of our already shaky and, in some cases wavering, allies, what right have we, with our ever-growing worldwide commitments, to plan an Army for next year which will be tens of thousands of combat troops smaller than the army of the little state of South Korea?

These planned further heavy reductions in our military strength have been urged on the President by the "budget-firsters" purely for financial reasons; also approval of the reductions by the Congress is being requested with the premise of complete reliance on the ground forces of such allies as Yugoslavia, every single member of whose army is under Communist domination.

And how about our commitments to our allies to supply them with a large number of combat divisions in case of war?

Our course, America must develop the potential of the atom in its development of modern weapons.

But in reducing steadily our ability to fight on the ground, while placing steadily increasing reliance on nuclear weapons delivered by air, we may well be committing ourselves to a path from

which there can be no turning back—world devastation, resulting from the use of the hydrogen bomb.

None but the blind would deny that the Communists are rapidly approaching atomic equality with the free world.

Some believe they are already at least equal to us in segments of that field.

When an atomic standoff comes, if the Communist armies start to move, say in the Middle East, or in Asia, what do we do?

Do we start a nuclear war? If we do not, what can we do?

Air power, according to Gen. Billy Mitchell, is everything that flies. Troops can be flown, and so can tanks and trucks. But if war should be forced upon us, this country, despite all its continuous boasting about its superior airpower, cannot as of today lift and properly support a single Army division. And this despite the fact that we have formally pledged our allies to support them on the ground as well as in the air.

Is anyone so gullible as to believe that, if any real effort is made to defend Formosa, American troops will not be needed for that defense?

How do we prove to the world that we are serious in our announced intention to defend Formosa? The answer—by announcing further heavy reductions in our combat divisions.

Everyone noted with interest the recent comments of Winston Churchill about the realities of the hydrogen age. But did we all catch his warning that modern nations could not place too great a reliance on nuclear weapons, when he called for other "forces in readiness" to deal with limited Communist aggressions?

What he implied was that, if we are to avert total war, we must be prepared to fight limited war. Limited objectives are nevertheless more desirable than unlimited destruction and disaster.

We Americans, in our abhorrence of any war, are inclined to search for cure-alls. That is why we are so inclined to accept the new nuclear weapons as a panacea for all our national security ills. That position was logical during the past decade, when we had a monopoly on such weapons, but that monopoly is now over.

Unless we reverse this trend of relying predominantly on nuclear weapons, we will create a military force capable of defending the free world in no other type war but nuclear war. Then the decision will be either mutual atomic devastation, or surrender to the Communist armies, at least in certain parts of the world.

There is a growing tendency to equate atomic stalemate with world peace. I believe this wrong, because once that is an accepted condition, the Soviet-Communists can increase their short-of-war expansions through the use of their great armies, armies now being improved by all the nations in the Communist conspiracy.

This bloc, possibly aware of our unwillingness during an atomic stalemate to employ nuclear weapons because of the terrible consequences, could march their modern armies with relative impunity, unmatched by any comparable strength on the part of the United States and its allies.

American and the free world possess ample resources to develop adequate and versatile defenses. Let us not be confused by those who would say otherwise.

We can, and must, be prepared with flexible military power to cope with Communist hostility. Atomic stockpiles must be maintained until proper safeguards against nuclear aggression are provided. But we must also meet the compelling requirements for other strong military capabilities, adequately mobile, to face a fluid world condition, and a rampant Communist imperialism.

For some days recently I could not read, and therefore listened consistently to the radio. In all countries but ours, the chief problem broadcast was the position of personalities, and the stability of various governments.

Names come to mind—Malenkov, Mendès-France, Adenauer, and the Treaty, Bevan, Dinh, Zim, and other little people trying to rule the relatively little states of the Far East.

The radio waves highlighted a totally different problem characteristic of this country, pounded into one's ear hour after hour and day after day, namely, how much one could get for his old car, or television set, if he turned it in for a more expensive one.

Last year the gross national product of the United States was $357 billion.

The world has never before seen anything like this kind of prosperity, correlated with by far the highest standard of living ever known to mankind—after taxes.

Nevertheless, with our possible enemy maintaining, and steadily improving hundreds upon hundreds of combat divisions, this administration is now asking Congress to further reduce our own combat divisions to a mere 15.

Today one question overshadows the world. Will America risk war by defending Quemoy and Matsu?

Will we? I do not know. Neither do other Senators. But this I do know. If we decide to defend these islands, American ground troops will be part of the action before it is over.

To coat the pill of these increased plans for disarmament, we are propagandized about vast superiority in the quality and quantity of our military equipment, as against that of the Communists.

But this wishful thinking was not borne out by the Stalin IV Tank of World War II, or the MIG–15 fighter plane of Korea, or the terrifying stories that have started to come out of Russia about their sucess with the so-called ultimate weapon—the intercontinental ballistic missile.

If we will be honest with ourselves, we know there can be no justification of these further heavy reductions in our military strength.

We know that when the Communists reach atomic equality, which, for reasons I plan to discuss at a later date—and they may have reached it at least in part already—we will bitterly regret any such reduction in our other forces, because if we are to keep faith with our allies, that means we can only be massive-retaliation originators of a hydrogen war.

This country, which once adopted as a national policy "speak softly but carry a big stick," while now increasing our threats against the possible enemy, steadily whittles at our military strength.

As we continue to increase our commitments, all over the world, and warn the Communists against further aggression, what right have we further heavily to reduce our military forces in order to save money?

I repeat—who wants to be the richest man—or nation—in the graveyard? We have enough wealth to take no such risk at the behest of those who put money first. Our own country, along with other free peoples, should come first.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO STUDY ASPECTS OF THE COMMON SYSTEM OF AIR NAVIGATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, with the indulgence of the Senate—and I hope I shall not take more than 5 minutes—I wish to call attention to a matter of vital importance in this day of hope that we may have some economy in Government. I do this at the request of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has unanimously submitted the report on Senate Concurrent Resolution 16.

In reporting the resolution, I ask unanimous consent that, following my statement, the concurrent resolution be immediately referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

BACKGROUND OF THE RESOLUTION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this matter was first brought to public light by the chairman of your committee when he interrogated the nominee for the position of Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation on February 23, 1955. Since that time several committees of both the House and Senate have interested themselves in the matter. The jurisdictional questions arising out of a reasonable solution to this problem are matters of concern to a number of Senate and House committees including the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, House Foreign Affairs Committee, Armed Services Committees of both the House and Senate, and others.

Your committee has held hearings on this controversy and has taken testimony from both civilian and military witnesses. Because of the classified nature of the material the hearings were held in executive sessions.

Other committees of the Congress have undertaken investigations of this matter. Undoubtedly classified material has been presented to and considered by them. Experience has shown that a multiplicity of investigations often leads to the unwitting disclosure of classified information, to the detriment of the national security. It would appear that

the possibility of leaks will be minimized by having a single committee on which the various committees having an interest in the subject are represented rather than to permit separate committee action.

Our present common system of air navigation was adopted and installed following recommendations made by the Congressional Aviation Policy Board of the 80th Congress and Special Committee No. 31 of the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics. The latter group was made up of top technical and operational representatives from industry and Government including the military services, Commerce, Treasury, State, FCC, and the like.

Known as VOR/DME, the system is composed of visual omni range (VOR) which provides heading, and the distance measuring equipment (DME) which provides distance. This system has been installed throughout the United States. 436 visual omni ranges and 241 distance measuring ground stations have been budgeted for installation. Testimony before the committee showed that approximately $116 million has been expended on ground and air installations by the Government and private sources. This amount is made up of about $30.7 million in private investments, the balance of $85.3 million being governmental expenditures.

As I recall the testimony, it will also require millions more to finish the whole job and to cover the entire United States.

Prior and subsequent to the adoption of VOR/DME as the common system for both military and civil air navigation functions the Navy commenced development of another system now known as TACAN—tactical air navigation. This development was intended for important tactical uses and was carried on in a military security classification to preclude compromise.

So far as is now known the two systems, for basic technical reasons, are incompatible. However, it appears that from the evidence before your committee that a full effort to solve the technical differences between the two systems has not been made.

According to the military, TACAN has certain characteristics which make it more valuable for tactical purposes. It is more accurate than VOR under certain circumstances and can be used aboard aircraft carriers, whereas it is claimed VOR is not now suitable for this latter use. The accuracy and value of DME is not questioned.

Commitments made by the military, despite the fact that the right hand did not know what the left hand was doing, for the acquisition and development of TACAN to bring it to its present state total approximately $320 million.

Of course, if the one is scrapped, it is lost in that case; if the other is scrapped, $116 million is lost in the other case, under two incompatible systems.

Representatives of the military have stated to the committee that TACAN has not been fully proven as acceptable or adequate for common system use and it is possible that further experiments may later prove that it is unacceptable. Considering all factors the evidence is TACAN probably cannot be fully operational in the Federal Airway System before 1965.

Yet they have spent $320 million, and have a contractual commitment for almost $180 million.

The cost of TACAN as the common air navigation system is estimated at about three-fourths of a billion dollars with the likelihood the ultimate cost may be greater.

In the meantime we have been going ahead with the system which has proved to be satisfactory and which everybody who testified said was satisfactory.

The relative merit of the two systems was presented to the Air Navigation Development Board, which includes representatives of Commerce and Defense Departments as equal partners. The Board formed an advisory committee consisting of Government and industry representatives known as the VORTAC committee. This advisory group hired a team of consultants skilled in the electronic and engineering sciences as applied to air navigation. Following the report of the consultants, a bare majority of the VORTAC committee recommended to the Air Navigation Development Board that the Government proceed to develop TACAN in lieu of VOR/DME as the common system. The minority of the VORTAC committee filed vigorous dissents. The ANDB, after considering alternate proposals, decided on the following course of actions:

First. Finish the development of TACAN to make it suitable for common system use at the earliest practicable date.

Second. Continue VOR as a common system navigation aid at least until 1965.

Third. Limit the use of civil DME facilities to experimental purposes, with the understanding that DME service is not—which is the directional-finding system—guaranteed beyond June 30, 1955. This is to assure that DME frequencies would not stand in the way of TACAN if it later is standardized.

Fourth. Permit military agencies to implement TACAN facilities to meet their minimum interim requirements, for the present, on a basis which will be noninterfering with channels assigned to the civil DME and the common system radar beacon.

Fifth. As a "backup" for the TACAN program, in case it should later prove unacceptable or inadequate for any reason, finish the design of the alternate proposal. This would consist of the present civil DME to provide distance plus a new CW omnirange device to be developed for a more suitable frequency band, as recommended by the consultants. The DME ground equipment will be held in readiness for this eventuality.

Since the decision of the ANDB, the Air Coordinating Committee has entered the picture. Composed of representatives from the Departments of State, Army, Navy, Air Force, Treasury, Post Office, Bureau of the Budget, and the Office of Defense Mobilization, this latter Committee has appointed a group of experts to further review the matter and make a report on the controversy on or before April 15 of this year.

This problem is not confined to the domestic scene. It is international in scope. Following the original decision to establish VOR/DME, our State Department sold foreign countries on the common system. The military have influenced the NATO countries in favor of TACAN. The State Department advised in a letter to the Air Coordinating Committee that any move to standardize on the military TACAN as the short range component of the common system will have "serious international implications."

In the light of the confusion existing in our policy for the common system concept of air navigation it is reasonable to assume that our foreign friends may be forced to develop a system of their own.

Based upon the testimony taken at the hearings and information received from all interested parties your Committee is convinced that the establishment of a joint committee to thoroughly explore this whole problem is the most desirable way of resolving this controversy.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

Your committee has amended the resolution to increase the representation on the joint committee and to provide that it shall submit prompt reports to Congress.

Because of the international aspects of the controversy your Committee is of the opinion that the congressional committees dealing with our foreign policy should be represented on the joint committee. Section one of the resolution has been amended to provide for the addition of representatives from the House Foreign Affairs and the Senate Foreign Relations Committees. In taking this action your Committee believes every safeguard must be taken to prevent placing this country in an unfavorable light abroad. And unless changes in the common system of air navigation are militarily or technologically vital for the safety and welfare of our country and the people it would appear to be wiser to perfect rather than scrap the existing program. Constant vacillations in policy in our dealings with allies can, as the State Department points out, lead to "serious international implications." The dangerous state of today's world requires the highest degree of cooperation between all departments of Government.

The legislative and appropriations committees must have the information which the joint committee is able to develop promptly if they are to properly discharge their duties. Accordingly, your Committee has amended the resolution to provide that the joint committee shall submit an interim report not later than June 30, 1955, and its final report not later than December 31, 1955.

The other amendments are administrative in nature.

The resolution as amended will bring together in one common forum all the Congressional interests necessary to review and reaffirm a sound national policy of air navigation designed to afford the

highest degree of safety for life and property—civil and military. Its adoption by the Congress will avoid a multiplicity of hearings and should result in substantial savings in man-hours and honey. Air space is not unlimited. This is particularly true along the airways and near the airports. Users of the space are increasing. With the new planes flying beyond the speed of sound, with improved models on the drawing board and in the experimental stage, the problems of air navigation, air control and landing are becoming increasingly serious. The hazards to life and property are increasing. It is time the Congress should take a long hard look at the potentially dangerous situation with a view to recharting the national policy. Your Committee unanimously recommends the adoption of the resolution as amended.

Mr. President, there are certain committee amendments which I should like to send to the desk.

I wish to close my remarks by repeating that because the right hand did not know what the left hand was doing, in one case the DME system was classified. It has now proved to be within 2 percent of being accurate. They do not even know for sure about TACAN, but it is claimed that it might be within 1 percent of being entirely accurate. It is not known for sure just how efficient it is, and it will not be known for 10 years. This country went ahead and spent $116 million on VOR/DME and convinced every other free country in the world that it should adopt the common system for its civilian and military aircraft. The Military Establishment went ahead and committed almost $320 million for another system which is not fully developed.

I say to my friend, the Senator from Illinois, we are dealing with over a half billion dollars. That is not a small amount in a budget for a vital project. We may have to "knock some heads together" or do something about it, so we can have a common system, which has cost a fabulous amount of money, and which has proved to be accurate.

Mr. President, I submit the report with the committee amendments. I may say it received the unanimous support of the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I suggest that the concurrent resolution be referred immediately to the Committee on Rules for appropriate action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY MR. KEFAUVER

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, this afternoon the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] delivered a speech on the floor of the Senate in which he attacked me, and also made some derogatory statements about the President of the United States. I did not have the opportunity of hearing the Senator's speech, but I have secured a copy of it and have read it with much interest.

I am glad the junior Senator from Wisconsin has made the speech. It is his privilege, if he wishes, to compare me to Neville Chamberlain. That, Mr. President, is the type of statement too often indulged in by some persons during these days. Instead of answering arguments on their merits, they call names, attach labels to certain persons, and try to make odious comparisons. So I am not surprised. But I should say to the junior Senator from Wisconsin I have never owned an umbrella. I am sure the American people will appreciate whatever comparison the junior Senator wants to make, and I am sure the American people will appreciate that there are few persons in public life whom the junior Senator from Wisconsin has not tried to bully or insult at one time or another.

I am also glad the junior Senator from Wisconsin made the speech because it is a confirmation of the charge I made in my original speech. In the same speech in which he denounced me, he denounced the President of the United States for not carrying forward with the junior Senator from Wisconsin, or for not having the Nation carry forward, a course of conduct which would be likely to cause us to become embroiled in a war in the Far East, which might spread and become a world war.

What I have been interested in is to see to it that our moral and legal positions are sound. The American people will fight for their freedom. They will fight courageously for a cause that is of importance to the freedom of the world and the safety of the United States. But if we must go to war, let us be certain we shall do so in a cause as to which our position will be legally and morally right.

As for the islands of Matsu and Quemoy, Mr. President, I wonder how long we would sit idly by if the Chinese Communists were to hold Staten Island, which is about as far from New York City as Quemoy is from the coast of China, or if the Chinese Communists were to hold Catalina Island, which is only a few miles off the coast of California.

Mr. President, I am in favor of our defending Formosa and the Pescadores with all our strength, until there can be a settlement there; and I hope we will use all our influence to bring about a solution of that problem.

But as for Quemoy and the Matsu, the defense of which would be very likely to get us into a war, I am afraid we would then be in a war without allies and without world opinion on our side. My effort all along has been with that thought in mind. I hope the speech delivered today by the junior Senator from Wisconsin and other statements of that sort—statements urging that we underwrite the attempted reinvasion by Chiang Kai-shek of the Chinese mainland—will not cause the President of the United States to bypass his better judgment and to carry our Nation into war over these islands, the names of which very few of the American people knew until a few months ago.

Mr. President, if any words of mine can put any stumbling blocks in the way of the present course of some persons toward a war in the Pacific—a war which would not be right, and a war in which we would not be justified in participating—it matters little to me what the junior Senator from Wisconsin or someone else may say.

THE NEED FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, today I wish to speak on what is known as point 4 technical and economic development. During the course of my remarks, I shall ask the Chair to permit me to include in the RECORD considerable portions of my prepared remarks, so as to place less of a strain upon the good nature of my friends who have entered the Chamber to listen to me.

THE NEED AND THE OPPORTUNITY

Mr. President, in less than 3 weeks an unprecedented meeting will convene at Bandung, Indonesia. It is the Afro-Asian conference, called by the Colombo powers—India, Pakistan, Burma, Indonesia, and Ceylon. Together with the 25 other self-governing invited nations, they will represent more than half the world's population and, furthermore, most of the noncommitted, neutralist nations. These are countries of the black, brown, and yellow peoples of the world, which stretch from Africa and through the Suez Canal to the China Sea. They are peoples who are properly smarting under the humiliations which were heaped upon them during the last century by the white soldiers, administrators, and businessmen of Europe, who dominated them for so long. At Bandung they will discuss means of promoting "economic, social, and cultural" cooperation, and "problems affecting national sovereignty and of racialism and of colonialism."

Against the background of the Formosa crisis, and with Red China participating actively in this conference, and undoubtedly hoping to take the lead, this meeting may be used for a gigantic propaganda onslaught against the West, and a buildup for communism. All of the attending nations hold bitter memories of colonialism; and although our country steered its course clear of that imperialist past, the Communists know how to channel the pent-up resentments of these nations against the chief Western power. We know the line. They will try to make Uncle Sam become Mr. Money Bags, racist, imperialist, and obsessed with his hydrogen bombs. On the other hand, we also know the Communist picture of himself, phony as the wolf in sheep's clothing, but strangely effective to people who have only known the old colonialism, and to whom the new imperialism of Russia and of Communist China as yet is unexperienced.

The Communists present themselves as the big brothers of the toiling masses. Let me point out that I am very careful here to say that the Communists present themselves as the big brothers of the toiling masses, lest this sentence and the ones which follow it be taken out of context. I am not saying that they are, I am merely saying that they say they are. They say they are the peace lovers. Lately they have also claimed to be the only hope of industrialization for the underdeveloped nations. They boast that they alone are not afraid of technological progress for Asia and Africa. They declare that they want a high standard of living for all mankind, not just for the greedy white imperialists. To bolster this argument, Russia has now ended its boycott of the United Nations Technical Assistance Program, and has offered its own program of aid, which six countries have accepted. They will not only receive Russian equipment and technicians, but they will also send some of their people to Russia for training.

There are other much publicized Communist moves, such as the new trade and barter agreements. Red China has signed a 5-year agreement with Ceylon, which will swap rice to Ceylon in return for vitally needed rubber. It has another agreement with Burma for her surplus rice—perhaps headed back for the Ceylon trade—but which is to be paid for by highly advertised Chinese technical aid to Burma. Furthermore, Russia has won some gratitude for several gifts, including the paving of the streets in Afghanistan's capital; and we should remember that this country lies along the traditional invasion route to India. Most impressive, in India itself, Moscow outbid the West and won the contract to construct a steel mill which will produce 1 million tons of steel a year.

It is astounding that even in the technological field the Communists seem to be seizing the advantage. Our own headstart is so great here that this development could only spring from a confusion in our policy. Our Nation, which is known for supersalesmanship, has miserably failed in presenting itself to other nations. Many of our best deeds are not generally known. Many of our less attractive characteristics are widely publicized by our enemies.

Furthermore, an administration with the greatest flair in history for public relations on the domestic scene, has stuttered, contradicated itself, and has often been silent in making America's case before the world. As a distinguished foreigner recently remarked, the United States does its best deeds "by stealth." In part, this may be because the Government fears political reaction at home. Apparently it does not sufficiently trust the good heart and good sense of the American people. And so it tries to conceal our policy even from ourselves. It apparently dares not think it through in long-run terms. So our Government improvises, constantly changes the organization, and the experienced personnel, and tries furtively to start again in a new way. As a result, we, as a nation, are made to twist and confuse the issues and to fumble our great advantage.

Today I am speaking up for point 4, the technical assistance and economic development programs—programs to help others help themselves. First, as an economy man who, I fear, has offended many colleagues on both sides of the aisle by trying to prune expenses for even favorite local projects, I am supporting a program which has mistakenly been called a giveaway. But as Henry Ford II recently put it, these are not giveaways. Rather, they are the most effective and economical approach to building a strong and prosperous free world.

Second, as one who has offended some of his coreligionists, because I support a strong military force and believe we should resist Communist aggression with the weapons of the flesh and the full force of our arms. As I think I have proved by my votes and by my actions, I nevertheless say that technical assistance may in the long run prove to be our best asset. Military strength is sometimes the only way to stop an aggression; and when needed it should be used. But at best it is a negative and holding operation. It will not of itself build the vigor or friendship of hungry, impoverished people. In the long run only a change in their living standards will make them strong allies. In the short run, only the hope that we will help them change these standards will make them good allies.

Let me put it better in the words of Henry Bennett, formerly of Oklahoma A. and M., who was the first administrator of the point 4 program and who literally gave his life for it during a plane crash while he was on service in the Middle East. Henry Bennett said, "Military rearmament is an unhappy necessity. Economic development is not only a necessity, but a great and inspiring opportunity to sow seeds of democracy among people who no longer accept poverty, disease, and ignorance as inevitable facts of life. It is an opportunity to create new wealth for the benefit of all free peoples. Finally, it is an opportunity to win friends and allies for our cause."

What we have done already, and with small amounts compared to the billions spent on defense, for which I have voted, has created some minor miracles around the world. If our civilization endures—and that is not at all certain—history may ultimately record this program not as a starry-eyed charity, but as the enlightened policy which saved our necks. It can also prove to be economically shrewd, for, to quote Mr. Ford again, as these underprivileged regions raise their per capita incomes, they will become good paying customers. This has always been true, and there is almost a direct ratio between the per capita income of the nations outside the Iron Curtain countries, and their amount of trade with us. Impoverished people cannot buy from us. The more productive other peoples are the more they can purchase of our goods, because the more they have with which to purchase. It is true internally that high productivity in one region helps others and that low productivity harms others. This is true internationally as well, in times of peace. Even in terms of dollars, therefore, this may prove enlightened self-interest, but that is not the main point I am making at this moment.

Our technical assistance program is therefore the supreme example of American practical good will. Perhaps it is the supreme example in all history of the practical and resourceful good will of one nation toward others. And it is providential in its timeliness. Up to the present era, one half of the world's population have always suffered from grinding poverty, hunger, and disease—the scourges that suffocate hope. And these, as Mr. Bennett has said, seemed inevitable. Even today, the majority of humanity lives on half the calories we Americans consume—1,600 to our 3,200—and theirs is a diet short of proteins and protective foods. But in the last decades modern technology has opened vistas of new abundance and emancipation from the old back-breaking toil of hunger and suffering. To attain this goal, man will have to learn self-discipline and wisdom, but if he fails, he will use his new powers for mass destruction.

We who want peace have been so concerned with the awful threat of the bomb which we have developed that we have unfortunately allowed the Communists, who are not concerned with human values, to seize the initiative. What we need is to tell our true record and to give assurance of a steady continuation of our constructive program. We must cease apologizing for our best acts. We have something with which to kindle the minds and hearts of men in every country. Let us tell our story boldly, and vote continuance of this program both under our auspices and that of the United Nations before the Afro-Asian meeting this month, or at least before it concludes. Let us make our program an open door, not a wall—a highway, not a dead end.

THE MARSHALL PLAN

In his momentous speech at Harvard on June 5, 1947, Gen. George Marshall, one of the greatest of Americans, proposed the European Recovery Program—now known as the Marshall plan.

This program was one of the great acts of statesmanship in modern times. It has been called a landmark in human history. The term "Marshall aid" is one aspect of American foreign policy which claims universal praise and respect.

Its twin purposes, in the words of the act, were to advance European recovery and "to achieve economic cooperation in Europe, which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity."

It gave hope where there was despair.

It provided food where there was hunger.

It brought unity and strength where there was chaos.

It is an eternal symbol that compassion is good foreign policy and that decency is contagious.

The results of that act were felt in many fields. The destruction has in the main been made good. In the economic field European production has by now

increased by about 50 percent over prewar—1939—levels. The Marshall plan was a catalytic agent which has helped to pull Europe forward. The full effects are only now being felt.

In the political field non-Communist governments were revived and sustained.

In the field of foreign affairs it made for strong, independent, and self-respecting allies while in Sovietized Eastern Europe former free countries became satellities and free men were transformed into automatons. Where we built up our allies, Russia sucked hers dry.

By this great act, America strengthened the weak, succored the poor, shared the burdens of war, helped resist aggression, organized our defenses, and lifted others from despair to independence.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course the Senator remembers that when the Marshall plan was originally proposed, it was made available to all the countries of Europe who were willing to join in a cooperative movement. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Alabama emphasizes a very important point. It was originally intended to be made available for East Europe as well as for West Europe. The Soviet Union, however, refused to accept the plan, and it also refused to permit Poland and Czechoslovakia to accept the plan.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That was after those countries had indicated their acceptance of it. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. The foreign ministers of those countries were called to Moscow and were told that they were not to be permitted to accept the plan.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not the Senator believe that it ought to be constantly brought to the attention of the world that we started out not with the idea of building up a wall between the two sections of the world, but to work out a cooperative program?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is quite correct. The Iron Curtain is the creation of the Communists, not of this country.

Not only did Europe avoid collapse but, also, she took real strides toward union. The Paris Pacts, ratified by the Senate today, which usher Germany back into the family of free and independent nations, testify to that fact. The creative forces of NATO, the achievements of the Atlantic Community, the pool for coal and steel, the European Payments Union, and the progress toward the solution of the Saar problem are the offspring of General Marshall's vision, President Truman's courage, and the wisdom of Congress.

But Marshall aid was not alone in saving vast areas of Europe from the scourge of totalitarianism. There was also the Truman Doctrine, which repulsed the Communists from the right flank of the free world. Not only did Greece and Turkey survive—and they were badly threatened in 1947—but they survived to fight again to save others from the fate they escaped. The gallant band of Turks—and no better fighting men exist on the globe—who fought up and down the peninsula of Korea earned the accolade of their comrades and the salute of the free world. I shudder to think what would have happened had we followed the advice of those who poured scorn on Marshall aid and the Truman Doctrine as "money down the rathole." For if we had, then that gallant band of Turks and, in the words of Winston Churchill, that "other famous ancient race, whose stormy and endless struggle for life stretches back to the fountain springs of human thought," might now have lost their manhood to the Soviet repression.

Not only did our vision, humanity, courage, and compassion save Europe and protect the Mediterranean, but where we have had the foresight to apply our ideals it has brought results at the new center of gravity in the east-west conflict; that is, in the Near East, the Middle East, and Asia.

The American wheat loan, for which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is in large part responsible and which was put through over the opposition of the State Department, I may say, staved off starvation in the famine areas of India. It even carried over into another year when the reserves built up prevented hoarding.

In the last fortnight we have witnessed the elections in Anghra, where the Communists were routed from their stronghold on Asia's subcontinent. Whatever may be the Indian reaction to the United States, we helped shatter that Communist bridgehead of stealth and subversion.

These stand as landmarks. They prove that, in the cold war, compassion is as important as conscription and arms. Money for these purposes has most emphatically not been sent "down the drain."

I say now that a program to share our scientific knowledge and our technical abilities so that the masses of people shall not remain hungry, diseased, and separated from their neighbors by walls of ignorance, is as important in the fight for human freedom as our military program, and should receive recognition from Congress in proportion to its necessity.

Our arms are needed to hold back the forces of darkness—and in that connection I congratulate the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] for the able speech he made today in which he pointed out that it is ridiculous to assume added military responsibilities while at the same time we diminish our Armed Forces—but technical assistance is of overriding importance if we wish to foster, in the words of President Truman, "The rights of the common man, the dignity of human beings, and the conception of the state as the servant and not the master of its people" in Asia as elsewhere. For the scene of tension has now shifted to Asia and to the East, and what happens there may well determine the future of the world. A mighty struggle is on for the neutral and uncommitted third of the world which is a world of color, low productivity, and poor health. In that struggle America and the other nations of the free world are bearing the burdens of the sins which a century of white rulers committed against the peoples of those countries.

Since these peoples, unlike those of Europe, are in a preindustrial stage, it is necessary for us to begin with them where they are, or roughly, where we were in 1700 or 1750. The first steps are therefore to help agriculture and the handicrafts, and to improve public health. Then we can go on from there.

THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF POINT IV AND OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The beginnings of point 4 go back to the work of our American missionaries and to our great foundations. Our medical missionaries treated the sick and trained native nurses and doctors to carry on their work. The Rockefeller Foundation started worldwide work in the field of public health and community sanitation and sent its experts and its doctors around the world. It founded and endowed the great Peking Medical College. Missionaries in India, Greece, and elsewhere started farm schools to help train native peoples how to gain a better living from the soil.

In the missionary colleges in both the Near and Far East ambitious boys and girls were trained to be doctors, dentists, engineers, mechanics, business executives, and housewives. American know-how was thus brought on a generous scale to the world by the devoted services and gifts of humble Americans. They proved that such active and practical good will at once forged bonds of friendship and raised the material and cultural condition of the people whom they served.

Incidentally, as a byproduct, it made our own lives deeper and better by bringing us into contact with these different peoples and these different nations. All honor and credit to these noble pioneers, who tend too frequently to be forgotten.

During the war, this work was carried on in Latin America at the initiative of President Roosevelt and under governmental auspices directed by Nelson Rockefeller. But the big impetus was given by Harry Truman, who in his inaugural address in January 1949 advanced his celebrated point 4, namely, that we should furnish American know-how and technical knowledge to help raise the productivity and the standard of living of the underdeveloped countries of the world. This program was slow to get under way, possibly because it seemed strange and unconventional to the gentlemen of the State Department. But appropriations were finally made and the work got under way in 1950.

It gathered momentum in 1951 and 1952 and while significantly enough it was dampened down during the next 2 years, it was still true that at the end of 1953, the United States was working directly on the technical assistance program with 59 countries, upon their request. Of these, 39 were independent nations, 19 were dependent overseas ter-

ritories in Africa and the Caribbean areas, and one was a United Nations trusteeship. These 59 countries, representing 900 million people, have asked the United States to share with them our technical knowledge and skills.

Despite the fact that the administrative direction of the work has been continuously changed from pillar to post, and that there was a wholesale dismissal of the trained and competent personnel in 1953 and 1954, a surprisingly creditable piece of work has been done. Despite all the loose talk that we have poured out countless treasure in thus helping others, the actual cost to the American taxpayer of such technical cooperation has been relatively small. Based on allotments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, the cost per person is less than a penny and a half a week.

For fiscal years 1952 and 1953 allotments were $127 and $145 million respectively. Allotments for 1954 were $104 million. For the 12 months ending June 30, 1955, Congress provided $116.5 million. For the coming year we do not yet know what the administration will actually recommend. That seems to be a deep secret. Compared with our essential military budget, however, these sums are not much more than a few drops in the bucket.

It is not often realized by most people that in some cases the contributions of the host countries to their technical cooperation programs average more than twice ours. In some cases, their contributions exceed ours by many times—27 times in the health program in Brazil, for instance. Peru in 1953, as another example, gave $12 for each dollar spent by the United States. In most countries the host contributions of land, buildings, equipment, and personnel, are not readily measureable in dollars.

As of September 1, 1954, FOA had some 1,750 technicians at work on a host of different projects in the 59 countries.

In addition, 40 different American universities were carrying out 52 distinct contracts in 26 countries around the globe to the immediate advantage of universities and the university communities themselves. These contracts have the advantage of bringing the facilities of the whole staff into the exchange program. Faculty members who go abroad can rely on the home institution for help.

This is a segment of the technical assistance program which is much more than merely a dry statistic. It is a unique development of tremendous significance to us as well as to the peoples and countries it directly serves. It is an excellent example of a two-way street. Each university group engaged in these projects is not only bringing to the recipient country its know-how and skills, but is expanding its own frontier of knowledge and experience. They are establishing experimental laboratories on the ground—whether it is in the social or technical services. It is an invaluable training ground for those who will teach our own young people the facts about conditions and cultures in other lands. This program is in its infancy—but the potentials are enormous.

Other voluntary agencies working on the program are the Near East Foundation under contract for a project of Iran community development; the Friends of India; Inter-Voluntary Service, which has a training school for village workers in Iraq, and the Farm Bureau with a training program for 600 young farmers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to commend the Senator from Illinois most heartily for making this speech, and inviting attention to a positive program which is accomplishing much and costing little.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true; and yet it is kept in the background, apologized for, and slurred in public statements.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

I am sorry that I must leave in order to keep an appointment. I wish I could remain and hear the Senator's entire speech.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the Senator's comments on and attention to this vital subject.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to state to the Senator that I believe the program he has pointed out is instrumental in creating friends throughout the world and in building strong alliances—stronger than we sometimes realize—and it is perhaps the most important program we are carrying out.

I had the high privilege, as the Senator from Illinois knows, of serving during one session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and it was my good fortune to be a member of the economic committee which worked on just such programs as this in the United Nations. As a result of my association I became thoroughly convinced that a majority of people are in the class which we sometimes describe as underdeveloped. Important as the building of armaments and the building of military strength may be to us, to a vast majority of the peoples of the world the greatest instrumentality for peace, as they see it, is holding out a helping hand as we have been doing under this program, with an expenditure of such relatively small sums.

I wish to compliment the Senator for bringing it to the attention of the Senate and the country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Alabama. He has always been stalwart in the support of all good causes, including this one, and he has done valiant service in connection with this program.

Mr. President, the Ford Foundation is doing magnificent work in India, and in Burma, the Government with sturdy independence is refusing to accept our aid but out of its own scanty resources is hiring our technicians.

FOA has also brought many participants from the cooperating countries to the United States for study and observation. The number of participants was up from about 4,000 in the fiscal year of 1953 to over 5,200 in the 1954 fiscal year.

Let us now turn to the real achievements of the work.

HEALTH

In the field of health, the technical assistance program has shown spectacular results. Nowhere else can such a small investment reap such incalculable returns. Not only have lives been saved, and we should realize that the life expectancy of at least 50 percent of the peoples on this globe is only about half of that of us in the United States, numbering a little over 30 years, but equally important, men and women, wracked with disease, have been transformed into healthy, productive people.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to compliment the Senator from Illinois on his very fine speech, in which he has called attention to our efforts to acquaint the peoples of the world with proper health methods and to provide them; but, unless we help those people to find ways to become more productive in producing food, we shall need to do more than to prevent disease.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Disease, however, not only kills people, but it causes those who survive to be less productive. We not only improve their health, but when we lower the death rate, we also enable those who survive to enjoy life more fully and to become more productive. We also endeavor to find new methods which will increase the food supply as rapidly as it is needed by the population.

Mr. LONG. But there will be other problems. As the population increases, it will be necessary to find ways to obtain greater production from the soil.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his contribution to the discussion.

An example of the miracle of modern science is the quarter's worth of penicillin, which in one shot completely cures a child of yaws, a child who otherwise is doomed to a life of torment, hideous disfigurement, and economic dependence. No wonder that such a cure produces more friendship than any other act.

Our new drugs and insecticides can rid this earth of many of its age-old scourges. And this offers endless hope, for in the tropics bad health has often played the determining role in the unholy trinity of disease, poverty, and ignorance, which enslave the population. Restore a man to physical health, and he becomes productive and capable of progress. Furthermore, there are many byproducts to the elimination of disease. When a region is cleared of malaria, not only is manpower increased, but also the arable acres of once malaria-ridden land.

The first nationwide fight on malaria was made in Greece. Here malaria had always been a problem, but it had grown acute with the floods and ruin which had followed the battles of World War II, the foreign occupation, and then the

guerrilla fighting. More than half the population was afflicted and Greece was consuming one-fifth of the world's quinine. Then DDT, the cheap and versatile hero of many disease control programs, was set to work. When its job was done, malaria for the first time in recorded history was reduced to a minor health problem. The increased manpower had grown to the equivalent of 150,000; there were vast new fields to cultivate, and the wealth of the malarial area had doubled. In addition, other fly-borne diseases, such as typhoid and dysentery, had dropped along with malaria, while the poultry and dairy production had soared.

This initial Greek experience has since that time been repeated around the world, in the Near East, Afghanistan, India, Burma, and the Amazon Valley in Brazil. Everywhere lives have been saved, sickness reduced, and productivity increased.

If DDT has been the cheap weapon against malaria, penicillin has proved the wonder drug against several widespread diseases, one of the worst of which is the tropical yaws. As I have said, one shot of penicillin often heals the awful sores and completely cures the victim. By the close of 1954, 6 million people had been treated by the World Health Organization. In Haiti until 1950, yaws was the worst health problem, affecting one-third of the rural population, and in some areas 70 percent of all people.

I spent a winter in Haiti nearly 30 years ago, and one of the most frightful experiences I had was in finding hundreds of patients who were suffering from yaws.

After 4 years the disease is all but eradicated, for in the rural areas it is not above 0.5 percent. In Indonesia it has also been a major problem, incapacitating whole areas, and impeding the national economy. By the end of 1955, 14 million people will have been examined and 2 million treated. But the program aims to cover the other 60 million people as rapidly as possible.

Since penicillin is the cure for syphilis as well as yaws, the projects often have a double success. But even in countries not afflicted with yaws, mass campaigns against syphilis have been undertaken in some dozen countries.

Modern science furnishes the means for a mass attack on other plagues, like the contagious and dread eye disease, trachoma, which the United States has been combating with mobile health units in both Iran and Indochina, or again, hookworm and other parasitic diseases.

Again, a new chemical developed by the Monsanto Co. is the long-sought answer to the intestinal plague, bilharzias, carried by worms from snails. The new chemical, dropped in an infected stream, purges the water for 8 miles. Around Cairo, Egypt, where the affliction has been acute, a project is systematically clearing up one section after another. Similar programs are under way in the Philippines and in Syria.

Campaigns are also under way to stamp out typhoid in Uruguay, black death in Iran and India, through wild rodent control, and the fatal sleeping sickness of Africa, for which the British have developed an immunization.

In the long run at least as important as these campaigns against specific plagues, and I have given only a sampling, is the educational program in hygiene and public sanitation. This work varies with the area, but it must always rely on training. Some 1,400 health technicians in Latin America have received some training in the United States. In addition, the United States has helped operate some 137 health centers as demonstration projects, 80 hospitals, 12 laboratories, and 3 clinics, while 6 training schools have been built. This Latin American joint health work has probably reached over 23 million people. At the grassroots the projects have built 38,400 privies, 80 sewage systems, and 228 safe water supplies.

In the Near East, the United States has helped set up countrywide health advisory systems in 11 countries; 7 nursing training programs; and 6 public-health training centers. Some 90 trainees were in the United States in 1954. From the Far East at that time there were 97 trainees in the United States. There were both water supply projects and hospital assistance programs in five countries.

Since germs are no respectors of national boundaries, and the once-remote places on this planet are now only a few hours' distance, it makes good sense for everyone's sake to reduce the number of filthy and pestilential holes as soon as possible. On a senatorial study tour, even we might pick up bubonic plague, the black death, or trachoma. Or even if we stay at home there is no surety that a victim of some dread disease may not be flown here in our midst at any time.

DIET AND NUTRITION

But helping others in health is not always linked with sanitation; sometimes it is connected with modern ideas of diet. In the Philippines, our program cut the death rate from beriberi in the Bataan region by 50 percent, simply by the introduction of enriched rice. Again, powdered milk, in countries lacking cattle and refrigeration, has been the great blessing offered to children. Among its many magnificent services, UNICEF's supplemental feeding stands close to the top. Incidentally, this has helped our disposal of dairy foods, for UNICEF bought in 1954 close to 110 million pounds of dried skim milk. In addition, under the disposal plan for surplus commodities, the United States Government gave UNICEF another 26.5 million pounds of skim milk for emergency feeding in Korea.

I think this type of work is capable of great enlargement. It would help, if carried out, in providing energy, and would assist in meeting the problem of disposing of our so-called dairy surpluses.

Some people worry about saving life in the underdeveloped lands, where there is already a shortage of food. It is said that it merely increases the population and hence merely causes men to die from starvation rather than from disease. As a humane people I do not believe, however, that we can really support the ravages of unnecessary plagues as a population control. But I wish to stress the fact, as I mentioned in my discussion with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], that these filth diseases not only kill people but leave many more incapacitated. Restored health brings greater productivity and progress. And alongside our health program is our farm program, which is helping to solve the food problem.

LIFTING FOOD PRODUCTION

The poet, Edwin Markham, made the Man With the Hoe the symbol of earthly toil. But in some lands men have never yet had a hoe, or a plow, or even a scythe. They labor at their rough, tough clods of earth with primitive tools such as their forefathers used hundreds and even thousands of years ago. To them we offer a wonderful show-how program of modern know-how. For instance, the replacement of a sickle by a scythe will multiply a man's productivity and cut through the centuries of trial and error attempts at progress. This we have found true in Afghanistan, where 90 percent of the population is agrarian, and mostly nomadic, and where men use the same tools which they did in the days of Cyrus and Darius. All benefit from sharper axes, better spades, shovels and saws, steel-pointed plows, and so forth. On the other hand, improved tools in some nations mean the latest which our farm implement factories can turn out. At this point, even in dollars our program pays off. In 1954, as an example, Peru bought $5.6 million worth of United States farm machinery, and she now possesses some 4,800 tractors. Indonesia, in the Eastern Hemisphere, brags of 180 tractors.

Insecticides are of course important for the control of plant, as well as of human, diseases. We know that since Biblical days the locust plagues have devoured crops, but at last there is a check to their ruin, and our planes have sprayed the locusts in the Near East and in Ethiopia. The sprays also protect against lice, ticks, flies, and the deadly torsalo grub in the tropics, which ruin milk and hides. In the Philippines 20,000 hemp farms have received treatment to control the destructive mosaic disease. In Iran, pistachio trees, unproductive for 18 years, were sprayed and produced a $3-million crop; in Libya after sprayings there were increased yields of 50 percent, while in Peru three selected farms showed a 400-percent increase. A control of leaf-cutting ants which previously destroyed 95 percent of the gardens, has been developed. A grasshopper menace in Honduras was stopped, and in Haiti vegetable spraying increased the yield by 40 percent. Potato yields in Indonesia were boosted 80 percent, while in Formosa, rice crops treated with insecticides showed a 30-percent increase.

Improved seeds are also showing the way to larger yields, especially in wheat, corn, rice, vegetables, and grasses. Iran reports 170,000 acres sown in improved wheat and barley with increased yields of 50 to 100 percent. New crops have been profitably introduced in lands which never cultivated them, and American hybrid corn is one of the best examples. Another example is the oil palm, now a main crop in Nicaragua with 2,000 acres planted. Pyrethrum, the base for many insecticides, but not previously available in the Western Hemisphere, is now cultivated in Ecuador. And throughout the Middle East, Far East, and Africa, and Latin America, forestry has been stressed for the sake of soil conservation, flood control, and fuel as well as for timber.

Perhaps most important in the farm program is the problem of water, both in connection with irrigation and drainage. In Jordan a single water-spreading project produced about 100 acres of grass in the desert, and water-spreading techniques have since been applied to 2,700 acres. In Egypt our program has helped to dike about 3,000 acres for water spreading. In the Philippines there are five major gravitation irrigation projects under construction to serve more than 200,000 acres. Thailand has placed about 190,000 more acres under irrigation with a series of earth tanks to hold water from the monsoon for the ensuing dry months. And particularly ambitious is the India program of tube wells, which increase irrigated acreage by about 300 acres per well. Two thousand six hundred and fifty wells have been or are in the process of being drilled.

The new fisheries are another new source of food, and especially important because proteins in these nations are short. The Indonesian art of breeding carp in rice paddies is being introduced in other countries, while India has increased its resources by more effective techniques. North of Bombay the United States has given help which developed a better net, with corks and winches, and then with the aid of diesel engines, the catch has been multiplied. A freezing plant has been established and a shark oil refinery which processes some thousand fish a day.

Storage facilities, proof against rodents and insects, have also been a boon in preserving harvests.

Samplings of the success of these various new techniques show these facts: Peru's productive land has increased 15 percent in the last 10 years, and the average yield per hectare has gone up almost 40 percent. Use of hybrid corn on 15,000 acres showed an increased yield of 300 percent; potato production increased by 96 percent.

In Panama rice production is up from the prewar deficit figure of about 23,000 metric tons to more than 95,000 metric tons in 1953, enough for its own demand. Costa Rica also produces enough rice, as well as corn and beans. About 10,000 family gardens have been planted and milk supplies are up 25 percent. In Haiti on demonstration plots, rice yields were increased from 280 to 1,600 pounds per acre.

In the last four years, in India, food production increased by 6 million tons a year. Liberia for the first time in history is becoming self-sufficent in its staple food, rice; while in Thailand, the rice crop was estimated as 75 percent above prewar harvests. The Philippines also for the first time in history produced enough for its people, about 50 percent above prewar levels. Corn yields in Indonesia have gone up in some parts as much as 80 percent, while in the desert of Persepolis a man from the University of Utah, with deep wells and a diesel engine, cultivated such fine crops on his demonstration farm that he paid for half the cost of operation in the first year.

Among the farm gains must also be counted the improvements in livestock and poultry. More than 2 million baby chicks have been exported from the United States and many thousand other animals. The breeding of better cattle from high-grade bulls as well as by the artificial insemination of 87,000 head has upgraded the quality of the livestock.

In all, the farm program has helped some 40 million farmers in Latin America, the Near East, Africa, South Asia, and the Far East. Some 33,000 farm technicians have received training; farm extension has been set up in 15 countries, and 4,000 youth clubs with a membership of 88,000 have been organized in 21 countries. More than 50 vocational schools in agriculture have been opened in 18 countries and agricultural colleges in 7, while about a thousand agricultural officials and farm leaders have been brought to the United States for training.

HANDICRAFTS AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

In many cases the handicrafts are developed in order to keep pace with the improvements in agriculture. In Lebanon the cottage industries have been aided by teaching the women how to design and turn out embroideries and rugs which are more attractive to outside markets. Simple village handicrafts are fostered in the community development program of India.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

But we cannot stop merely with agriculture, handicrafts, and health. Take Turkey, for example. Here is one of our best allies with nearly 20 strong divisions of fighting men. But Turkey is straining her resources to maintain this army with one-half of its scanty budget pledged to these purposes. And if her income does not increase, she will probably be forced to cut back on her arms to our detriment and that of the free world. How then can her income be increased? Primarily only if she develops factories which will turn out tools and machines. But this requires mines for coal and iron, power dams, and transportation. Much the same problem comes up in other countries such as India and Indonesia. After a time the scythes, spades, plows, and saws which we may furnish will wear out. If they are to be replaced, some development in coal, iron, power, and transportation will be needed.

Nor need we be afraid of raising up commercial rivals. If we want strong allies, we cannot keep them weak. Prosperity for others inevitably creates a greater demand for our products and, therefore, makes us prosper more fully.

To avoid the chaos which might otherwise occur, industrial developments must ultimately be built side by side with improvements in farming and transportation. Otherwise, in these areas of great population, improvements in one segment like agriculture, may ultimately throw men off the land with no place to seek work and a livelihood. Grave problems will result from improvements in a given area unless there are also programs for developing industry and training men in industrial skills at the same time that farming methods are improved.

The technical assistance program has attacked this problem in many ways. We have furnished funds for industrial surveys, and have helped set up industrial banks to provide investment and capital; there are many programs for management training; the techniques of labor-management relations are being taught; we have educated people to help build up responsible trade union organizations; there are programs for vocational education and training, small handicraft industries have been encouraged; and the private investment potential of many areas has been studied under technical assistance.

Some specific examples of these programs will make clear the great job that is being done in a variety of countries and by many private and public American groups under contract with the technical assistance program.

In the area of industrial surveys there are various examples. On Formosa, the J. G. White Co. is advising the Formosan Government on the industrial potential of that island. There, groups of specialists are helping to design plants and factories. They are teaching engineering techniques, surveying markets, and developing management-training programs to serve the industrial potential of the island.

The technical assistance program is cooperating with the Philippine Government in creating an industrial development center of its own. It is being staffed, in part in the early stages, by United States technicians; but the result will be an indigenous industrial development center for the Philippines.

These preliminary plans are vital if Asian governments are to attract industry, and the technical assistance program in this one area is an example of how we are helping other peoples to help themselves.

Capital and credit are vital needs. In many areas interest rates are so high as to be prohibitive. The main function of technical assistance in this field has been to set up industrial banks to provide both investment capital and working capital. In some cases counterpart funds are the original sources of the capital. This is true of Greece. One of

the finest examples is an industrial bank in India which, thanks in part to technical assistance, has now attracted capital to the bank from Indian private sources, from the Indian Government, from the British Government, and from American private sources.

The technical assistance program has also helped countries to create conditions which would attract both private domestic and foreign capital. One of the best examples is the accomplishments of the team which went to Turkey under the leadership of Clarence Randall. New laws were passed which provided a genuine basis for capital formation from both domestic and foreign sources. Conditions were created by law for stable tax rates, nondiscrimination against foreign capital, and the right to repatriate a portion of earnings—conditions vital to investment.

The absence of a managerial group is one of the great needs which technical assistance has sought to meet. Often there is no great middle class to provide managerial skills for new industry. Purdue University, for example, has a contract with the Formosan Government to train young people in industrial techniques. A productivity center was established in Japan with technical aid. In Iran, help has been given to small industrial plants to make their industries efficient and to meet their own internal needs. The American Bechtel Company, in building a power station in Korea has, as a part of its contract, agreed to train Koreans to manage this new plant. These are all positive measures to improve the skills and techniques of other people so that they may run their businesses by themselves.

In the field of labor-management relations one of the striking examples is the contract between the University of the Philippines and the University of Connecticut, under which labor-management courses patterned after those given in American universities are being established.

Vocational education, so vital to a country entering upon an industrial revolution is another phase of the overall technical assistance program. Such skills as operating construction equipment, draftsmanship, and repairing and servicing automobiles are being developed by technical aid.

Tuskeegee Institute is now training vocational education teachers in three universities in Indonesia. Stanford University has a contract for training students in engineering and business administration in the Philippines. Bradley University, of Illinois, has set up centers for vocational education and for training teachers in Iraq. North Carolina State University, in collaboration with the National Engineering School of Peru, is training textile engineers for that country, and the W. R. Grace Co. has agreed to provide jobs for every textile engineer trained by the school. The University of Michigan has a vocational school in Mexico City for training people in auto maintenance—skills important to the Mexican people and to us, too, if we hope to sell our automobiles abroad. The University of Wisconsin has a contract affiliation with four engineering colleges in India and the University of Minnesota is cooperating with the Univeristy of Seoul in Korea in an engineering program.

These examples are merely a few of the ways by which industrial development is being encouraged by the technical assistance program. In this way industry may develop side by side with improvements in agriculture and transportation, the stresses and strains of countries industrializing may be softened, and human values and the dignity of human beings may not be subordinated to industrial development.

SUMMARY

I know the objections which are inevitably advanced against any such program. It will be said that our heroic efforts to save Europe and our aid to Asia and the East have won us not the world's friendship but the world's hate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. While I agree with much of the statement of the Senator from Illinois, will not the Senator agree with me that so far as concerns the use of American capital to develop heavy industries in foreign countries, there are many such countries whose people are industrious and capable, and the United States could be repaid the funds used in developing foreign industry. It would certainly be worth while to do that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think as we move into the development of capital goods, such goods should be supplied on a loan basis as much as possible.

Mr. LONG. Certainly a people who are as industrious as the Turks will make a success of the equipment we provide them for productive purposes; and at the rate at which they produce, they could very well repay us for much of the investment which is required in developing industries for them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator from Louisiana is correct when we consider the fields of steel mills, power dams, railway lines, machine shops, coal mines, and so on. It might not be true of roads, but I think it is of the others I have mentioned.

Mr. LONG. The people of some countries are so impoverished it would be a shame to expect them to repay us for helping them get started; but as people get on their feet and become more productive, it makes sense that they should agree to repay us, just as has been done by our friends in South America. They have made much progress as a result of obtaining capital, on reasonable terms, from the Import-Export Bank.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am certainly not opposed to that, and that should be done wherever it is possible.

I, too, at times, have shared a feeling of resentful frustration because of our not being appreciated. It is unfortunately true that men have a perverse tendency to dislike being placed under an obligation and tend to dislike those who do them favors. It reminds me of a remark which Mr. Dwight Morrow made when a certain man had been speaking in very uncomplimentary terms about him. Mr. Morrow puzzled over it for a minute, and then he said, "I cannot understand why X is saying bad things about me. I have never done him a favor." Such an attitude is unfortunately true, and it is a part of the dark side of mankind.

But this is as characteristic of ourselves as it is of others, and we should not be greatly surprised if we see this same unlovely characteristic cropping out in those we seek to help. The powerful and the rich are seldom loved, particularly by those who have hitherto either been dominant or have believed themselves to be culturally superior.

But if there is one thing that the founder of our religion taught, it was that we should primarily seek the good of others rather than their gratitude. He taught us by example and by precept that we should try to help others and not to make the pursuit of popularity our primary goal. This is at times hard to appreciate, and the growth of the public relations industry and of the current religion of success has made it even more difficult.

But it is true. And we only make matters worse if we continually thrust emotional thermometers into the mouths of others to determine the degrees of gratitude which they feel, conduct elaborate Gallup polls to see how others like us, or put up billboards to tell others how good we are. This is about the best way for us to lose friends and to estrange people. For it convinces men that we are basically interested only in ourselves and not in them.

Instead of judging our programs by the gratitude they create, should we not rather test them by the improvement in living standards and the build up in hope, self-reliance, and independence which they foster? If we can assist in the demonstrations that the way of freedom and mutual aid is the path to greater personal fulfillment and national strength, this will best serve the real interests of these peoples—and build up their resistance to tyranny. The entire free world will be stronger.

Though it is hard to follow—very hard to follow—straight forward and hard-headed concern for others is still a primary duty. Nor should we forget the wrongs—political, economic, and spiritual—which the white race has inflicted upon those of darker skins, nor of our own errors which have helped to contribute to the resentment against us. Let us be chary of judging others harshly, lest we ourselves be similarly judged.

Experience should instead teach us that friendship seldom springs full blown at first sight. If it does, it is likely soon to wither. Friendship is, instead, built up slowly from an accumulation of incidents, acts, and words. In the long run, the man or woman who is generous and helpful will forge deep and abiding friendships which will be far more enduring than anything which may be obtained by the cheap tricks of public-relations men. Therefore, while prudence

should not be our dominating motive, it is nevertheless true that such a policy of active and intelligent good will is the best means of binding the non-Communist and anti-Communist peoples together in that strongest of all ties, namely mutual respect and friendship. In this sense, therefore, it is our best protection against communism, which has been well defined by an eminent divine as "the unremedied evils of the world marshaled by hate to achieve the world's destruction."

Another question which inevitably comes up in our mind is: How long must such a program continue? It is now 8 years since President Truman heroically launched the Marshall plan, and before that there had been lend-lease, UNRRA, and the liberal post-war loans. It is but natural, therefore, that we should feel tired and want relief. "Must this go on forever?" we ask. Even mighty Atlas, according to Greek mythology, wanted to shift and even to lay down his burden of supporting the heavens. So we, too, grow weary of helping to support the earth.

This is inevitable and not to be wondered at. But we should realize that in relation to our resources, we need assume only a modest burden. We can never expect that the need for unselfishness will pass, and certainly as long as the cold war continues, there are sound reasons of prudence why we should keep on. For this business is not a one-shot affair. It is not done once and for all. It can only be carried on successfully if it has the same degree of permanence as the need it is designed to meet, although as good stewards of our own substance we should be thrifty.

And this brings me to a third objection, namely, that our overseas personnel live on such a lavish scale that they waste our substance and estrange the hard-pressed peoples of the countries concerned by their aloofness and their luxury. I am regretfully compelled to admit that this seems to be the case with many of our military and diplomatic representatives, although there have been some notable exceptions like Chester Bowles in India and Eugenie Anderson in Denmark, who lived simply, and who, in trying to be open-hearted friends, won immense popularity for themselves, and respect and affection for ourselves. This seems to be a lesson which the professional diplomat, soldier, and bureaucrat finds it hard to learn. They should remember that the Persian satraps and the Roman and British proconsuls did not help their countries' standing.

But this fault seems to be far less true of the workers under point 4, or what is now termed technical assistance. From all that I can learn, they live in comparative simplicity and work amidst the squalors and dangers of poverty and disease. They are the front-line soldiers and the combat engineers of this battle for whom I have always had greater affection than for those who sit safe and comfortable in the seats of the mighty at general headquarters.

The truth of the matter is that we should not be afraid of the deep desires for a world of kindness and of friendship which lie within ourselves and within others. We at times are afraid of following the friendly instincts of our hearts lest we be ridiculed for our softheartedness or be betrayed by the ingratitude of those whom we would try to help. No one wants to seem to be a simpleton and to be an "easy touch." But there is something worse. It is that we may grow hardhearted and materialistic if we close the door upon these generous impulses, and come only to concern ourselves with wealth, power, publicity, and secular advantage. When this happens we become somewhat unlovely and either lose friends or fail to win them. At our funeral there may be flowers, but there will be no tears and few sincere mourners. So it is with men, and so it is with nations.

Nor should we be fearful of the political consequences of trying to be generous. Some have tried it, however imperfectly they may have done so, and have found that, despite bitter opposition and what seemed to be insurmountable odds, the heavens did not fall in on them. In fact, quite the contrary.

What we should realize and respect is the deep hunger of the human heart for a world of peace and friendship. To tens of millions of men and women, technical assistance and the United Nations, with all their faults, are tangible means of helping, in some small measure, to make this earth truly the Kingdom of our Lord.

As we deliberate here, while the hard-faced men and the cynical elements of the press, politics, and industry seek to embitter our minds and frighten our spirits, let us remember those tens of millions of other Americans who do not have much money or worldly influence, but who are nevertheless committed to this task. Let us think of the churchwomen who, from their egg money and their cake baking, have kept foreign missions going through the generations, and who see in all this the continuance of the same spirit. Let us think of the farmers, now about to launch upon another season, who hope that the abundance of the soil may not only bring prosperity to them and to their families, but that it may also help to relieve hunger and bring abundance to God's children wherever they may be found. Let us think of the factory workers at the lathe, who want the tools and machines which they help to fashion to be used for man's development, rather than for his destruction. Let us think of the white-collar workers, who want to be dealing, not with impersonal figures and cases, but somehow to help the grand design. Yes, let us think of those who have largely conquered the greatest of spiritual impediments, wealth and power, and who humbly seek the good of mankind.

As the Bandung Conference approaches, it is therefore urgent that we make up our minds. If we in Congress, if the policymakers of the Government, and those who administer the affairs of the Nation, will consider these issues and these peoples, there can be little doubt what our own decisions and actions will be: A renewed and expanded technical assistance program by our Government, and full-scale participation in the aid programs of the United Nations and the Organization of American States.

Mr. President, it is well for us to remember the advice which Kipling gave to Britain nearly 60 years ago, at the diamond celebration of the accession of Queen Victoria to the throne, and when Great Britain occupied about the same relative position in the world that we do today:

> For heathen heart, that puts its trust
> In reeking tube and iron shard,
> All valiant dust, that builds on dust,
> And guarding calls not Thee to guard,
> For frantic boast and foolish word,
> Thy mercy on Thy people, Lord.

REPORT BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL ON ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION CONTRACTS FOR ELECTRIC POWER—PART I

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, today there has been made available to members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a report by the Comptroller General on the Atomic Energy Commission Contracts for Electric Power—Part I. Part I deals with Ebasco Services, Inc., and their performance at the Joppa, Ill., steam-electric plant.

Mr. President, there is a little background to the submission of the report, which it might be well to review.

Last November, during the hearings held in the 83d Congress, by the joint committee on the subject of the utility contract between the Atomic Energy Commission and the Mississippi Valley Generating Co., there was testimony by Mr. Thomas Murray, a member of the Commission. The testimony is on page 281 of the hearings. In his testimony Mr. Murray commented on the fact that he had heard that Ebasco Services were to assume the same role with the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. that this company had played with Electric Energy, Inc.; and then Mr. Murray said:

> The more I reflected on this, the more disturbing its implications became. In effect, I found myself being asked to approve Ebasco for the engineering and construction phases of the work under this contract.

Then skipping a few lines, we find that he said:

> And so I asked the general manager's office for all records concerning the replacement of Ebasco by the Bechtel Corp. I was startled when I was told that there were no records.

With that as a starting place, it became my privilege, upon becoming chairman of the joint committee, on February 3, to address to the Honorable Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, a letter in which I said I had been advised that the General Accounting Office had recently begun an audit of the utility contracts between the Atomic Energy Commission and the Ohio Valley Electric Corp. and Electric Energy, Inc. I asked if I might receive a copy of the report.

Under date of February 9, Mr. Campbell replied that they were at work on the report; that it would take some time to complete it; and that as each part of it was released, a copy would be furnished to the joint committee.

That is the copy which now has been furnished to the joint committee, and which the joint committee will print as a committee document, and parts of which will possibly be inserted today in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the report there is an explanation of how the Comptroller General became interested in this subject. I shall quote from page 1 of Mr. Campbell's report. I think I should say, parenthetically, that many comments were made about Mr. Campbell, at the time of confirmation of his nomination. But I must say that his report is a very interesting and enlightened one, and promises very fine things for Mr. Campbell's administration of his high office.

I quote now from page 1 of his report:

We feel a review of Ebasco's performance is important because (1) the large increase in estimated construction cost of the Joppa plant resulted in a significant increase in the estimated annual cost of electric power to the Government, and (2) we understand that the Mississippi Valley Generating Co., known as the Dixon-Yates group, who recently contracted with AEC to furnish a large amount of electric power to the Government, is considering using Ebasco for design, engineering, and construction management of its powerplant at West Memphis, Ark.

Back of all this there was, of course, a great deal of comment, most of which probably we should not review again. But the joint committee issued its report, and the then minority members, as the committee was then constituted—the Democratic members of the group—commented rather strongly on the Dixon-Yates contract, and pointed out the difficulties Ebasco had been under in the work it had done on previous contracts. They also pointed out that, as the contract had come before the joint committee, it was the testimony of the Atomic Energy Commission that Ebasco was to construct the Dixon-Yates plant.

We made comments on that, as will appear on page 17 and elsewhere throughout the report. Then, in the section contributed by Mr. HOLIFIELD and Mr. PRICE, there were at page 59 several citations to the effect that members of the joint committee had been very much disappointed in the selection of this company to construct the Dixon-Yates plant.

At that time there was some rather extensive questioning. I began some of it. I asked what they were doing in allowing Ebasco to construct the plant. At that time it was pointed out—at least, I tried to point out, and it appears on page 167 of the hearings—that General Nichols had permitted a decision upon the construction of the plant to be reached. I asked him this question:

Are you familiar with any plan to select anyone to build this plant? Do you know whether Mississippi Valley Generating Co. has decided upon anyone to build the plant for them?

I now read General Nichols' reply, as it appears on page 167:

They have indicated to us they plan to use Ebasco; and the Ebasco company—Ebasco Services, Inc.—is presently working with them, for example, on such things as working out the site and planning on that. Ebasco was already on the job, at the company's expense.

I was interested in the hearings on this subject, in which we were talking about the "Ebasco fiasco." This was the earlier hearing, in May or June. I said, "Are you familiar with that?" General Nichols testified that that was before his time.

I said:

Surely, when becoming general manager, and knowing we lost $40 million by the Ebasco fiasco, you certainly would not want to step back into it without examining it, would you?

Then he made a very interesting reply. He said:

No, sir. In other words, when they first brought up the point at Ebasco I sort of lifted my eyelids, as you apparently do, Senator, and I went into it in some detail. I went into it in considerable detail, and I will tell you why we have finally agreed, and why we are not objecting to the idea of Ebasco.

A little later I said:

Just one $40 million flop ought to be enough for one government at one time.

Later he commented that this firm was chosen to do the work, and that they were perfectly qualified, and were the best people that could have been selected.

I go back into that history only to comment that the Comptroller General of the United States has issued what I regard as an extremely fine report. From page 3 through page 6 he cites the summary of his findings. I ask unanimous consent that the summary and conclusions of the Comptroller General of the United States be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the summary and conclusions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY

Our major comments are summarized below. Where appropriate, a page reference is given for a more complete discussion of a subject.

1. Ebasco is a wholly owned subsidiary of Electric Bond & Share. Middle South Utilities, a public-utility holding company whose subsidiaries are serviced by Ebasco, was at one time a subsidiary of Electric Bond & Share, but at the present time is an independent regional holding-company system.

2. Based on a proposal submitted by EEI, in which Ebasco estimated that a four-unit powerplant capable of supplying a firm load of 427,500 kilowatts would cost $70 million, AEC decided to obtain 50 percent of its power requirements for Paducah from EEI.

3. One month later AEC increased the EEI firm load to 500,000 kilowatts, and Ebasco increased its cost estimate to $87 million, which estimate was used in the definitive contract. AEC executed what amounted to an open-end cost-type contract with EEI on May 4, 1951, for 500,000 kilowatts of power. On October 14, 1952, AEC executed a similar type contract with EEI for 235,000 kilowatts of additional power, which agreement required EEI to add a fifth and sixth unit to its plant.

4. Ebasco progressively increased its construction-cost estimate for the first four units until April 1953, when it reported a cost estimate of $130 million to EEI. EEI immediately took over direct control of construction and shortly thereafter terminated Ebasco's construction services entirely.

5. Ebasco, EEI, EEI's consultants, and AEC have all issued reports which discuss Ebasco's increases in its construction-cost estimates.

6. Based on our review, we are of the opinion that the basic reasons for the increases in Ebasco's estimates are:

(a) The original estimate was based on inadequate information.

(b) The labor problems encountered were greater than anticipated.

(c) The management activities at the site were not adequately performed.

7. The indicated cost of the Joppa administration building is $82 per square foot. We have been informed that a reasonable cost for an administration building is $20 to $24 per square foot.

8. The total increase in the estimated cost of the Joppa power plant is $51 million. Because of the nature of the open and cost-type contract, AEC will bear the major portion of this additional cost. The increase in AEC's annual power costs estimated to result directly from the construction cost increase is $2.5 million, or $62.5 million over the 25-year life of the contract.

9. It is EEI's opinion that, as a result of Ebasco's defective cost estimates, EEI incurred excess financing costs of approximately $5 million because it was forced to borrow additional funds at a rate of interest which was the highest paid by any utility in a decade.

10. There was a 50-generator-months' delay in the commercial operation of the first 4 units of the Joppa plant, which delay forced AEC to incur extra power costs during the construction period in an amount estimated to exceed $8 million. The AEC-EEI contract does not penalize EEI for failure to get the units in commercial operation on the dates stated in the contract.

11. There were delays in Ebasco's submission of cost information. Apparently one reason for this was the split in responsibility between the Ebasco Joppa staff and the Ebasco New York staff.

12. EEI's independent public accountants have questioned the propriety of almost $500,000 of Ebasco's billings to EEI for services rendered. Such billings to EEI totaled approximately $5 million.

13. At the present time the amounts of Ebasco's fee as well as Ebasco's billings for services are in dispute. EEI has proposed a compromise settlement to AEC, providing, so AEC informs us, essentially that Ebasco not be allowed a profit on its construction work but would be allowed a profit on its engineering work. AEC has advised EEI that the minimum negotiated settlement that it can accept, without court action, is one under which Ebasco would receive no profit for its services on the Joppa project.

14. The current status of Ebasco on AEC power projects is (1) Ebasco is essentially completed at EEI, (2) Ebasco is the independent engineer at OVEC, and (3) Ebasco is being considered for design engineering and construction management by MVGC (the Dixon-Yates Group).

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings set forth in this report, it is our opinion that the best interests of the Government would be served if AEC decided to take the following actions with respect to Ebasco's participation in Government work:

1. Develop completely, for the record, all of the aspects of the disagreement between

EEI and Ebasco pertaining to the amounts of Ebasco's fee and Ebasco's billings for service, and accomplish a timely settlement in the best interest of the Government (we believe it is important to point out that, based on discussions with AEC officials, we believe that AEC's planned actions are in accordance with this conclusion).

2. Defer consideration on Ebasco's participation in any work on the MVGC plant if MVGC recommends Ebasco prior to a satisfactory settlement of the EEI disagreement with Ebasco.

3. Withhold approval of Ebasco's participation, if recommended by MVGC, even after a satisfactory settlement unless MVGC will give AEC contractual assurance that any increase in the actual cost of construction of the facilities over the contract estimate of $104,115,000 will not be included in the cost of power taken by the Government.

Mr. ANDERSON. In the summary and conclusions the General Accounting Office reached a decision which I think is a commendable one, and one with which I find myself in strong agreement. I read from the summary:

Based on the findings set forth in this report, it is our opinion that the best interests of the Government would be served if AEC decided to take the following actions with respect to Ebasco's participation in Government work.

This is the Comptroller General of the United States speaking:

1. Develop completely, for the record, all of the aspects of the disagreement between EEI and Ebasco pertaining to the amounts of Ebasco's fee and Ebasco's billings for service, and accomplish a timely settlement in the best interest of the Government (we believe it is important to point out that, based on discussions with AEC officials, we believe that AEC's planned actions are in accordance with this conclusion).

I hope the Atomic Energy Commission will insist that this settlement be reached, that the size of Ebasco's fee be fixed, and that its billings for service be settled in some fashion.

The second recommendation or conclusion of the Comptroller General is as follows:

2. Defer consideration on Ebasco's participation in any work on the MVGC plant if MVGC recommends Ebasco prior to a satisfactory settlement of the EEI disagreement with Ebasco.

I find myself very strongly in agreement with that recommendation. It was one of the points which caused the long discussion and debate over the Dixon-Yates contract. Many persons have sought to make it appear that the only interest some of us had in the Dixon-Yates contract was a battle between the private power companies and public power companies. That might have been an element to some degree in the minds of some, but others of us thought it was a bad contract in itself; and that, without regard to the principles involved in the question of public or private power, it should have been rejected.

The Comptroller General says further as a third recommendation and conclusion:

3. Withhold approval of Ebasco's participation, if recommended by MVGC, even after a satisfactory settlement unless MVGC will give AEC contractual assurance that any increase in the actual cost of construction of the facilities over the contract estimate of $104,115,000 will not be included in the cost of power taken by the Government.

In other words, the Comptroller General seems to be saying to the Atomic Energy Commission, "If you do allow Dixon-Yates to use Ebasco, certainly you had better get a guaranty from them."

If I may do so, I should like briefly to outline some of the items in this report. I do not intend to go into it at any great length, because we are planning to reproduce it.

On page 10 of the report there is an interesting paragraph which shows the connection between Ebasco and the Middle South Utilities, which is in Dixon-Yates. It is pointed out that—

Ebasco Services, Inc., is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Electric Bond & Share Co. At least 3 men—Curtis E. Calder, George G. Walker, and T. C. Westcott—are directors in both of these organizations. Middle South Utilities, Inc., was initially a registered holding company subsidiary of the Electric Bond & Share Co.; however, since December 1949, when Electric Bond & Share distributed and sold its holdings in the company, Middle South Utilities has become an independent regional holding company system. All three companies have their principal offices at 2 Rector Street, New York City.

So, in reality, Middle South Utilities was almost dealing with itself on this contract.

On page 13 there is comment about the order of the Security and Exchange Commission to distribute Middle South Utilities to its security holders. We find these words:

Mr. Edgar H. Dixon is president of Middle South. He and all of the other executive officers of Middle South have been officers or associated with the various companies which formally made up the electric power and light interest.

On page 14 there is the statement that—

The Commission, in a meeting on November 8, 1950, considered the various proposals and by a majority vote decided to assign to TVA the power supply responsibility in accordance with its proposal and to support TVA's request for funds before the Bureau of the Budget. The dissenting voter, however, Commissioner Thomas E. Murray, contacted several private utility companies regarding the submission of an independent proposal.

I think that is rather important, because Commissioner Murray is now the only hold-over member of the old Commission. It was Mr. Murray who proposed, not that they accept a bid from TVA, but that they find private utilities to make the contracts which would lead to supplying power for the Portsmouth and Paducah plants. The constantly-repeated statement that those of us who have opposed the Dixon-Yates contract—and they included Mr. Murray—were opposed to private utilities, is certainly given pretty bad treatment in this report.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. In connection with the statement the Senator has read from page 14, and the statement which he himself has made with respect thereto, I invite his attention to page 7. It will be found that on December 6, 1950, hearings were held on the AEC and TVA supplemental appropriations. It so happened that at that time I was acting chairman of the Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee considering this item. It was I who held that hearing.

The AEC asked for the appropriation, on behalf of the TVA. The committee felt disposed to grant the request, or recommend to the Congress the appropriation of the amount requested. Why? Because, as the Senator will recall, if he will note the date, on December 7, 1950, we were in quite a military emergency. The urge to expand the atomic-energy program was presented to our committee as a matter of national concern and of extreme urgency.

Then on page 7, the same page, there appears the statement that on December 14 an additional hearing was held on AEC and TVA supplemental appropriations.

It was at that time that the Atomic Energy Commission came back before the committee and said that Commissioner Murray had made the contacts and had had the conversations with private utilities, and that the private utilities had formed the concern of EEI, Inc., and that they proposed to furnish one-half the power at rates comparable to those offered by TVA.

Those who would charge that all of us who opposed the Dixon-Yates contract were public-power advocates might recall that history.

The committee of which I was acting chairman unanimously reported the appropriation bill, in which it was provided that one-half of the power should be supplied by TVA and one-half of it by EEI, on the assurance that the cost of the power to the taxpayers would be comparable. We felt that we should, in this emergency then existing, follow the recommendations of the President, of the Atomic Energy Commission, and of the Bureau of the Budget.

However, the history which the Senator from New Mexico has cited, and which is detailed in this report, does not bear out the prediction as to the cost of power. The Ebasco fiasco resulted. It resulted in greatly increased costs. Perhaps the Senator from New Mexico has already referred to the citation with reference to the additional cost which this contract entailed. It cost the taxpayers approximately $62½ million more than the original estimates.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I was coming to that point. I am very happy that he has given his own testimony with respect to what took place.

All I want to do is to make sure that we establish for the record that the transaction that brought EEI, Inc., into existence was made by the very people who are now being charged with

opposing the Dixon-Yates contract because they do not like private power.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield further.

Mr. GORE. The one member of the Atomic Energy Commission who was responsible for this recommendation and for this alteration of policy has since expressed his regret and his keen disappointment, and now stands as a stalwart opponent of the Dixon-Yates contract. This report once again shows the Dixon-Yates combine as grabbers of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree fully with what the Senator from Tennessee has stated. It might serve a useful purpose to refer to items 8, 9, and 10 of the summary. They appear at pages 4 and 5 of this publication.

Paragraph 8 shows the total increase in the estimated cost of the Joppa powerplant to be $51 million. Then, when various other items are added it makes the record total of $62,500,000.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Furthermore, because of the delay in meeting construction schedules, the Atomic Energy Commission was forced to ask TVA to buy for the Commission emergency power to meet the requirements, and that cost the Atomic Energy Commission an additional $8 million.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. That is referred to in paragraph 10.

Mr. President, on page 15 there is a reference to the AEC minutes of a meeting with private utilities. Those minutes contain the following excerpt:

> Selection of the design and construction contractors has not been made. Dixon indicated that Middle South would back Ebasco for the job. The other companies did not indicate concurrence or nonconcurrence.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does not Mr. Dixon occupy the same office with Ebasco? Are not both companies receiving mail at the same address?

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes; indeed they are.

Mr. GORE. Is it any wonder that he was backing them?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it is not any wonder at all. I point out that Mr. Dixon's primary complaint involved AEC's increasing the construction cost estimate. This is what he put in his telegram:

> First, we definitely do not agree with the staff's restatement of our $125 million proposal at the TVA figure of $139 million. The cost of a powerplant depends not alone upon capacity, but also in a large measure upon design, structure, and similar items. Our estimate of $125 million was made by Ebasco, whose experience in this field cannot be surpassed. We see no reason to recede from this estimate.

I say to the Senator from Tennessee that if we had before us the minutes of the Atomic Energy Commission all the way through and understood this transaction, we might have reached a different decision.

I am not going to take too much additional time of the Senate, but I believe it is important to refer to page 20 of the Comptroller General's report. The report shows that Ebasco's preliminary figures given to AEC listed a construction cost estimate of $65,300,000. Then the Ebasco construction cost estimate was raised on December 7, 1950, to $70 million. One month later the cost estimate was increased to $87 million, which is the estimate used in the definitive contract.

In the next paragraph the report shows that Ebasco progressively increased its construction cost estimate for the first four units until it reached $128,500,000 on May 12, 1953. Shortly thereafter EEI terminated Ebasco construction services.

I should think they would. The original estimate was $65,300,000. Then the next estimate was $70 million. Then the next estimate was $87 million. Then they got up to $128,500,000. That represented a 47.7-percent increase over the $87 million contract estimate, and an 83.6-percent increase over the $70 million estimate.

I believe that is certain proof that Mr. Dixon was right when he said:

> The experience of Ebasco in that field cannot be surpassed.

Never has a company thrown away money as that company threw it away.

I think it is very significant that the cost got out of sight. One reason some of us feel some concern about the Dixon-Yates contract is that everything spent in excess of $104 million becomes a liability against the Nation—not the total amount, and perhaps only one-half of it, but just the same it can be very expensive for the Government.

I finally turn to page 39 of the report. The Ebasco people wanted to erect a small office building, in which to do their work, and they estimated that the office building would cost $159,000. Before they got through with it they succeeded in spending $392,132. Rather, they reached a total as the final cost of $82 per square foot.

I agree with Mr. Dixon, here is a company whose experience cannot be surpassed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. On page 38 there appears a description of that building. It was a rather small building, only 116 feet long, 41 feet wide, and 1 story high. It was not built of marble or alabaster or stainless steel; it was plain concrete block with brick veneer. But that little building cost the taxpayers more than $392,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. But the Senator from Tennessee does not realize the magnificence of the doors. At the bottom of page 39 it is stated that a study was made of the cost of the doors installed in the building—I understand it was a temporary building—and the Comptroller General says the cost of the hollow metal doors was $3.314, or $114 for each door. The installation cost was $8,034, or $277 for each door.

If one wishes to get in or out of the utility business it is an expensive undertaking when dealing either with Dixon-Yates or Ebasco Services, Inc. The total installed cost was almost $400 a door, the report from the Comptroller General shows.

Mr. President, this document is of great interest. The joint committee will print it as a committee report and make it available. The remaining documents which are to come from the Office of the Comptroller General will be, I am sure, equally valuable as we look at this subject.

I merely wish to point out that this entire document shows how hard the Democratic side of the aisle tried to keep the Government out of the contracts. I think one of the results of the fight was that we were finally able to get rid of Ebasco, or, perhaps, I should say, we hope we may get rid of it.

Dixon-Yates have assured the Atomic Energy Commission that they will not use Ebasco for construction work, but only to plan the construction work. By the time Dixon-Yates get through in West Memphis, if they ever get to work—I hope they will not—they will put a per capita cost on doors the like of which neither Arkansas nor Tennessee has ever seen, judging from the knowledge we now have of the doors to which reference has been made.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. It is one more reason why the Dixon-Yates contract should be canceled. I know President Eisenhower has much reading to do, and in order to make it easier for him to obtain the salient points of the report, since the Senator from New Mexico will have the report copied and I shall be able to obtain additional copies, I am going to mark the salient points and send them by special delivery to President Eisenhower tonight.

Mr. ANDERSON. The report has clear type, excellent printing, and the contents are interesting.

Mr. GORE. It is very readable.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. President, one of the regrettable things is that even though, time after time, we have pointed to the bad planning behind the whole matter, we received no response whatever from the people who pushed it. Even when those who constructed the OVEC plant came to the Atomic Energy Commission and said, "We have discovered that we have 165,000 kilowatts of power additional to what we had planned, and we can turn it all over to the Atomic Energy Commission," I have not heard a reply or an indication that the Commission intends to cancel the Dixon-Yates contract, although the availability of this power was brought to their attention during the time when they could have called for a cancellation of the contract.

Mr. President, I pay tribute to the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Campbell, and say to him that if this is a forerunner of future work that will be handled by his department, we shall look forward to succeeding documents with great interest.

STATEMENTS BY SENATOR BENDER

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed

in the RECORD several statements prepared by me under the headlines, respectively, "Bender Says Washington Merry-go-Round Still Dizzies Businessmen," "Bipartisan Foreign Policy," "Speaking of Taxes," "What Russia Got From German Industry," "Question of the Week," "Agonizing Reappraisal on Chinese Islands," and "Meeting of the Big Four."

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENDER SAYS WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND STILL DIZZIES BUSINESSMEN

My attention has been called to the effort of a Cleveland business establishment to obtain United States Government work. This company has been employed by prime contractors for the United States for many years. It has established an excellent record of performance. It has trained personnel available and it faces imminent closing because of failure to obtain additional work.

In response to suggestions made by Government agencies, representatives of this company visited Washington for a period of 1 week. They visited 20 separate offices within the city of Washington and 2 others in Philadelphia. They were shifted from the Pentagon Building to the Navy Department, to the Bureau of Yards and Docks, to the Corps of Engineers, to the Army Small Business Office, to the Department of Commerce, to the Bureau of Ordnance, to the Small Business Administration, to the Signal Corps Supply in Philadelphia, and finally to the Philadelphia District Public Works Office.

The net result of this entire operation was frustration and no contract. It has not been a complete waste of time, however, because the company has now been referred to the Tank Automotive Center in Detroit, to laboratories in Trenton, to the Naval Center in Johnsville, Pa., and back to the Navy Department in Cleveland.

The net impression gained by all of this effort was the confirmed belief that the Government agencies are far more interested in entering contracts with prime contractors, leaving the small-business man with the task of pursuading the bigger operators to farm out lesser work to them.

In view of the announced purpose of our Government to stimulate small business, this runaround is discouraging. The experiences of this company, I have been told, could be multiplied by a thousand.

Certainly by this time we should have established some way of coordinating all these efforts. If there is no work obtainable for such companies they should be told without the necessity of spending time, effort, and many fruitless days in and around Washington.

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

In the last few weeks there has been more conversation in Washington on war than we have had since Korea. Most of it has been sheer speculation. The rest of it has been armchair strategy. None of it has contributed to the question of world peace.

For years we have talked about a bipartisan approach to foreign affairs. The late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan, and our former Secretary of State Cordell Hull were the architects of this bipartisan foreign-policy program. The gentlemen on the majority side of the aisle have seemingly forgotten this worthwhile objective. Even though this goal has not been achieved in practice, we should still be trying to stop politics at the water's edge.

There are some people in the Senate who are trying to make the Republican Party sound like a war party. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Every effort of our President is directed toward preventing war. Every diplomatic effort of the past 2 years has been based upon the determination to stop wars from developing. For the first time in a generation there has been no large-scale fighting for a year.

Let us remember in all this wild talk that on the question of ratification of the Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of China the vote in this Chamber was 64 yeas and only 6 nays. This was not a partisan question. Our commitments to the Chinese Republic and our determination to defend it were agreed upon by both political parties. Neither party can avoid or evade its responsibility for the consequence of this action.

Let me remind you, too, that we have committed ourselves to other major steps in the Far East.

By a vote of 82 to 1 we adopted a resolution ratifying the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. We are all in this together. Let us face the challenge of Formosa with the unity and determined purpose which alone can assure our country of success in its drive to deter aggression everywhere in the world.

SPEAKING OF TAXES

With the new April 15 deadline moving unhappily into focus, America's taxpayers (and we are all taxpayers) have some cause for reflection. Sad as it may seem, the net result of our inflationary years from 1939 onward has been felt in every home.

A married man with two children who earned $2,000 before taxes in 1939 must earn $4,182 today to be in the same shape he was in at that time. The chap who took in $3,000 under the same circumstances in 1939 must produce $6,577 now to match his former condition.

Just as bad, if not worse, is the price index. Folks living in large metropolitan areas have seen their index jump from 99.4 in 1939 to 191.1 in December of 1954. Our dollar today will buy somewhere in the neighborhood of half what it did 16 years ago.

When you add up the total of Federal, State, and local taxes, the $3,500 wage earner pays out about $1,040. Our $4,500 income is hit with $1,425 in taxes. The $7,500 income is subject to $2,630 in taxes. And the folks whose incomes reach $15,000 pay out more than $6,150 yearly in taxes. Maybe it's time we did something to stop this climb.

WHAT RUSSIA GOT FROM GERMAN INDUSTRY

There has been a good deal of speculation about the gains derived by Russia from the surrender of Germany. Many German scientists have been taken to the Soviet Union by one means or another. Their ultimate contribution to the Communist world is not foreseeable, but it is certain to be important.

More tangible loot taken from Germany was the world's biggest forging press taken piece by piece from the I. G. Farben Co. and moved into the interior of Russia. This press was directly responsible for the strength of the Russian MIG's which flew hard and fast against our jet fighters over Korea. The Russians seized plans for still larger German forging presses at the same time.

These gigantic machines cut the cost of planes substantially and increase their structural strength through one-piece construction. We are finally catching up with this new industrial development in our own country. It seems incredible that Uncle Sam can ever be behind Russia in a technical skill. We won't be for long.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK

Which Democrat will you have, the gentleman who worries about the White House squirrels, the one who speculates about the health of the President's wife, or the chap who objects to Mr. Eisenhower's churchgoing?

AGONIZING REAPPRAISAL ON CHINESE ISLANDS

There are almost as many appraisals of the importance of the Matsu and the Quemoy Islands as there are appraisers. This is true both inside and outside of the administration. Military experts have honest differences of opinion as to the possibility of defending these islands with or without land troops. Some people doubt their strategic value to the defense of Formosa. Others stress the vital importance of stopping the Communists from winning another propaganda triumph against the West.

In this difficult situation, President Eisenhower has assumed responsibility for the ultimate decision. It is an awesome burden. On the outcome may depend the future of mankind, for if a third world war stems from the decision taken, no one can foresee clearly the outcome. If you are thinking of the presidency as the greatest honor which any man can attain in our country, think of this decision impending, and pray for the President as you regard this agonizing choice.

MEETING OF THE BIG FOUR

Some folks have the idea based on the old song, The More We Get Together, the Happier We'll Be. It just isn't always so. The Big Three got together at Yalta and the net results were something less than happy.

Now there is talk of a "big four" meeting to ease world tensions. Churchill has always been for these international assemblages. The French like to talk about conferences "at the summit." Russia invariably manages to wait out the others in the hope that she will be "invited," and therefore occupy a choice spot along the bargaining counter. Uncle Sam usually attends for the purpose of giving something away and getting nothing in return.

President Eisenhower's attitude of caution and restraint in rushing into print on the subject is a refreshing change in American diplomacy. We have insisted that until Russia and her pals show some signs of abiding by the rules, we are not going to send our team into action. It is about time somebody reminded the Reds that there are rules.

ALLEGED THREATS TO OUR NATIONAL SECURITY, PRESTIGE, AND ECONOMY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, when the people of North Carolina elected me to the United States Senate they did so with the expectation that, for me, at least, there would be no "privileged sanctuary" beyond the Potomac River. They elected me in the full expectation that I would not hesitate to call attention to acts of omission and commissions that I might find in Washington, and at any level they might be found.

Since coming to Washington, I find that many people, especially my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, consider the White House to be a "privileged sanctuary," immune from any criticism. If such a thing as a "privileged sanctuary" from legitimate, constructive criticism should ever come to pass in this country, then we would cease to be a true democracy.

With that in mind, I feel compelled, as a citizen of the United States, as well as in my capacity as a United States Senator, to call attention to a long series of acts and statements, which, taken together, constitute a real and dangerous threat to our national security, to our prestige and standing in

international circles, and to our domestic economy.

I do not approach the task with joy. There is nothing pleasant about reviewing the damage to effective government produced by an administration without firm and steady leadership. No. It is with great regret and even with sorrow that I present to my colleagues some of the matters which are troubling me, as they must be troubling other Senators. There already have been expressions of deep concern coming from all sides over the drift and confusion which characterize this administration—a drift that has now carried us dangerously close to the brink of war. I cannot wait longer—none of us should wait longer—to state what we believe to be the causes—or at least some of the causes—of that lack of control over our national destiny.

We all remember the chanted slogan "I like Ike" that swept the country back in 1952.

Our great military hero, back home from the wars, had laid aside his uniform to lead a crusade in the fields of civilian affairs, an area in which he had no experience, and of which, time has now proved, he has little, if any, understanding.

In the past 2 years he has proved that statesmanship is no accident, that the art of government is an exact science, and that the shoemaker should stick to his last.

Judging by the mail received in my office, the fears that have been aroused in the hearts and minds of the people all over the United States during the past 2 years have no partisan political implications. They come from people in all walks of life and from both Republicans and Democrats.

Even some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have expressed grave concern over the course the ship of state is traveling.

Let me make this clear: My intention is to analyze and explain, if I can, the drifting, erratic course the American ship of state is following.

No honest and fair examination of this dangerous drift can be made without reference to the part played by the responsible head of the administration—the President himself. But, of course, it is incumbent on all who speak to confine their observations to actual deeds of this administration, as I shall do, and to question no one's motives.

No one, I think, can question that the American ship of state is meeting heavy weather, and is floundering around. It is pulling first in one direction and then in another in response to the contradictory and confusing commands of a disorganized and undisciplined crew. Some members of the crew seemingly are unaware of the things for which the President has said he stands, and others are quite obviously hostile to many of his avowed objectives.

What is most disturbing is that the captain of the ship—President Eisenhower shows little concern over, and takes no action to correct, the frequent ignoring of his wishes by members of his administration and by his party lieutenants.

One of the clearest examples of the President's apparent lack of control over his administration and his party leaders may be found in the release of the Yalta papers by the Department of State.

The Constitution lays upon the shoulders of the President the responsibility for the conduct of our foreign relations. Nothing in recent weeks has affected our relations with other governments more adversely than the sudden release of these papers over the explicit and known objections of our principal ally, Great Britain.

This makes all the more puzzling the statement by White House Press Secretary Hagerty that President Eisenhower was not consulted about making the Yalta papers public. The decision to do so, Mr. Hagerty says came—and I quote the newspaper accounts of what he said—"from entirely within the State Department."

To me, it is inconceivable how any Chief Executive, be he in business, the military, or the Government, can tolerate the taking of such an important action as the release of the Yalta papers without his knowledge or consent.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Not at this time.

Lack of control over his administration is made evident by the mere fact that Mr. Dulles would dare to take such an action without first consulting the President.

Later, at a news conference, President Eisenhower said he had not even read the Yalta papers, and added that he would be opposed to using them for political purposes in the 1956 campaign. Authorizing a direct quotation of his statement, Mr. Eisenhower said:

> There is nothing * * * as I can see * * * to be gained by going back 10 years and showing that, in the light of after events, someone may have been wrong or someone may have been right.

This, Mr. President, was the position taken by Mr. Eisenhower on March 23, 1955. His position was immediately challenged by at least two of the top-level leaders of Mr. Eisenhower's own party. They warned him and the country that they had the firm intention of using the Yalta papers for partisan political purposes on any and all occasions and particularly in the 1956 election campaign. In fact, the Senate Republican Policy Committee staff has just handed to Republican Senators a 51-page document on how to use the Yalta papers to indict previous Democratic administrations. The President has yet to take any action to persuade these men that they should respect his views. Instead, they ignore the President, the leader of their party, with complete impunity.

There is another aspect of the Yalta papers' release which, in the opinion of many persons who have communicated with me, should be further explored.

I refer to the following sequence of events: Secretary Dulles announced that there would be no release; that to release them would be against security requirements.

Then, in less than 48 hours, a State Department official, still unidentified, leaked a complete copy of a single newspaper, thereby opening the flood gates for a wave of criticism and ill will throughout the free world.

A tight-lipped Secretary of State, tight-lipped at least in this matter, has declined to reveal the identity of the man who obviously violated the security code by leaking the Yalta papers.

At this point, Mr. President, let me read from a letter I received from a constituent. This man asks:

> How can the Eisenhower administration dare look the American people in the eye and talk about national security and security risks when a protective cloak has been thrown around the person who leaked the Yalta papers right after Mr. Dulles said it would violate the public interest and international security to publish them?

I have never claimed to be a mind-reader, Mr. President, so I can only wonder as to what reason President Eisenhower and his Secretary of State had for permitting publication of the Yalta papers. Certainly they could have prevented publication, even after the leak was made, if they had so desired and tried hard enough.

Whether or not the purpose of the Yalta release was to take the public eye off the mounting tensions in Asia, particularly in the Formosa area, it certainly had that effect, temporarily, at least.

Of course, it is a matter of common knowledge that our allies of the Western Hemisphere, confused, fearful, and even angry over conflicting reports about our intentions toward the possible exchanging of atomic bombs in a desperate defense of Quemoy and the Matsu Islands, were warning us about that time that if we did so, we would have to go it alone.

Now, the rash of confused statements and acts which are alarming so many of our allies and our own people finds expression in nearly all of the departments of the executive branch of the Government.

It was only a short time ago that Mr. Benson, Mr. Eisenhower's flexible Secretary of Agriculture, fired a long-time employee of the Department of Agriculture, Wolf Ladejinsky. Ladejinsky, Secretary Benson charged, was a bad security risk. Almost immediately, Mr. Harold Stassen, head of the Foreign Operations Administration and another political appointee of President Eisenhower, gave Ladejinsky employment in his agency.

The press corps obviously found this rather puzzling, and at the next Presidential news conference was primed to ask a few questions. Just what kind of security program did the country have when a man fired as a bad security risk by a Cabinet officer was immediately given employment in a critical area by another officer appointed by the President? That was a natural question.

Mr. Eisenhower professed to see nothing inconsistent in the two contradictory acts.

But, remember this—

He said, according to the New York Times, in its January 12 issue:

Stassen has to stand responsible—

For hiring Ladejinsky—

and if something should turn up to show that his judgment was wrong, then he—

Stassen—

would be held responsible.

Can any Senator here conceive of a General in command of an army saying, "If this attack fails, it is Colonel Blank's fault"? Of course not. The responsibility lies with the man in command. I would have thought General Eisenhower learned this at West Point, early in his career. Even as a private in World War I, I managed to learn how the chain of command works—sometimes to my sorrow.

This is especially true of the Government of the United States, since the Constitution specifically provides:

The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America.

The responsibility of the President for the activities of the executive branch was recently ably enunciated in the following words:

The ultimate responsibility for the conduct of all parts of the executive branch of the Government rests with the President of the United States.

Do Senators know who said that? None other than Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Yet he seeks to lay the blame for any unfortunate outcome of the Ladejinsky case on one of his subordinates.

I fully agree that from a moral as well as from a constitutional standpoint full responsibility for the acts of his appointees and subordinates rests upon the shoulders of the President.

Let me call your attention to another instance of floundering around. Sometimes I call it messing around. A few weeks ago, Secretary of Labor Mitchell announced that some action ought to be taken to repeal the so-called right to work laws in 17 of our States. He said such action was necessary to keep square with the labor organizations of this country.

The words had hardly rolled from the tongue of Mr. Mitchell before President Eisenhower, the man who appointed Secretary Mitchell, said that the Labor Secretary did not necessarily express his views in the premises.

If Secretary of Labor Mitchell does not represent the views of the President in labor matters, just who does represent them? For whom, and for what government, is Secretary Mitchell working?

As I said earlier, it is with sadness, coupled with alarm for the safety of these United States, that I view and review the chaos that has been wrought, at home and abroad, by a governmental pattern that leaves any and every top level subordinate free to dash off at any tangent he fancies contradicting the President and canceling out acts and statements of fellow Cabinet officers and highly placed military figures.

Such a pattern cannot help but result in piling confusion upon confusion, and makes for a government completely lacking in sense of responsibility.

Take, for instance, the confusion that surrounds the administration's security-risk program, and how that program has been handled.

On November 23, 1953, President Eisenhower said:

If we are going to continue to be proud that we are Americans, there must be no weakening of the codes by which we have lived, the right to meet your accuser face to face.

Mr. President, those were brave words, and plainly and clearly spoken; but right on their heels came Mr. Brownell, the President's Attorney General, with an entirely different viewpoint. Mr. Brownell let Congress know in no uncertain terms that, in his opinion, the Justice Department just could not handle the security-risk problem if the accused had the right to be faced by his accuser.

And, in a brief filed March 8, 1955, Assistant Attorney General William F. Tompkins had this to say on the subject:

It is becoming increasingly clear that the current attack against Government witnesses and informants of the FBI has its roots in a Communist effort. It has * * * as its objective * * * the hamstringing of the FBI's informant system. And there is no more effective way of attempting to do this than through the demand for confronting of witnesses in these noncriminal (security hearing) matters.

How else can one interpret that statement except as a condemnation of President Eisenhower's demand—for that is what it was—that one's right to meet your accuser face to face be respected? We are no longer surprised, although we still are shocked, when extremist elements of the Republican Party indulge in inferred charges that Mr. Eisenhower is soft on communism.

These are but some of the symptoms of the confusion, both planned and unplanned, which saturate this administration, and the confusion has its main source in Presidential swaying in the wind and drifting with the current.

There was the immense confusion over the administration's position which last year rendered this country diplomatically impotent while Indochina was being carved up—moving half of that country and many millions of people behind the Iron Curtain of tyranny. In that situation there were differences among the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and differences between the Joint Chiefs and the Commander in Chief, according to reliable press reports. There were differences within the administration and within the Republican Party. The country and the world could not tell whether President Eisenhower, or the Senator from California, Mr. Knowland, or Vice President Nixon, or Secretary Dulles was speaking for American foreign policy. And the things some of them said in the beginning differed radically from the course they later took.

At the outset, the administration gave strong indications that it had determined on a course of armed intervention to prevent the fall of northern Indochina. But, at the showdown, it shifted to a mild acceptance of the Geneva settlement as the best of a bad bargain.

Confusion now hangs over the administration's course on the Chinese offshore islands of Matsu and Quemoy.

Of course, it is better that the President not reveal his precise intent about the islands at this time; but let us pray to God that he has made up his own mind about what he plans to do. Let us hope that his position is firm, and that he will not be pressured or tricked into conflict by warminded leaders of the Republican Party.

Confusion is bad enough in itself, but what distresses me most is that planned confusion seems to be an outstanding feature, a fixed strategy, of the Eisenhower administration. Great pains have been taken to paint the President as a political amateur, and therefore dependent on the more politically experienced men around him for advice. But I say President Eisenhower is a master architect of confusion, not the tool of confusion.

When a baseball game is going badly, the manager does not replace the batboy. He replaces the pitcher. That is, he looks to the man most likely responsible for the bad turn the game is taking. In the case of our Government, there is no question as to where the ultimate responsibility lies. It lies with the President of the United States. It is time we stopped criticizing the batboys and began to see just what kind of a job the pitcher is doing. It is time we began placing the responsibility for events where the responsibility really lies—on the President of the United States.

There is a most unique situation confronting us. As a rule, whether it be in business, in Government, or in the Military Establishment, the subordinates always pass the buck to the higher ups. The underlings always want the boss to make the tough decisions. In the case of the present administration, the exact opposite is true. The boss—the President himself—is passing the buck down the line of command. He, and he alone, can correct this unfortunate situation.

Today, as I look back over the past 2 years, the famous expression "A. W. O. L." comes very clearly to mind, for this is truly an administration without leadership. We can never have real leadership so long as the President tries to handle the tough decisions by putting them off, by passing the buck to others, or by his ducking responsibility for the acts of his subordinates.

General Eisenhower owes it to the American people, and to himself, to be the President of the United States in fact as well as in name.

APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR BRIDGES TO COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN of Iowa in the chair). At the request of the Vice President, the Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] as a member of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, under authority of Public Law 108, 83d Congress, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Hon. Homer Ferguson.

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from the President to the Vice President, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 31, 1955.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
The Vice President of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: For some time I have had under consideration the desirability of accelerating the completion of the Inter-American Highway which extends from the United States to the Canal Zone via the Central American countries.

The early completion of the Inter-American Highway in close cooperation with the affected countries is a clearly established objective of United States policy.

Although this project has been under construction sporadically since 1934 and the Congress has appropriated funds in the amount of $53,723,000 to date for its completion, the incompleted state of the project prevents realization of maximum benefits.

Recently I have sought the advice of interested agencies of the Government, and I am convinced that for economic and political reasons now is the appropriate time to speed completion of the Inter-American Highway. I believe this would be the most significant single action which the United States can take in Central America and Panama to bring about the most mutually advantageous results.

Among the considerations which make me feel that an accelerated construction program on the highway is essential are these:

1. A completed highway will provide a very important contribution to the economic development of the countries through which it passes.

2. There will be an opportunity for increased trade and improved political relations among these countries and the United States.

3. The resultant increase in tourist traffic would not only improve cultural relations but also serve as a very important element in the development of their economies through earnings of foreign exchange.

4. The existence of such an all-weather highway would be of substantial security importance, both in providing overland contact and communication as far southward as the Panama Canal, and in bringing an important physical link between these countries in our common defense of the Western Hemisphere against aggression from without and subversion from within.

The stabilizing effect of these factors will tend to bar any possible return of communism which was so recently and successfully defeated in this area.

It is estimated that the amount needed to complete the Inter-American Highway in a 3-year period is $112,470,000, of which $74,980,000 would be the share of the United States, leaving $37,490,000 as the combined share of the several cooperating countries on the usual 2:1 matching basis.

In the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1952 and 1954 Congress authorized the expenditure of $56 million for this project. Funds actually appropriated against these authorizations have totaled $6,750,000, leaving a balance of $49,250,000 yet to be appropriated. Of this amount $5,750,000 is currently included in budget estimates now pending before the Congress. In order to accelerate the highway work sufficiently to permit its completion within the next 3 years, an additional authorization of $25,730,000 will be needed.

It will also be necesary to increase our 1956 appropriation request from $5,750,000, to $74,980,000.

In the near future I shall transmit to the Congress the necessary budget request to carry out this program, and I trust that the Congress will give this proposal for accelerated completion of the Inter-American Highway its most favorable consideration.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The letter will be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

THE PAN-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to comment on the statement, made a moment ago by the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], relative to the Pan-American Highway. If the distinguished Senator from North Carolina will refer to Senate Report 1627, on the accessibility of critical materials to this Nation in time of war, and for purposes of an expanding economy and for our security, he will find a complete outline of that highway.

It should certainly be completed as a part of inter-American—21 nations—cooperation. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from North Carolina on the statement he has made.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada will yield to me, let me comment on the fact that, as of this date, the President of the United States has sent to the Senate, addressed to the Vice President of the United States, the President of the Senate, a message in which the President of the United States takes cognizance of the fact that something should be done about the Pan-American highway. The Senator from Nevada knows better than does almost anyone else the necessity for completing that highway. So I am very happy to know that today the President of the United States has sent to us that message, and that it will appear in today's issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, let me say here that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico will remember very well the trip we took through the Central American countries, beginning with Panama, north including Mexico, and examining all of the Pan-American Highway then constructed in that area. In the course of that trip we became intimately acquainted with the difficulties of completing the job. At that time the distinguished Senator from New Mexico was chairman of the Public Works Committee, and I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, Power, and Rivers and Harbors. We visited each one of the Central American countries, and also visited Mexico; and we made a report on the advantages of early completion of the highway.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

The President's message which came to the Senate this afternoon, and which was addressed to the Vice President of the United States, the President of the Senate, was to the effect that what he, the President of the United States, had in mind was to have that work carried out, so that within the next 3 years it would be possible to drive an automobile from Washington, D. C., to Panama City. I hope that project can be carried out.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from New Mexico that I hope that in a reasonable period of time it will be possible to drive automobiles from here or from New Mexico or Nevada to Chile and, by way of the Pan American Highway, and also through "feeder" roads to Buenos Aires and to Rio de Janeiro.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. And then, by means of additional air fields which could be advantageously located by our Air Force at places where it is almost impossible to construct highways, there could be closer cooperation between the nations of South America and the nations of North America. The 21 nations of the Western Hemisphere, which we said in Senate Report 1627—1954—could be defended and could be made self-sufficient in the protection of the critical materials without which we could not fight a war or live in peace.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes, Highways are one of the best means of bringing about closer cooperation.

Let us bear in mind that I did not vote for the President, but I think he has a good program. When he sends to the Senate a message calling for completion of a highway from the United States southern border to Panama City, I am for it.

Mr. MALONE. Then, Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will bear with me, let me say that if the highway could be completed through to Chile, then, by means of the construction of branches or so-called feeder highway, it could later be extended to all the countries of South America. But the United States would not need to furnish all the money for building those highways. Those countries have tremendous amounts of labor and materials to contribute.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. We have trained engineers, who are capable of providing the direction. In that way we could materially hasten the construction of the highway.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, first things must come first. For instance, in constructing a road from Washington, D. C., to Philadelphia, one must first reach Baltimore, Md.

Similarly, in constructing a highway to Chile, one must first reach Panama City.

The message of the President, which has come to us this afternoon, is based on the idea that within the next 3 years the Pan American Highway can be com-

pleted, so that any American citizen and his family will be able to get into his jalopy in Washington, D. C., and become acquainted with the countries to the south of us by driving on a paved road all the way to Panama City.

As I said a moment ago, in driving from Washington, D. C., to Philadelphia, one must first reach Baltimore, Md. So it is that when a motorist who uses the new highway reaches Panama City, he will be able to plan on driving to the countries of South America.

Certainly the Senator from Nevada is correct. Certainly there is no question about the desire of Latin America to have good highways. Let me say that when I speak of Latin America I have in mind more than completion of the highway to Panama City. At this moment there are thousands of miles of international highways in South America. Today one can travel from Bogotá, Colombia, or from Santiago, Chile, on the west coast, across the Andes, at an elevation of almost 13,000 feet, to Buenos Aires or Rio de Janeiro. Furthermore, Mr. President, let me point out that the automobiles which are driven on those roads are made in Dayton, Ohio, Cleveland, Ohio, or Detroit, Mich. So it is to our own interest to cooperate and to help.

I know the Senator from Nevada will help in that effort.

COL. ROBERT R. McCORMICK, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, today the Nation has lost a real leader.

Colonel McCormick was first of all an American, intensely loyal to his principles and ideals.

He was a fighter of the old school—there was no middle ground. In his book you were for this country or against it, and his Chicago Tribune and allied news outlets reflected it.

His integrity was unquestioned and his character established through generations.

Today America lost one of its own.

CONSTITUTIONAL REGULATION—THE DOMESTIC ECONOMY VERSUS FOREIGN RELATIONS—THE 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on the subject of foreign trade, the Congress is so far away from the dog that bit it through the passage of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act that it does not recognize its own constitutional responsibility.

CONGRESS TRAINED IN SHIFTING RESPONSIBILITY

After 21 years, the habit of shifting Congressional constitutional responsibility to the President whenever he so demands has become almost automatic.

A DOMINATED CONGRESS—1934

In 1934 a browbeaten Congress tied the regulation of the domestic economy to the foreign policy negotiations for the first time since the Constitution pointedly separated them in 1789.

SIT STILL AND REGAIN CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

It seems almost impossible for Members of Congress to realize that if they would only sit still and not pass any extension of the 1934 Trade Agreement Act, the American working man and investors would be back in business.

1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT SET INDUSTRY AGAINST INDUSTRY

The Congress through passage of the ill-fated Trade Agreements Act, set industry against industry, and working men's groups against other working men's groups, in a mad scramble to survive and save themselves from extinction through special dispensations or amendments excepting their own domestic product, while other products, industries and workers were to be sacrificed on the altar of a one-economic-world foreign policy.

DICTATOR CONTROLLED DOMESTIC ECONOMY AND FOREIGN POLICY

By 1776 George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and others had been pushed around so long by kings and dictators, who by executive order could regulate both the domestic economy and the foreign policy, that they determined, through the constitution of new Republic, that it should never again happen to Americans.

Article I, Section 8 of that immortal document says, in simple and direct language, that—

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises—

Which we know as tariffs and import fees—

> to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States.

Article II, section 2, provides, in the same straightforward language, that the President—

> shall have power to make treaties—

And he—

> shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls.

Treaties are made subject to ratification by vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting.

TIED DOMESTIC ECONOMY TO FOREIGN POLICY

Under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the constitutional responsibility of Congress to regulate the domestic economy through the laying of duties or tariffs and of regulating foreign commerce—trade—was transferred bodily to the executive branch of the Government. Under that act, as amended, the President could lower the duties a total of 75 percent on any product, without regard to the difference in cost of production due to our wage-living standards and other costs here, as compared to low-wage foreign costs.

He is now asking for an additional 3 years' authority to lower the duties 15 percent more.

CONSTITUTION AMENDED BY SIMPLE ACT OF CONGRESS

The Constitution was thus amended through the simple act of Congress, and the President, thenceforth, was in a position to trade the domestic economy for foreign policy, which he has proceeded to do, thereby undertaking to remake the industrial map of this Nation, as the Chief Executive has done since 1934.

SIT STILL—REGAIN CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

If the Congress were simply to sit still and pass nothing, at midnight on June 12 it would automatically regain its constitutional responsibility to regulate the domestic economy and to regulate foreign commerce through the adjustment of duties or tariffs on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

AFTER JUNE 12 STATE DEPARTMENT NO FURTHER COMMITMENTS

On and after that date the State Department could make no further commitments to lower duties. That date would also mark the end of all trick organizations, such as the Geneva General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT; the International Trade Organization—ITO; the International Materials Conference—IMC; and the International Trade Organization, recently created by a United Nations Assembly resolution—all designed to divide the markets of this Nation with the other nations of the world in the name of a foreign policy for peace.

REGULATING DOMESTIC ECONOMY REVERTS TO CONGRESS

At midnight on June 12, 1955, in the absence of congressional action extending the act, regulation of duties or tariffs on all products with respect to which there is no trade agreement would revert to the Tariff Commission under the 1930 Tariff Act, in which the Congress laid down the principle of continuous adjustment of flexible duties or tariffs on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

The difference in the cost of production here and abroad is the principle laid down—considering the effective wage standards of living, taxes, and the general cost of doing business, giving the American workingman and investors equal access to their own American market.

THE PRESIDENT CANCELS TRADE AGREEMENTS

In that event the trade agreements already made would remain in force until the President served notice for cancellation on the nation with which such trade agreements had been made. Then, in the specified time, generally 6 months, the adjustment of the duty on the particular product in that trade agreement would revert to the Tariff Commission.

FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

The American workingmen and investors would then be back in business, under the principle laid down by the Congress of the United States, of fair and reasonable competition.

DESTROYS SMALL INVESTOR AND WORKINGMEN

Manipulation of the duties or tariffs in the interest of foreign policy, as the 1934 Trade Agreements Act authorized the President to do, has the dangerous implication of destroying the American workingmen and small investors and making us dependent on foreign nations, across the major oceans, for the critical materials without which we cannot fight a war or live in peace.

TAKE PROFIT OUT OF LOW FOREIGN WAGES

The adjustment of the flexible duty or tariff under the Tariff Commission is

designed to equalize the domestic and foreign costs and to take the profit out of low-cost foreign labor, much of which is being exploited by American companies at the present time.

EVEN BREAK IN OWN MARKET

Such a duty would not prevent imports, but it would give the American workingmen and investors an even break in their own market, which is all any producer or workingman ever asked.

No American producer or workingman is for a high or a low duty or tariff—they only ask for the duty to be adjusted on a basis of fair and reasonable competition—then as the chief competitive foreign nation raised its living standard the duty would be correspondingly reduced—and when their wage standard of living approached our own—free trade would be the almost immediate and automatic result.

DEAN ACHESON-WILLARD THORP

Mr. President, on July 12, 1949, in debate on the floor of the Senate I stated that our Secretary of State, at that time Dean Acheson, had said:

It is hardly possible any longer to draw a sharp dividing line between the economic affairs and political affairs. Each complements and supplements the other. They must be combined in a single unified and rounded policy.

Mr. President, that statement contravenes the Constitution of the United States, which pointedly separates the regulation of the domestic economy from foreign policy negotiations.

I quote further from my statement on the floor of the Senate on July 12, 1949:

Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State, was for the first time very definite in testifying before the Senate Finance Committee on the 24th of January of this year in support of the 3-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act when he said—and, Mr. President, this is an important pronouncement by the Assistant Secretary of State:

"1. The European recovery program (Marshall plan or ECA) extends immediate assistance on a short-term basis to put the European countries back on their feet.

"2. The trade-agreements program is an integral part of our overall program for world economic recovery.

"3. The International Trade Organization, upon which Congress will soon be asked to take favorable action, provides a long-term mechanism * * * each part of this program is important. Each contributes to an effective and consistent whole."

So says the Assistant Secretary of State.

ORGANIZATION FOR TRADE COOPERATION

What have Secretary Dulles and the State Department substituted for part 3, the ITO, which Willard L. Thorp testified was a part of the whole, including free trade, which was part 2?

They have substituted an organization called the Organization for Trade Cooperation. The Organization for Trade Cooperation is supposed to be submitted to Congress; that is, the organizational features of it are to be submitted so they say. The organizational features are written out, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate is considering them. What are they? They represent a reorganization of the Geneva General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. That is what they are.

If Congress approves the Organization for Trade Cooperation, it will at the same time approve the organizational features of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, also known as GATT.

It is not intended that they submit to Congress the multilateral agreements which have been made under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or that they will later make under the Organization for Trade Cooperation, providing Congress approves it.

It is my humble opinion that if the Senate follows the House in its approval of H. R. 1—extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—that the Organization for Trade Cooperation will never be submitted to Congress, or if it is submitted it will not be pressed—because the Secretary of State has testified that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act gives the President full authority to join GATT.

The Secretary of State has testified that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act gives the President all the authority he needs to cooperate with the Geneva General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

PROCEDURE AS A MEMBER OF GATT

Mr. President, he designates a representative or representatives to attend the meeting of GATT in Geneva. Whenever the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade meets, that representative represents the President in the negotiations. When conclusions in multilateral trade treaties have been arrived at, such conclusions may then be submitted to the President and the President authorizes the representative to sign for him.

CONGRESS COMPLETELY IN THE DARK

That is done 3,000 miles from Washington, D. C. Then the United States is bound to the multilateral treaties. If Senators knew—and I hope they realize what they are doing before they vote on this important measure—that this same organization has passed on the adjustment of duties on 58,000 products, none of which has ever been or ever will be submitted to Congress, and none of which any Member of Congress knows anything about until it was a settled matter, they might feel differently about it.

AN ECONOMIC YALTA

Any extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act by this Congress would be an economic Yalta.

It will be infinitely worse than the alleged political sellout by Mr. Roosevelt at Yalta, since it is only alleged that Mr. Roosevelt sold out the foreign nations. By this act, Congress will be selling out the workingmen and small investors of our own country.

LEGITIMATE FOREIGN TRADE

The legitimate foreign trade, namely, the products shipped abroad from our shores, and the imports from foreign nations for which the shipper is duly paid, has amounted to about 4½ to 5½ percent over the last half century. If the taxpayers' cash sent to foreign nations, together with the national-defense equipment delivered to them now called foreign trade and paid for by American taxpayers, be deducted, the legitimate foreign trade is, at this time, just about that same percentage.

A SAD COMMENTARY

Mr. President, it is a sad commentary indeed when, through a policy of trading American markets for foreign-policy concessions, the American investors and workingmen must beg with hat in hand for an even break to compete in their own markets.

HIGHEST KNOWN WAGE-LIVING STANDARD

The duty or tariff was utilized for a century of time under the Constitution to equalize the domestic and foreign cheap labor costs in order to promote the development of the whole country alike on the highest known wage-living standard of the world.

THE FLOOR UNDER WAGES

The flexible duty or tariff adjusted on the basis of fair and reasonable competition served as the floor under wages, giving the American workingmen and investors equal access to the American markets. The difference in the effective wages and the general costs of doing business here and abroad was represented by the duty.

THE RUSSIAN WAY

Mr. President, the State Department proposes that workmen whose jobs are moved to foreign lands through low-wage labor competition should be moved to other areas and that investors be compensated for their loss at taxpayers' expense.

That is the Russian way.

WRITERS OF THE CONSTITUTION DID NOT TRUST ANYONE

There was a definite basis, in addition to the separation of powers, for lodging the regulation of the domestic economy in the legislative branch. Every precinct in the Nation is represented on the Senate and House floor, and they would accept no principle that would favor the development of one area of the country over another for any reason.

The writers of the Constitution did not trust any man or group of men, including themselves. They not only wrote the Constitution defining the powers of the three branches of government, but they wrote a Bill of Rights specifically spelling out what it meant in important particulars.

Nowhere do we find in the Constitution or Bill of Rights a way to amend the Constitution of the United States without submitting it to the people. It belongs to them.

EVEN IF CONSTITUTIONAL IT WOULD BE UNWISE

Mr. President, even if it were constitutional, which many believe it is not, to transfer to the President the regulation of domestic economy and the regulation of foreign commerce, it would be unwise.

SUIT NOW PENDING IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

There is a suit now pending against the Secretary of the Treasury by Morgantown Glass Co., in the United States United States district court, alleging that it is unconstitutional. Also that participation in the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade is unconstitutional. I hope the Senate will refuse to extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act and that the legislative branch of our three-branch Government will resume its con-

stitutional responsibility to the people of the United States of America.

DISTRESSED AREAS—EFFECTS OF THE 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. President, the Department of Labor, in a report made public today lists 156 distressed areas in the United States.

This is 12 more distressed areas than there were 2 months ago, 76 more distressed areas than there were a year ago at this time, and 119 more distressed areas than there were 2 years ago.

The Joint Committee on the Economic Report on March 14 of this year issued Senate Report No. 60 of the 1st session, 84th Congress.

In that report it printed a table under the heading: "Reasons for Substantial Labor Surplus in 44 Major and 100 Smaller Labor Market Areas, Classified as Group IV in January 1955."

Group IV areas are areas with a substantial labor surplus, as the Labor Department puts it, or areas with a very substantial labor surplus. "Labor surplus" in both cases is bureaucratic language for unemployment.

The common term for these areas of substantial or very substantial unemployment is "distressed areas."

INJURED INDUSTRIES

I ask unanimous consent that this table listing the distressed areas as of January 1955, and listing the "principal industrial or other source of economic distress" be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reasons for substantial labor surplus in 44 major and 100 smaller labor market areas, classified as group IV in January 1955 [1]

[Group IV-A, unemployment from 6.0 to 11.9 percent; group IV-B, unemployment of 12 percent or more]

Name of group IV area [2]	Subclassification [3]	Principal industrial or other source of economic distress
Alabama:		
Alexander City	A	Textiles; lumber.
Anniston	A	Machinery (electrical); ordnance; lumber.
Decatur	A	Textiles; industrialization lack.
Florence and Sheffield	A	Aluminum; leather.
Gadsden	A	Primary metals; textiles.
Jasper	B	Mining (bituminous coal).
Talladega	A	Textiles; ordnance; Government.
Arkansas: Fort Smith	A	Drought (agriculture, food); mining.
Connecticut: Bristol	A	Machinery (bearings); watches and clocks (fuses).
Georgia:		
Cedartown and Rockmart	A	Textiles (cotton and synthetic tire cord).
Cordele	A	Ordnance (shells); trade and service (oil mills).
Illinois:		
Harrisburg	B	Mining (coal, fluorspar).
Herrin, Murphysboro, and West Frankfort.	B	Mining (bituminous coal); radios.
Litchfield	B	Mining (bituminous coal); primary and fabricated metals.
Mount Vernon	B	Railroad cars.
Indiana:		
Connersville	A	Machinery (household: refrigerators and sinks); auto parts.
*Evansville	A	Aircraft; refrigerators.
*Fort Wayne	A	Electrical machinery; automobiles; aircraft.
Michigan City and La Porte	B	Ordnance: aircraft wings; railroad cars, machinery (farm).
Muncie	A	Auto parts; ordnance; fabricated metals.
*Terre Haute	B	Mining (Coal); Government.
*South Bend	A	Automobiles; farm machinery.
Vincennes	B	Mining (bituminous coal); industrialization lack.
Iowa:		
Burlington	A	Ordnance (ammunition); machinery (electrical).
Ottumwa	A	Machinery (farm).
Kansas: Pittsburg	B	Mining (coal, lead, zinc); ordnance (out of area).
Kentucky:		
*Ashland and Huntington, Ky. and W. Va.	A	Electrical machinery; railroad equipment.
Corbin	B	Mining (bituminous coal); railroad shops; lumber.
Frankfort	A	Industrialization lack (Government, seasonal distillery center).
Hazard	B	Mining (bituminous coal).
Henderson	B	Government; autos and refrigerators (out of area).
Madisonville	B	Mining (bituminous coal); instrument.
Middlesboro and Harlan	B	Mining (bituminous coal).
Morehead and Grayson	B	Industrialization lack.
Owensboro	A	Radio and television; furniture.
Paintsville and Prestonsburg	B	Mining (bituminous coal).
Pikeville and Williamson	B	Do.
Maine: Biddeford	A	Machinery (textile); textiles.
Maryland: Cumberland	B	Textiles (rayon); railroads; mining (bituminous coal).
Massachusetts:		
*Fall River	A	Textiles; rubber.
Fitchburg	A	Machinery (nonelectrical); fabricated metals.
*Lawrence	B	Textiles (wool).
*Lowell	A	Textiles.
Milford	A	Machinery (textile); textiles.
*New Bedford	A	Textiles; electrical machinery.
North Adams	A	Machinery (electronics).
Southbridge and Webster	B	Textiles (woolen); opthalmic goods.
Michigan:		
Adrian	A	Foundries (nonferrous); machinery (household), fabricated metals.
New York—Continued		
*Battle Creek	A	Aircraft; auto equipment; nonelectrical machinery.
Bay City	A	Autos, auto parts; machinery (construction, mining).
Benton Harbor	A	Primary metals; other durables (out o area).
Ionia, Belding, and Greenville.	A	Refrigerators; auto parts.
Iron Mountain	B	Auto bodies; mining (iron); lumber.
Jackson	A	Auto parts, radio and television.
Monroe	A	Auto parts; paper.
*Muskegon	A	Refrigerators; auto equipment; steel foundries.
Owosso	A	Machinery (auto-connected electrical).
Port Huron	A	Auto parts; primary metals.
Minnesota: *Duluth and Superior, Minn. and Wis.	A	Ore transportation; industrialization lack.
Missouri:		
Joplin	A	Mining (lead, zinc); industrialization lack (trade center).
St. Joseph	A	Machinery (electrical); industrialization lack; out of area.
*St. Louis	A	Ordnance; primary metals; electrical machinery; leather.
Springfield	A	Industrialization lack (trade center); out of area.
New Jersey:		
*Atlantic City	A	Industrialization lack (seasonal resort center).
*Paterson	A	Textiles; aircraft; instruments; electrical machinery.
New Mexico: *Albuquerque	A	Industrialization lack (construction center).
New York:		
*Albany, Schenectady, and Troy.	A	Ordnance; railroad equipment; electrical machinery.
Amsterdam	B	Wool carpets, rugs; apparel; gloves.
Auburn	B	Ordnance (shells); machinery (farm); other durables.
*Buffalo	A	Steel; electrical, nonelectrical machinery; aircraft.
Gloversville	B	Leather (gloves, tanning); out of area.
Hudson	A	Textiles.
Oswego and Fulton	A	Fabricated metals; out of area.
*Utica and Rome	A	Textiles; nonelectrical machinery.
North Carolina:		
*Asheville	A	Industrialization lack (seasonal resort center).
*Durham	A	Industrialization lack (seasonal tobacco center).
Kinston	A	Do.
Waynesville	A	Industrialization lack (seasonal resort center).
*Winston-Salem	A	Industrialization lack (seasonal tobacco center).
Ohio:		
Cambridge	B	Glass, pottery; communications equipment.
*Canton	A	Steel; foundries; nonelectrical machinery.
Findley, Tiffin, and Fostoria.	A	Machinery (electrical, nonelectrical); apparel; rubber; glass.
Mansfield	A	Machinery (household); primary metals; rubber.
Newark	A	Mining; auto parts; glass (mineral wool).
Sandusky and Fremont	A	Machinery (electrical, nonelectrical); primary metals.
Springfield	A	Trucks; aircraft parts; machinery (nonelectrical).
*Steubenville and Wheeling, Ohio, and W. Va.	A	Steel; mining (bituminous coal).
*Toledo	A	Automobile parts, equipment; primary and fabricated metals.

[1] Major areas are indicated by asterisk.

[2] List covers only period since July 1951 when present area classification system was introduced. Many of these areas were classified in somewhat similar groups under the previous system. Classifications are based on narrative-statistical labor-market reports submitted to the Bureau of Employment Security by affiliated State employment-security agencies. The reports are prepared locally, drawing upon labor-market data available in local public employment offices, including information on current employment and unemployment levels and employer hiring plans.

The extent of unemployment in an area is one of the major factors in determining the area classification. Other criteria include employment outlook as reflected by local employer estimates of manpower requirements, the relationship between labor supply and labor demand, and the seasonal pattern of employment and unemployment fluctuations.

[3] It will generally be true that areas of *substantial labor surplus* (IV-A) will have unemployment ranging from 6.0 to 11.9 percent of covered employment, while areas of *very substantial labor surplus* (IV-B) will have unemployment of 12 percent or more of covered employment.

Source: Bureau of Employment Security, U. S. Department of Labor.

Reasons for substantial labor surplus in 44 major and 100 smaller labor market areas, classified as group IV in January 1955 [1]—Continued

[Group IV-A, unemployment from 6.0 to 11.9 percent; group IV-B, unemployment of 12 percent or more]

Name of group IV area [2]	Subclassification [3]	Principal industrial or other source of economic distress
Oklahoma:		
McAlester	A	Ordnance; construction.
Muskogee	A	Drought (agriculture, food).
Oregon: *Portland	A	Lumber; ship repair; transportation services.
Pennsylvania:		
*Altoona	B	Railroad locomotives, cars (production and maintenance).
Berwick and Bloomsburg	A	Railroad equipment; textiles.
Butler	B	Railroad equipment.
Clearfield and Du Bois	B	Mining (bituminous coal); durable goods.
*Erie	A	Refrigerators; railroad equipment; foundries.
Indiana	B	Mining (bituminous coal).
*Johnstown	B	Mining (bituminous coal); steel.
Kittanning and Ford City	B	Mining (bituminous coal); stone, clay, and glass.
Loch Haven	B	Railroads; machinery (electrical).
New Castle	A	Steel; other durable goods.
Oil City, Franklin, and Titusville.	A	Machinery (construction, mining, pump); steel.
*Philadelphia	A	Transportation equipment; other durable goods.
*Pittsburgh	A	Steel.
Pottsville	B	Mining (anthracite coal).
*Reading	A	Steel; textiles; apparel.
*Scranton	B	Mining (anthracite coal).
Sunbury, Shamokin, and Mount Carmel.	B	Mining (anthracite coal); radio-television; textiles.
Uniontown and Connellsville.	B	Mining (bituminous coal).
*Wilkes-Barre	B	Mining (anthracite coal).
Williamsport	A	Aircraft.
Puerto Rico:		
*Mayaguez	B	Apparel; industrialization lack.
*Ponce	B	Do.
*San Juan	A	Do.
Rhode Island: *Providence	A	Textiles; nonelectrical machinery.
South Carolina: Walterboro	A	Lumber; apparel; out of area.
Tennessee:		
Bristol, Johnson City, and Kingsport.	A	Chemicals (explosives); textiles; furniture.
*Chattanooga	A	Chemicals; primary and fabricated metals; textiles.
*Knoxville	A	Textiles; apparel; aluminum.
Pennsylvania—Continued		
La Follette, Jellico, and Tazewell.	B	Mining (bituminous coal); industrialization lack.
Newport	B	Industrialization lack (agricultural center).
Territory of Hawaii: *Honolulu	A	Government; industrialization lack (pineapple, sugar, and tourist center).
Texas: Texarkana	A	Ordnance (Government, private).
Vermont:		
Burlington	B	Textiles (woolen); aircraft parts.
Springfield	A	Machine tools; textiles (woolen).
Virginia:		
Big Stone Gap and Appalachia.	B	Mining (bituminous coal).
Covington and Clifton Forge.	B	Railroads; paper.
Radford and Pulaski	A	Chemicals (explosives, synthetic fibers).
Richlands and Bluefield	B	Mining (bituminous coal).
Washington: *Tacoma	A	Government; industrialization lack (seasonal lumber center).
West Virginia:		
Beckley	B	Mining (bituminous coal).
Bluefield	B	Do.
*Charleston	B	Mining (bituminous coal); chemicals.
Clarksburg	A	Mining (bituminous coal); radio and television; fabricated metals.
Fairmont	B	Mining (bituminous coal).
*Huntington and Ashland, W. Va., and Ky.	A	Electrical machinery; railroad equipment.
Logan	B	Mining (bituminous coal).
Morgantown	B	Do.
Parkersburg	A	Chemicals (industrial organic).
Point Pleasant	B	Shipbuilding; industrialization lack.
Ronceverte and White Sulphur Springs.	B	Mining (bituminous coal).
Welch	B	Do.
*Wheeling and Steubenville, W. Va. and Ohio.	A	Steel; mining (bituminous coal).
Wisconsin:		
Beaver Dam	A	Machinery (electrical, farm): shoes.
La Crosse	A	Machinery (farm); rubber footwear; auto parts.
*Racine	A	Farm machinery; foundries.
*Superior and Duluth, Wis. and Minn.	A	Ore transportation; industrialization lack.

DISTRESS HITS 33 COAL-MINING CENTERS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, a study of this table will be informative and revealing. It will be noted that the No. 1 distressed industry in 33 of these distressed areas is coal mining. Coal mining is suffering because of the tremendous imports of foreign waste oils from other areas of the world which are being dumped on our eastern shores.

Lead and zinc is the important industry in one distressed area, and the second major industry in another. Fluorspar is the second major industry in still another. The lead and zinc industry and the fluorspar industry are being destroyed by import dumping.

TWENTY-FIVE TEXTILE CENTERS HURT BY IMPORTS

Textile manufacture is the No. 1 industry in 20 distressed areas, and is the second dominant industry in 5 others. All of us know what is happening to the textile industry throughout the United States because of growing import competition from cheap-labor countries.

Electrical machinery is the top industry in 7 distressed areas, the second outstanding industry in 5 other areas, and a major industry in still another area.

Chemical manufacture is the principal distressed industry in four distressed areas.

Imports of electrical machinery and chemicals are causing a sacrifice of American investments and American jobs.

IMPORTS DAMAGING MANY OTHER AMERICAN INDUSTRIES AND AREAS

Mr. President, this is an interesting list. Read through it and you will find lumber, glass and pottery, leather, primary metals, watches and clocks, machine tools, all suffering from strong import competition, and the cities and areas in which these industries are located suffering distress and unemployment along with their principal industries.

Now we come to areas which have been added to the "distressed area" list since January.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed, in the RECORD a listing of these areas as prepared by the Department of Labor, and also its analysis of the conditions causing this distress and unemployment. It is taken from a release today, Friday, April 1, by the Bureau of Employment Security of the Department of Labor.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTRESSED AREAS

CHANGED FROM GROUP III TO GROUP IV-A

Portland, Maine: Closing of two metalworking plants, layoffs in ordnance, furniture and fixtures, construction, trade largely responsible for recent nonfarm employment drop. Unemployment up two-thirds since end of 1954.

San Diego, Calif.: Unemployment rises sharply during winter as construction, trade, food processing layoffs add to long-term downtrend in aircraft, tuna fishing. Further cutbacks scheduled in aircraft and foods. Inmigrant jobseekers also likely to prevent reduction in labor surplus from current substantial levels, despite expected spring pickup in construction and other nonmanufacturing activities.

SMALLER GROUP IV AREAS CLASSIFIED GROUP IV-A IN FEBRUARY

Illinois

Galesburg: Increased labor surplus traceable to declines in important nonelectrical machinery, fabricated metals, transportation, construction. Unemployment up 10 percent over the year.

Mount Carmel-Olney: Recent declines in food processing, electrical machinery, petroleum refining, and construction contribute to substantial labor surplus. Small anticipated seasonal increases in food processing and apparel not likely to reduce unemployment significantly.

New Jersey

Long Branch: Sharp job drop since year ago boosts labor surplus to substantial levels. Cutback in construction as local work on major State highway is completed, loss in Government, reductions in apparel, textiles primary factors in employment decline.

North Carolina

Fayetteville: Retrenchment in construction (partly due to project completions at Fort Bragg), and Government lead recent employment downtrend. Unemployment up 15 percent over past year as industrial expansion fails to keep pace with labor force growth.

Rocky Mount: Increasing surplus of tobacco workers primarily responsible for substantial unemployment conditions. Tobacco processing season shortened considerably in recent years; only limited job opportunities available during 9-month off-season. Increasing mechanization of agriculture adds to unemployed group.

Ohio

Marietta: Employment down significantly over past year, as work on several large construction projects is completed; chemicals, furniture cut back sharply. Unemployment up two-fifths since year ago.

Connecticut

Danielson: Shutdown of four textile mills, sharp over-the-year decline in lumber and

furniture, other manufacturing losses result in substantial labor surplus. Unemployment up approximately 30 percent in past year.

Torrington: Continuing employment downtrend, under way since fall of 1953, raises labor surplus to substantial levels. Factory cutbacks, heaviest in important nonelectrical machinery, largely responsible for unemployment increase; recent declines in most nonmanufacturing industries also contribute.

Iowa

Sioux City: Heavy loss in dominant meatpacking, caused by closing of major establishment, raises joblessness to substantial proportions. Electrical, nonelectrical machinery also reduce payrolls due to slackening orders. Scheduled spring pickup in construction, farming not likely to reduce surplus significantly.

Mississippi

Greenville: Two-year downtrend in agriculture and allied nonfarm industries results in substantial labor surplus. Unemployment now one-third above year ago. Further reduction in cotton acreage points to possible additional rise in joblessness over the next few months.

New Jersey

Bridgeton: Sizable recent increase in joblessness paced by layoffs in apparel, food processing. Unemployment now one-fourth above year-ago levels. Little change likely this spring as pickups in glass, food, chemicals may be all but offset by seasonal retrenchment in oyster packing.

North Carolina

Shelby-Kings Mountain: Long-term decline in dominant textiles—partly due to plant modernization—major factor in development of substantial labor surplus. Underemployment in industry also significant. Three consecutive years of drought have cut cotton farmers' income.

Ohio

Athens-Logan-Nelsonville: Payroll declines in lumber, stone, clay, glass, most nonmanufacturing industries responsible for return of area to substantial surplus category after 2-year absence. Return of workers laid off by out-of-area plants also boosts unemployment. Long-term coal downtrend, low level of manufacturing activities add to area's economic problem.

New Philadelphia-Dover: Over-the-year reductions in important coal mines, clay refractories, other smaller factory losses reduce employment totals, raise unemployment to substantial proportions. Effect of recent tornado, destruction of local plant by fire, plus labor-management disputes in clay products, further cloud outlook.

Zanesville: Losses in nonelectrical machinery, mining since year ago contribute to area's substantial unemployment totals. Seasonal employment pickup scheduled to late spring not likely to cut jobless figures significantly.

Pennsylvania

Lewistown: Employment cutbacks in several manufacturing lines, railroads starting in the last half of 1953 resulted in the development of a substantial labor surplus. Factory losses heaviest in primary metals, refractory brick, furniture. Unemployment up 10 percent in past year.

Meadville: Two-year employment downtrend, aggravated by recent losses in railroads, trade, construction, pushes area into substantial surplus category. Joblessness more than one-fourth above year-ago level.

NINETEEN NEW AREAS ADDED TO DISTRESS LIST IN 2 MONTHS; 7 AREAS TAKEN OFF

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, 19 new distressed areas were added in the past 2 months and 7 areas that were in distress 2 months ago now have recovered sufficiently to be removed from the distressed list. None of those removed, however, are dominated by industries suffering from imports, such as textiles, foreign fuel oils, watches or clocks, glassware, pottery, leather products, or minerals.

CONGRESS CREATES ITS OWN PROBLEMS

During the past 21 years, a policy appears to have been established by Congress, under which, whenever any difficulty arises, an arbitrary attempt is made to correct it at once, without a study being made of the basic cause of the distress.

In the Defense Act, Congress established the principle that the Government may accept a higher bid for a Government contract from a distressed area than a bid from a going concern in an area where there is little or no unemployment.

Not once, but many times, industries which are in good condition and operating satisfactorily under Government contracts have looked forward to receiving other such contracts, in order to maintain normal employment.

But somewhere there is a distressed area.

POLICY CREATES NEW DISTRESSED AREAS

The area which is manufacturing a part of the products necessary to the national defense in an area of normal employment may have submitted a low bid. Nevertheless that concern does not receive the contract; a company in a distressed area in some other part of the United States gets it. The going-concern, normal-employment area then becomes a distressed area.

That certainly shows how much thought is given to such matters by Congress. The Government thereby causes new distressed areas, while by manipulation it destroys already successful areas.

The 7 cities removed from the distressed area list are Canton, Ohio; Honolulu, Hawaii; Racine, Wis.; and 4 areas in Michigan, namely, the Ionia-Belding-Greenville area, which produces auto parts and home-appliance machinery; Adrian, which is a refrigerator-manufacturing center; Jackson, where the auto industry holds the key; and Owosso.

The existence of 156 distressed areas in the United States is a living argument against extension of the Trade Agreements Act. The 1934 Trade Agreements Act is an act to export jobs and import unemployment. It is doing that now.

THE PRESIDENT MAY TRADE ANY PART OF THE DOMESTIC ECONOMY FOR A FANCIED ADVANTAGE IN FOREIGN POLICIES

Mr. President, by the Trade Agreements Act passed by Congress in 1934, in which the Constitution of the United States was, in effect, amended, without the proposal being submitted to the people, the workings of the legislative and executive branches were tied together for the first time in 175 years. The regulation of the domestic economy and the negotiations for foreign policy were merged so that now the President of the United States can trade off any part of the domestic economy for a fancied improvement in the foreign policy.

VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTION

The Constitution of the United States pointedly separates the regulation of the domestic economy from foreign policy negotiations because the wise and experienced men who framed the Constitution of the United States had scars all over them, scars which they had sustained in fighting a dictator who could control at will, by Executive order, both the domestic economy and the foreign policy of a nation.

The Founding Fathers pointedly separated the two functions, but a subservient Congress, in 1934, tied them together again. Now we have the unbelievable picture of a Republican administration, which always throughout its previous history has protected the workingman and investor by the imposition of duties on each product which roughly make up the differential between the effective wages, taxes, and the cost of doing business in this country and in the chief competitive country, favoring the policy of free trade—one economic world—through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. President, let us get back to adjusting the duties on each product on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, giving equal access to American workingmen and investors to our own American markets through regulation by the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress, under the 1930 Tariff Act.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN ASIA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not intend to detain the Senate long this evening. I notified the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that I intended to discuss the resolution which he submitted today.

On January 28, 1955, the Senate, by a vote of 85 to 3, passed House Joint Resolution 159, authorizing the President of the United States to use the Armed Forces for securing and protecting Formosa, the Pescadores, and related territories.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the full text of House Joint Resolution 159, Public Law 4, 84th Congress.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area

Whereas the primary purpose of the United States, in its relations with all other nations, is to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace for all; and

Whereas certain territories in the West Pacific under the jurisdiction of the Republic of China are now under armed attack, and threats and declarations have been and are being made by the Chinese Communists that such armed attack is in aid of and in preparations for armed attack on Formosa and the Pescadores,

Whereas such armed attack if continued would gravely endanger the peace and security of the West Pacific area and particularly of Formosa and the Pescadores; and

Whereas the secure possession by friendly governments of the Western Pacific Island chain, of which Formosa is a part, is essential to the vital interests of the United States and all friendly nations in or bordering upon the Pacific Ocean; and

Whereas the President of the United States on January 6, 1955, submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification

a Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of China, which recognizes that an armed attack in the West Pacific area directed against territories, therein described, in the region of Formosa and the Pescadores, would be dangerous to the peace and safety of the parties to the treaty: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, and shall so report to the Congress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a little more than 2 months after the passage of House Joint Resolution 159, the senior Senator from Oregon has submitted a resolution which would reverse the action previously taken by the Senate. I believe that the resolution, if seriously considered by the Senate, would not only result in the islands of Matsu and Quemoy being ultimately turned over to the Chinese Communists, but such action would be very detrimental to the morale throughout the entire Far East. Probably within a year or two, the result would be that most of Asia would have passed behind the Communist Iron Curtain.

The argument has been made that this is not the place to draw the line. It will never be easy to draw a line.

Another argument is that the islands of Quemoy and Matsu are within 5 miles of the China coast. So far as Quemoy is concerned, that is true. So far as Matsu is concerned, that island is approximately 20 miles from the China coast. But if the argument of closeness to the enemy has any validity, then why should we draw a line as between the Soviet world in Europe and the free world? We are up against Soviet forces just across a river line.

Prior to World War II, there were those who asked: What difference will it make if Czechoslovakia and the Sudetenland are taken over by Adolph Hitler? They are small, remote countries. Is it worth risking anything to maintain the independence of those distant people?

I think the Senate and the American people have not forgotten how four great powers—Great Britain, France, Italy and Germany—met together, through their representatives, at Munich. There Adolf Hitler pledged that if Germany were only granted the Sudetenland, albeit Czechoslovakia was not represented at the conference, he would make no further territorial demands in Europe. Unfortunately, Mr. President, we know what the result was. Within a year of that time he had moved in and taken over all of Czechoslovakia.

We next heard the question asked whether any steps should be taken in the defense of Danzig, which was a distant city, situated, in an unfortunate circumstance, between Nazi Germany and Poland, and whether it was worth risking the free nations of the world in order to try to defend it. But the issue was not Danzig at that time; it was a solemn agreement which Great Britain and France had entered into with Poland. Having seen that the giving up of Sudetenland would not accomplish the purpose of peace, because it only encouraged further aggressions, when the next step of aggression came in Poland, both Great Britain and France lived up to their commitments.

Mr. President, the introduction of the resolution today, if taken seriously by the people of Asia, and I think by the people of Europe, will give great aid and comfort to the Chinese Communists. I have no doubt that over the Peiping and the Moscow radios, and in the newspapers Izvestia and Pravda, it will be said that the Government of the United States, which just 2 months ago, by an almost unanimous vote of its Congress, passed the joint resolution which I have had printed in the RECORD, has now, in the face of Communist threats, revised its position and is prepared to retreat. I believe that would be disastrous to the peace of the world. Those who really want to preserve the peace of the world should think very carefully before giving the impression to the Communist world that there are deep divisions within our Government and within our country.

Mr. President, the fact of the matter is that up to the time of the passage of the Formosa resolution, in the speeches of Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai, and in the Communist press of the Soviet Union, and, indeed, in the Communist press of the United States and the free world, wherever such newspapers are published, there were many bellicose statements that the Chinese Communists were about to capture the islands on their way to Formosa.

It so happened that after the show of unity on the part of the Government and the people of the United States that type of talk pretty largely died down, and the indications were that the men in Peiping finally realized that they were at the end of the road so far as the commission of further acts of aggression was concerned, and that there would be resistance on the part of the free people of the world if the Communists attempted to take more people behind the Iron Curtain.

That has been true up until today, April 1, 1955. But, Mr. President, if the Chinese Communists believed that such a resolution as was introduced today would be seriously considered by the Senate of the United States, and that our Government would reverse its position from the one it took on the 28th day of January of this year, I say most respectfully that might lead them to further adventures. A great danger to the peace of the world today is that the Communists may misinterpret the mere introduction of a resolution which would reverse our policy and which, on its face, would tie the hands of the Commander in Chief. If they believed that the resolution represented a considered opinion by any considerable number of the Members of the Congress of the United States, the Communists might feel that the American people were so divided and so disorganized that what they would not do yesterday they might be prepared to do today.

Mr. President, I have no quarrel with the senior Senator from Oregon. He is at least being consistent. He was one of three Members of the Senate who voted against the Formosa resolution. Those who voted against it were the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], who has joined him in the resolution offered today, and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. At least, they had made their position clear then, and if today that is still their position, they are consistent.

After hearing the arguments in the House and in the Senate of the United States, and presumably facing up to all the potentialities which might be involved, the representatives of the 48 States of the American Union voted by the overwhelming majority of 85 to 3 to pass the Formosa joint resolution. I think that action gave great encouragement to the people of Asia, gave new courage to the neutrals of Asia, and caused the potential aggressors in Asia to stop, look, and listen.

In view of the very critical situation which perhaps in the next 90 days or more may confront the world, if the Communists now gain the impression that we are divided, that we are paralyzed, that our leadership is open to question—that whereas Congress took one stand 2 months ago, it has now reversed its stand—I am confident that would not be contributing to the cause of peace, but, to the contrary, might invite the very thing those favoring the resolution say they wish to avoid.

Mr. President, the situation is very strange. There seems to be a rising tide of appeasement in India, in Europe, and in some quarters in the United States of America.

Mr. Nehru, in his address before the Parliament of India yesterday, pointed out that he believed the Chinese Communists should have possession of Quemoy and Matsu, and indicated very strongly his belief that they should also gain control of Formosa and the Pescadores. He went beyond that, Mr. President. He even went to the point of saying:

Even though the whole world was fighting, we should not go to war.

Mr. President, I am interested in that statement because from time to time in the past 30, 60, or 90 days, there have been persons who have suggested that one solution to the problem would be to take the Republic of China off the Security Council and out of the United Nations and give its seat on the Security Council to India and its seat in the General Assembly of the United Nations to Communist China.

Mr. President, I doubt very much whether India is qualified to sit on the Security Council, if one keeps in mind the Charter of the United Nations. I wish to read a number of paragraphs from the charter. I raise that question since apparently it is going to be a subject of discussion during the weeks or

months ahead and it is important that we have the facts before us. Article 1 of the United Nations charter, which I hold in my hand, reads:

The purposes of the United Nations are:

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace.

I wish to call attention to a number of other sections of the charter, dealing with the functions and powers of the Security Council.

In article 24 we find:

1. In order to insure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf.

Article 25 states:

The members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present charter.

Article 41 states:

The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

Article 42 states:

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations.

Article 43 states:

1. All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

Article 44 states:

When the Security Council has decided to use force it shall, before calling upon a member not represented on it to provide armed forces in fulfillment of the obligations assumed under article 43, invite that member, if the member so desires, to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that member's armed forces.

Mr. President, it is quite clear that even in the charter of this organization, which is devoted to the peace of the world, there is recognition of the fact that aggressors might be loose in the world, and that the only way they could be stopped would be by the use of economic and, if necessary, military sanctions.

It is true that the record of India in the Korean operation was not a good one. India did not supply a single soldier, sailor, or airman to resist the aggression in Korea. India supplied a single ambulance unit.

Mr. President, communism could not have been stopped in Korea by means of the use of a single ambulance unit. I hope the day will never come when the borders of India will be threatened by Communist China or the Soviet Union. But if that should happen, it would seem to me that the precedent India has established gives India no great claim upon the United Nations or upon the free nations of the world to come to her defense; and I think India and her people would be sorely disappointed if, in response to a plea for assistance against potential Communist aggression against India, each of the free nations of the world agreed to contribute a single ambulance unit of peace. That certainly would not preserve the freedom of the people of India.

Mr. President, in the concurrent resolution which was submitted today by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], he suggested, among other things, that the President of the United States should take appropriate action to lay before the United Nations the danger to the peace of the world presented by the threat of attack "upon such islands"—meaning Quemoy and Matsu—with the request that the United Nations undertake supervision of their evacuation.

I think it is fair to ask this question: Suppose the Government of the Republic of China is not prepared to evacuate further territory in the face of Communist aggression? Does the Senator from Oregon propose that the United Nations shall, by force, cause the evacuation? Would that then put the United Nations forces in opposition—perhaps in armed opposition—to our friends, the Republic of China, who now occupy, and have occupied throughout recent history, the area of Quemoy and the Matsus?

Mr. President, no easy solutions are before us. Of course, the President of the United States has very heavy responsibilities. But I believe that the adoption of the concurrent resolution submitted today by the Senator from Oregon would in fact tie the hands of our Commander in Chief, and might inadvertently, but actually, encourage aggression in the Far East, and bring about the breach of the peace which the Senator from Oregon hopes, I assume, to prevent by means of his concurrent resolution.

THE POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES WITH REGARD TO THE REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS AD HOC COMMITTEE ON RESTRICTIVE BUSINESS PRACTICES

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, on February 11 of this year, I had the honor to address the Executives Club of Chicago on certain aspects of the United States foreign economic policy and the role of the United Nations in this area. My remarks may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 18, at pages 1819–1828.

On that occasion, I took the opportunity to review the history of chapters V and VI of the Habana Charter, which never was accepted by the United States Congress. Chapter VI provided for intergovernmental commodity agreements designed to stabilize the prices and trade in various commodities. Chapter V dealt with so-called "restrictive business practices." Unfortunately, the entire charter is a product, originally, of our own State Department; and the specific proposal to review restrictive business practices was sponsored in the United Nations by our Government, under a former administration. Although the United States had not ratified the Habana Charter, various organizations established within the framework of the United Nations had attempted to advance these concepts since 1947. Last year, the United States took a firm stand in opposing the establishment of a Commission on International Commodity Trade to permanently implement the philosophy of chapter VI of this charter.

When the Economic and Social Council voted to proceed with the organization of this Commission in spite of our objections, we declined to participate. During the course of my remarks, I referred in these words to our position in refusing to serve as a member of this Commission:

I wish to commend the Secretary of State and his associates for this action. I regard it as the first step in reversing some of the unfortunate economic trends within the United Nations which were originally promoted by our own Government.

Our present able delegation to the Economic and Social Council, headed by the Honorable Preston Hotchkiss, has had to devote a great deal of its efforts to combat proposals which originated in our own State Department many years ago. This is unfortunate, as the Iron Curtain countries are presented with an opportunity to sow dissension among the free nations when it becomes necessary for us to cast votes in opposition to proposals sponsored by friendly countries in the United Nations. Yet, if we are to remain true to our own economic philosophy, we can take no other course. Our sins of the past have now returned to haunt us.

In the speech which I delivered before the Executives Club of Chicago in February I pointed out that the vitally important job of extricating us from these two Commissions was only half done. We had removed ourselves from the Commission on International Commodity Trade but the problem presented by the report and recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices still persisted. My concluding paragraph summarized the situation in these words:

I am confident that the steps which have already been taken by the Eisenhower administration to repudiate chapter VI of the Habana Charter through our nonparticipation in the Trade Stabilization Commission will be repeated at the forthcoming session of the Economic and Social Council when, I sincerely hope, we will withdraw from any further participation in this group designed to implement chapter V of the rejected Habana Charter.

It now gives me great pleasure to be able to report that Secretary Dulles has instructed the United States representative to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, Mr. Preston Hotchkiss, to clarify the United States position with regard to the report of the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices.

This statement is a clear cut definition of our position, and I am including

it in my remarks for the benefit of my colleagues. It is gratifying that we are making such excellent progress in clarifying the position of our Government in the deliberations of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement from the State Department entitled "United States Comments to U. N. on Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES COMMENTS TO U. N. ON REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE ON RESTRICTIVE BUSINESS PRACTICES

Following is the text of a note transmitted by the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations to the Secretary General of the United Nations:

"The Government of the United States is appreciative of the study which has been given by the United Nations to the problem of restrictive business practices and the efforts which have been made to develop proposals for international cooperation. The United States has been, and continues to be, strongly mindful of the vital importance of this problem in terms of the objectives of expanding production and trade, promoting economic development, and increasing standards of living.

"The United States Government has given careful and extensive consideration to the proposals of the Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices. In doing so, it has evaluated the committee's proposals in the light of whether they would be effective in eliminating restrictive business practices which interfere with international trade. It has noted the substantial differences which presently exist in national policies and practices in this field and it has been drawn to the conclusion that these differences are of such magnitude that the proposed international agreement would be neither satisfactory nor effective in accomplishing this purpose.

"In order to recommend action against cartel practices, the proposed international body would be required not only to find that such practices exist, but that they have harmful effects on production or trade in the light of very general criteria. This latter determination would be extremely difficult for a body of governmental representatives to make in the light of the substantial divergences in approach previously referred to, and, in the opinion of the United States Government, would likely result in the condoning of restrictive practices or in no agreement by the international body on the disposition of complaints brought before it. In addition, since action under the proposed agreement would be primarily a matter of enforcement procedures under national laws, the present stage of development of national legislation offers little hope that recommendations of the international body could be effectively carried out. While encouraged by the progress which has been made in recent years in this field, the United States does not feel that the point has been reached at which a broad international arrangement of the type proposed by the committee could be successfully implemented.

"The elimination of harmful restraints on international trade and the furthering of the development of free competitive enterprise continue to be basic objectives of this country's economic policy. In the present circumstances, however, the endeavor to effectuate a plan of international cooperation along the lines envisaged by the current proposals might well prejudice rather than promote the attainment of these objectives.

"It is, therefore, the opinion of the United States Government that present emphasis should be given not to international organizational machinery but rather to the more fundamental need of further developing effective national programs to deal with restrictive business practices, and of achieving a greater degree of comparability in the policies and practices of all nations in their approach to the subject.

"The reports submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee and the Secretariat are, in the view of the United States, valuable for analysis of the problem of restrictive business practices. The subject merits full and continuing examination by all nations with a view to meeting the fundamental need cited above."

PROPOSALS TO MODIFY OR REPEAL RAPID DEPRECIATION AND DIVIDEND CREDIT PROVISIONS OF 1954 REVENUE ACT

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, the Congress has just completed the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1955. While this bill was before the Senate for consideration certain issues were raised during the course of debate that disturbed me greatly. I refer particularly to the proposal to modify or repeal those provisions of the 1954 act which provided for rapid depreciation of business assets and also those provisions for dividend credit.

Due to the requirement of germaneness these proposals were not properly before the Senate during consideration of the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1955. Inasmuch as these proposals may come before us during the debate on H. R. 4725 which has passed the House of Representatives or possibly at some later date in this session I think it timely that I present my views on these points based upon my observations while serving as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives at the time of the enactment of the 1954 revision of the internal-revenue laws.

While I am not a member of the Finance Committee I had the privilege of serving as a member of the Ways and Means Committee in the other body for 8 years. When the 1954 revision of the internal-revenue law was on the floor of the House of Representatives I made an intensive study of the charge that the dividend-credit provisions would rob the United States Treasury of much needed revenue. The result of that investigation showed beyond doubt that the dividend credit would increase the revenue, rather than reduce it. At that time I included certain tables in the RECORD to support that conclusion.

I have completed the task of bringing these tables up to date and I now wish to present the revised tables and discuss this entire matter so that my colleagues will have this information available whenever these issues may be considered further.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared, together with the revised tables to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the statement and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The present administration has dedicated itself to an expanding, dynamic economy with rising standards of living for all our people. The transition from the war economy of 1953 with steadily rising prices to the peacetime economy of today with high levels of employment and stable prices is an amazing accomplishment. Nothing like it has ever taken place in our history.

Last fall our friends on the other side of the aisle were preaching doom and gloom and haranguing the people of an impending economic disaster. That disaster has not taken place. Under President Eisenhower disposable income after taxes is at the highest level ever attained; more new houses are being built than ever before; the steel and automotive industries are operating at very high levels; and the confidence of the business community in the policies of this administration is responsible for the current level of prices on the stock market.

Could it be possible that the success of this administration in making jobs and expanding our economy precludes the possibilities of a Democratic victory next year? Does the Democratic National Committee hope by investigating the stock market and penalizing business with its amendments to the tax bill to destroy the confidence which this administration has established and thus produce enough unemployment so they can say in 1956 that the Republicans have produced a boom and bust—that 1929 has returned? Are they willing to do this so that they may enjoy another 20 years of political power?

I am particularly disturbed at the suggestion that this administration, in adopting the 1954 tax bill, was bestowing benefits upon the wealthy at the expense of the average American. On the contrary, the 1954 tax bill was designed to provide incentives to make jobs for our expanding population. When labor unions demand guaranteed annual wages and old-age pensions they must expect that the corporations who grant these demands will be in business and in a position to fulfill these guaranties. It is part of our job to frame tax legislation so that with sound management American business enterprise can weather any storm. It is ridiculous to talk of incentives for corporate expansion and stability as special favors to wealthy individuals. Certainly the economic health of this country depends upon maintaining sound corporate structures. The wage earners employed by our corporations have as much stake in their solvency and stability as anyone else.

The minority report of the Finance Committee proposed a modification of the rapid depreciation provisions of the 1954 tax bill. They estimated the revenue loss from this provision by using data from page B-13 of the report of the then minority members of the Ways and Means Committee on H. R. 8300, 83d Congress. This study is based on the assumption that capital replacement and additions continue at the present levels. Our purpose in providing rapid depreciation was to see to it that additions and replacements would take place at a more rapid level.

The majority report of the Ways and Means Committee, which I had the privilege of signing a year ago, said:

"More liberal depreciation allowances are anticipated to have far-reaching economic effects. The incentives resulting from the changes are well timed to help maintain the present high level of investment in plant and equipment. The acceleration in the speed of the tax-free recovery of costs is of critical importance in the decision of management to incur risk. The faster tax writeoff would increase available working capital and materially aid growing businesses in the financing of their expansion. For all segments of the American economy, liberalized depreciation policies should assist modernization and expansion of industrial capacity, with resulting economic growth, increased production, and a higher standard of living.

"Small business and farmers particularly have a vital stake in a more liberal and

constructive depreciation policy. They are especially dependent on their current earnings or short-term loans to obtain funds for expansion. The faster recovery of capital investment provided by this bill will permit them to secure short-term loans which would otherwise not be available.

"Various forms of faster writeoff of fixed assets have been almost universally adopted in recent years by countries with modern income-tax systems. Among such countries are Great Britain, Canada, and Sweden. The results of the liberalized depreciation policies have generally been favorable in stimulating plant modernization and expansion. While comparisons are difficult, the proposals contained in your committee's bill do not go as far in the direction of accelerated depreciation as the treatment in some other countries nor as far as some of the proposals which have been brought to your committee's attention. Mindful of the need for constructive action within the limits of sound budgetary policy, your committee has adopted provisions which will give the economy added stimulus and resilience without departing from realistic standards of depreciation accounting" (p. 25).

"The changes made by your committee's bill merely affect the timing and not the ultimate amount of depreciation deductions with respect to a property. No accurate estimate can be made of the cost of this provision even in the early years of its application because of uncertainty concerning the extent to which the new declining-balance formula will be adopted and because of the difficulty in allowing for the effects of the increased investment resulting from the provision upon tax revenues.

"If there were no stimulus to investment and all eligible taxpayers adopted the new formula, the loss in the fiscal year 1955 would be about $375 million. In the second and immediately subsequent years there would be greater losses if the effect on investment were ignored but it is highly likely that by that time the stimulus which the new formula brings will have produced a volume of additional investment and taxable income which will result in there being no net revenue loss under this provision" (p. 26).

The provisions for rapid depreciation do not afford tax relief to anybody. They merely make it possible for investors to recover their capital more rapidly. When the capital has once been recovered there are then no depreciation allowances to offset against current income. A change in the provision we adopted last year can only retard the rate of our industrial progress and ultimately cause unemployment and a declining revenue for the Treasury. The modification of these provisions cannot increase Federal revenues by 1 red cent.

Now let me discuss the question of the dividend credit. It has been alleged that the dividend credit favors a limited group of wealthy taxpayers. The so-called rich have never needed this provision of the 1954 tax law. They have been able to invest in tax-exempt bonds whose average yield, early in March, was about 2⅓ percent. Those who are fortunate enough to have great wealth, which in many cases has been inherited, are not concerned with what we do on the floor of the Senate in the consideration of any income-tax bill. They were not concerned when we raised taxes to pay the costs of World War II or for the fighting in Korea. They have invested their money in tax-exempt bonds; they have no worries about income taxes on April 15; and the rest of us must assume their share of the burden of government.

The Eighty-third Congress, in incorporating the dividend credit, was interested in inducing those who are now paying no taxes to share the cost of Government with the rest of us. Furthermore, it is essential if we are to preserve a competitive free enterprise economy, that new businesses can be started and that venture capital may be available to those individuals who can provide the new ideas and methods which will keep our economy dynamic.

For many years new offerings of common stocks have been few and far between. Capital has been raised through bank loans and the sale of bonds. While it is too early to appraise the effect of the 1954 tax law, it is significant that General Motors Corp. has recently sold new common stock with a value of more than $320 million. I think we have begun to correct the imbalance in corporate structures and to encourage equity financing.

If the dividend credit will induce individuals to invest more of their funds in common stocks, the Government will receive the major share of such investment. The Treasury has everything to gain and very little to lose by fostering equity investment. Let us remember that every dollar which a corporation pays in interest for borrowed money, rather than as a profit to its equity owners, produces no corporate income tax revenue.

For an individual to receive $10,000 in dividends, the corporation must first earn $20,833. Of this amount, the corporation income tax accounts for $10,833. A single individual with a $10,000 taxable income derived entirely from dividends and making no provision for deductions or exemptions now pays a personal income tax of $2,640 before the dividend credit and $2,240 after taking this credit. The Federal Government, in other words, will collect $13,073 in taxes from the investment which made the payment of these dividends possible. The individual retains $7,760 of the $20,833 which the corporation earned.

It was the opinion of the Ways and Means Committee, last year, that allowing an individual to retain an additional $400 on an investment which makes it possible for him to assume the risk of earning $20,833 in a new venture which yields tax revenues of $13,073 is good business for our Government.

I am convinced that the Treasury has lost billions of dollars in potential tax collections from the unwillingness of investors to assume risk when the scales are so heavily weighted against them. Those who oppose the dividend credit say that we have aided only a limited number of people who happen to own common stocks. Wide stock ownership is one way to destroy the artificial barriers between Wall Street and Main Street and to dissipate the class hatreds upon which demagogs thrive.

I am concerned that the advisability of the program of the New York Stock Exchange to secure broader participation in American enterprise by small stockholders has been questioned in the hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

We should encourage investment for income rather than for a turn on the market through a capital gain. I don't think the New York Stock Exchange or anyone else will be able to really stimulate such stock purchases unless we make the retained income from an investment in American enterprise attractive. If free enterprise is to be our way of life, a far greater number of our citizens should have a stake in American industry.

No one has to buy common stocks. The Government with a 52-percent corporate income tax and personal income taxes at present rates is the senior partner in every business enterprise. We certainly should do everything possible to induce more equity investment in order to increase the Treasury's revenue.

Now let me show the arithmetic for a single individual who receives his entire income of $100,000 from dividends, with no provision for any deductions or exemptions. In order that the investor may receive $100,000 in dividends, the corporation must first earn $208,333. The corporate income tax will account for $108,333. Assuming that the remainder of the earnings are paid as a dividend, this will give the investor $100,000. Under existing law he will pay $67,320 as a personal income tax without regard to dividend credit. The dividend credit gives him an additional $4,000. It seems like a good investment for the Government to secure a total tax take of $171,653 by letting the investor keep this $4,000.

My table 1 shows the corporate earnings before taxes required to pay dividends of varying amounts, the personal tax in each tax bracket under the present law, and the total tax take by the Government from the combined corporate and personal income taxes and the investor's retention from an investment in each bracket.

Corporations can obtain funds for expansion from the sale of common stock if we continue to foster such investment through the prvisions of the 1954 tax law or they can be derived through bond issues which yield the Government no corporate tax revenues. Bonded debt is undesirable for other reasons.

Henry C. Simons is quoted in Production, Jobs, and Taxes, a C. E. D. publication, as follows:

"Heavy fixed (or floating) debt is obviously undesirable for the single enterprise in an unstable economy or industry. Any temporary adversity is likely to produce insolvency, with grave losses, not only for the stockholders but also for senior securities and the enterprise as a whole, through the great costs of reorganization and the inevitable disturbances of operations and business relations which insolvency involves. Moreover, even if technical insolvency and reorganization are avoided, the enterprise and the whole economy may gravely be damaged by the practices necessary in avoiding it. Thus, physical properties may be abused merely to prolong technical, legal solvency, to avoid definitive squeezing out of shareholders, management, or control in bankruptcy or reorganization, and thus to gamble (with nothing to lose) on remotely favorable contingencies. The physical plant may thus be bled white to meet current obligations, especially interest payment and bond maturities, in the pursuit of mere liquidity.

"These things are doubtless widely understood. What is less clearly apprehended is the aggravated instability of the whole economy, and the obstacle to deliberate monetary stabilization, which corporate debt structures produce in their aggregate. It should be obvious what desperate and frantic struggles for corporate liquidity mean in total where the economy has slipped into general recession which, debt structures apart, might prove innocuous and short-lived. They may well mean the difference between a mild recession and a precipitous, catastrophic deflation."

Mr. Simon's remarks made some years ago are just as true today. It is up to us to encourage equity financing.

My second table shows the percent of corporate earnings before taxes and of dividends paid which may be retained by an individual investor whose entire income is derived from dividends under present law.

This table shows that the investor receiving $10,000 in dividends under present law retains 37.2 percent of the corporate earnings before taxes and 77.6 percent of the dividends paid him. I say that the relief afforded in 1954 was necessary as the Government was losing billions of dollars in tax revenue as individuals are always perfectly free to exercise their proper and legal alternatives and place their money in tax-exempt securities. This is not tax evasion.

My third table compares the rate of return necessary on an investment in private industry before taxes, and my fourth table the dividend rate required to provide the same net return to the investor as he might obtain from a tax-exempt bond in each income-tax bracket. For example, to obtain the 2.33 percent net yield after taxes, which is the present yield on tax-exempt bonds, a $10,000 dividend must represent an earnings return before taxes of 6.3 percent and a dividend yield of 3 percent.

I again wish to emphasize that the so-called rich are not worrying about this bill. For many years, as these tables show, they have had an alternative to paying confiscatory taxes without assuming any of the risks of investment in private enterprise.

We did not provide tax relief for the rich in 1954. The 83d Congress supported President Eisenhower's program to increase equity investment and thereby increase Federal revenues through the operation of the combined corporate and personal income tax. We endeavored to insure the flow of capital and maintain a proper balance in corporate financial structures between equity investments and debt so that our economic structure would be more stable and less subject to failure should a recession take place. We encouraged new small business which must appeal to investors with substantial means by offering them some hope of securing a yield after taxes commensurate with the risk in investing in a new business. We provided employment in the construction and capital goods industries by encouraging investment in new facilities and modernization. These facilities make it possible for our economy to be more productive and thereby increase the wages of our workers. Many present labor-management contracts include provisions for annual productivity wage increases. These increases can only be paid if the productivity of the economy continues to advance. This requires a flow of new capital investment which was fostered by the 1954 tax bill.

The Ways and Means Committee which drafted this bill originally in the 83d Congress was working toward increasing the revenues of the Treasury so that a general tax reduction through a revision of rates could ultimately be effected. This is still my objective. It is a sound approach to meeting the Government's needs for revenue.

TABLE No. 1.—*Comparison of Government and individual returns from an equity investment under present law*

Taxable income derived entirely from common-stock dividends; no allowance for deductions or personal exemptions [1]	Corporate earnings before taxes necessary to pay dividend with no retained earnings	Corporate income tax [2]	Personal income tax without regard to dividend credit	4 percent dividend credit [3]	Total personal tax	Total Federal tax	Amount of earnings retained by individual
$2,000	$4,167	$2,167	$400	$80	$320	$2,487	$1,680
$4,000	8,333	4,333	840	160	680	5,013	3,320
$6,000	12,500	6,500	1,360	240	1,120	7,620	4,880
$8,000	16,667	8,667	1,960	320	1,640	10,307	6,360
$10,000	20,833	10,833	2,640	400	2,240	13,073	7,760
$12,000	25,000	13,000	3,400	480	2,920	15,920	9,080
$14,000	29,167	15,167	4,260	560	3,700	18,867	10,300
$16,000	33,333	17,333	5,200	640	4,560	21,893	11,440
$18,000	37,500	19,500	6,200	720	5,480	24,980	12,520
$20,000	41,667	21,667	7,260	800	6,460	28,127	13,540
$22,000	45,833	23,833	8,380	880	7,500	31,333	14,500
$26,000	54,167	28,167	10,740	1,040	9,700	37,867	16,300
$32,000	66,667	34,667	14,460	1,280	13,180	47,847	18,820
$38,000	79,167	41,167	18,360	1,520	16,840	58,007	21,160
$44,000	91,667	47,667	22,500	1,760	20,740	68,407	23,260
$50,000	104,166	54,166	26,820	2,000	24,820	78,986	25,180
$60,000	125,000	65,000	34,320	2,400	31,920	96,920	28,080
$70,000	145,833	75,833	42,120	2,800	39,320	115,153	30,680
$80,000	166,666	86,666	50,220	3,200	47,020	133,686	32,980
$90,000	187,500	97,500	58,620	3,600	55,020	152,520	34,980
$100,000	208,333	108,333	67,320	4,000	63,320	171,653	36,680
$150,000	312,500	162,500	111,820	6,000	105,820	268,320	44,180
$200,000	416,666	216,666	156,820	8,000	148,820	365,486	51,180

[1] It is assumed that such deductions and exemptions equal the amount of income other than dividends.
[2] Corporate marginal rate of 52 percent in these computations.
[3] In the interest of simplicity the $50 exclusion is ignored.

TABLE 2.—*Percent of earnings and dividends retained by individual under present law*

Taxable income derived entirely from common-stock dividends; no allowance for deductions or personal exemptions [1]	Corporate earnings before taxes necessary to pay dividend with no retained earnings	Amount of earnings retained by individual	Percent of total earnings of corporation retained by individual	Percent of dividends retained by individual
$2,000	$4,167	$1,680	40.3	84.0
$4,000	8,333	3,320	39.8	83.0
$6,000	12,500	4,880	39.0	81.3
$8,000	16,667	6,360	38.2	79.5
$10,000	20,833	7,760	37.2	77.6
$12,000	25,000	9,080	36.3	75.7
$14,000	29,167	10,300	35.3	73.6
$16,000	33,333	11,440	34.3	71.5
$18,000	37,500	12,520	33.4	69.6
$20,000	41,667	13,540	32.5	67.7
$22,000	45,833	14,500	31.6	65.9
$26,000	54,167	16,300	30.1	62.7
$32,000	66,667	18,820	28.2	58.8
$38,000	79,167	21,160	26.7	55.7
$44,000	91,667	23,260	25.4	52.9
$50,000	104,166	25,180	24.2	50.4
$60,000	125,000	28,080	22.5	46.8
$70,000	145,833	30,680	21.0	43.8
$80,000	166,666	32,980	19.8	41.2
$90,000	187,500	34,980	18.7	38.9
$100,000	208,333	36,680	17.6	36.7
$150,000	312,500	44,180	14.1	29.5
$200,000	416,666	51,180	12.3	25.6

[1] It is assumed that such deductions and exemptions equal the amount of income other than dividends.

TABLE 3.—*Percent earnings on investment before taxes to yield 2.33 percent to individual*

Taxable income derived entirely from common-stock dividends. No allowance for deductions or personal exemptions: [1]	*Under present law*
$2,000	5.8
$4,000	5.8
$6,000	6.0
$8,000	6.1
$10,000	6.3
$12,000	6.4
$14,000	6.6
$16,000	6.8
$18,000	7.0
$20,000	7.2
$22,000	7.4
$26,000	7.7
$32,000	8.3
$38,000	8.7
$44,000	9.2
$50,000	9.6
$60,000	10.4
$70,000	11.1
$80,000	11.8
$90,000	12.5
$100,000	13.2
$150,000	16.5
$200,000	19.0

[1] It is assumed that such deductions and exemptions equal the amount of income other than dividends.

TABLE 4.—*Yield required on dividends paid to give 2.33 percent to individual*

Taxable income derived entirely from common stock dividends. No allowance for deductions or personal exemptions: [1]	*Under present law*
$2,000	2.8
$4,000	2.8
$6,000	2.9
$8,000	2.9
$10,000	3.0
$12,000	3.1
$14,000	3.2
$16,000	3.3
$18,000	3.4
$20,000	3.4
$22,000	3.5
$26,000	3.7
$32,000	4.0
$38,000	4.2
$44,000	4.4
$50,000	4.6
$60,000	5.0
$70,000	5.3
$80,000	5.7
$90,000	6.0
$100,000	6.4
$150,000	7.9
$200,000	9.1

[1] It is assumed that such deductions and exemptions equal the amount of income other than dividends.

EFFECT OF TELEVSION PROGRAMS ON CHILDREN—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, there has been much discussion in the past on the effect of television programs on children. The Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary held hearings last year and engaged in certain staff studies of the effect on the juvenile mind, of the portrayal of crime and violence on some television programs.

Further studies will be conducted this year. I mention this as a preface to observing that I have read the script of a program called "The Search," which will be on CBS Television on April 3, at 4:30 o'clock p. m. This is a fine type of program, a type of program which I think is quite beneficial, and I hope all Senators who can will see it.

The subcommittee is to hold hearings on this subject. I wish to give notice of such hearings next Wednesday and Thursday, at which time we hope to have the opportunity of giving everyone interested an opportunity to be heard. There is a great deal of interest in the subject matter.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate will now stand in adjournment until Monday, April 4, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.), the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 4, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 1, (legislative day of March 10), 1955:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Allen Whitfield, of Iowa, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for a term of 5 years, expiring June 30, 1960.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

John T. Williams, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the western district of Tennessee for a term of 4 years, vice William Ernest Smith, resigned.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters.

ALABAMA

Warren G. Findley, Calera, Ala., in place of L. R. Nail, removed.

William R. Pope, Danville, Ala., in place of H. L. Heflin, deceased.

James E. Lambert, Darlington, Ala., in place of J. E. Lambert, resigned.

Robert G. Mason, Fairhope, Ala., in place of C. C. Baldwin, retired.

James L. Stephens, Horton, Ala., in place of J. D. Jackson, removed.

Cyrus Kitchens, Oneonta, Ala., in place of W. W. Wilson, transferred.

Eugene Williamson, Orrville, Ala., in place of H. E. Marshall, retired.

Tommy H. Bellomy, Scottsboro, Ala., in place of J. E. Reid, resigned.

Hunter L. Stokes, Sulligent, Ala., in place of M. B. Bankhead, retired.

William C. Gantt, Titus, Ala., in place of H. J. Ward, deceased.

Austin E. Gray, Trafford, Ala., in place of R. C. Johnson, retired.

ARIZONA

Leonard O. Vittitow, Eloy, Ariz., in place of R. H. Marsch, removed.

ARKANSAS

Alma K. May, Booneville, Ark., in place of B. B. Bevens, retired.

Otis W. Tyler, Greenbrier, Ark., in place of H. E. Mayhew, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Wyvonne R. Bibb, Alpaugh, Calif., in place of M. J. Broman, retired.

Alma A. Hyland, Altaville, Calif., in place of A. B. Clifton, deceased.

James I. Bailiff, Arcadia, Calif., in place of W. R. Stewart, retired.

Georgamy K. Campbell, Brockway, Calif., in place of H. G. Walters, resigned.

John H. Shepard, Carpinteria, Calif., in place of M. O. Bauhaus, resigned.

Sue M. Ghezzi, Cayucos, Calif., in place of L. F. Ghezzi, deceased.

Mary T. Fye, Crestline, Calif., in place of F. K. Smith, resigned.

Edith V. Stordalen, Daggett, Calif., in place of F. R. Moore, deceased.

Albert B. McVeigh, Eldridge, Calif., in place of R. A. Smith, retired.

Guido Berti, Greenfield, Calif., in place of R. W. Dunham, retired.

Vernon D. Darby, Middletown, Calif., in place of R. R. Dingle, transferred.

Helen E. Glaab, Montalvo, Calif., in place of E. A. Glaab, deceased.

Lyle R. Burkhart, Montrose, Calif., in place of C. B. Daly, retired.

Hazel M. Ginn, Moss Landing, Calif., in place of A. B. Anderson, resigned.

Clyde A. Coggins, Nipton, Calif., in place of F. R. Coggins, declined.

Bruce L. Hunt, Paradise, Calif., in place of M. C. Hatch, retired.

William J. Rissel, Pebble Beach, Calif., in place of J. H. Ashley, transferred.

Lawrence W. Elledge, Trona, Calif., in place of J. P. MacPherson, resigned.

Maxine M. Spradling, Vernalis, Calif., in place of A. E. Schaeffer, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Robert A. Chadsey, Middlefield, Conn., in place of E. M. Jenkins, retired.

FLORIDA

James N. Peacock, Ocoee, Fla., in place of R. E. McDaniel, resigned.

Willis S. Morey, Princeton, Fla., in place of C. L. Lott, resigned.

IDAHO

Beatrice M. Fenstermacher, Headquarters, Idaho, in place of G. E. Johnson, resigned.

Winfrey K. Kimble, Irwin, Idaho, in place of N. M. Wade, resigned.

Vera Miskin, Palisades, Idaho. Office established November 17, 1952.

David P. Woodard, Sandpoint, Idaho, in place of D. P. Moody, retired.

ILLINOIS

Chester B. Stanton, Dawson, Ill., in place of T. H. Peddie, deceased.

Herbert S. Biller, Illiopolis, Ill., in place of Clyde Hardbarger, retired.

Florence J. Howell, Sparland, Ill., in place of L. L. Eubanks, retired.

Jerome P. Arkels, Tonica, Ill., in place of D. E. Boddie, retired.

Emery H. Doden, Toulon, Ill., in place of O. M. Colwell, retired.

INDIANA

Walter A. Smith, Indianapolis, Ind., in place of G. J. Ress, retired.

Edwin T. Livengood, Union City, Ind., in place of R. W. Rosenbush, deceased.

IOWA

Hilbert O. Herron, Blairstown, Iowa, in place of R. O. Mayhew, deceased.

Agnes K. Nielsen, Kimballton, Iowa, in place of C. A. Hald, deceased.

Paul R. Bender, Monticello, Iowa, in place of M. F. Hogan, retired.

Dick Steenhoek, Newton, Iowa, in place of C. C. McCarl, resigned.

Charles I. White, Oakland, Iowa, in place of J. L. O'Neill, retired.

Evelyn A. Tish, Searsboro, Iowa, in place of T. P. Sheehy, removed.

KANSAS

Gertrude M. Retter, Denton, Kans., in place of Ellen McEnulty, deceased.

Harold H. Bennett, Haviland, Kans., in place of M. C. Meisel, resigned.

Max R. Donahey, Logan, Kans., in place of J. R. Dailey, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Mae A. Edwards, Prospect, Ky., in place of T. M. Murray, removed.

LOUISIANA

Floyd E. Bennett, Livingston, La., in place of M. G. McCullough, retired.

David J. Bondy, New Roads, La., in place of N. C. Wilson, retired.

MAINE

Willis J. Gates, Millinocket, Maine, in place of G. J. Jones, retired.

Elmer C. Davis, Northeast Harbor, Maine, in place of W. S. Holmes, retired.

Everett W. Harrington, Winthrop, Maine, in place of H. C. Miller, retired.

MARYLAND

Leon W. Tyler, Fishing Creek, Md., in place of Gorman Robinson, removed.

Virginia F. Mishou, Lusby, Md., in place of H. J. Pardoe, retired.

Francis Marion Rawlings, Rising Sun, Md., in place of T. R. Biles, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Joseph A. Cunis, Ashland, Mass., in place of A. L. Cavanaugh, retired.

Alfred G. Davis, Lincoln, Mass., in place of E. A. Rollins, retired.

Barbara J. Coombs, South Harwich, Mass., in place of Ann Donahue, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Maurice K. Dean, Barryton, Mich., in place of B. J. Moorman, resigned.

Letha A. Leng, Frederic, Mich., in place of E. C. Dunckley, deceased.

Bert O. Hobolth, Keego Harbor, Mich., in place of P. P. Quinlan, retired.

Leslie F. Augsbach, Spring Lake, Mich., in place of W. A. Hammond, deceased.

MINNESOTA

Clifford W. Mattson, Gully, Minn., in place of E. C. Ellerton, retired.

MISSOURI

John H. Scott, Bunceton, Mo., in place of R. K. Elliott, resigned.

Norman F. Kline, Ellisville, Mo., in place of A. L. Schatz, retired.

NEBRASKA

Louis Kerst, Crete, Nebr., in place of E. B. Hardeman, retired.

NEVADA

Alice M. Gabler, Zephyr Cove, Nev., in place of G. B. Wylie, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Carrie S. McDonald, Harrisville, N. H., in place of R. L. Alexander, retired.

Reginald W. Stevens, Wolfeboro Falls, N. H., in place of J. F. Magee, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Vernon A. Statesir, Freehold, N. J., in place of J. B. Johnson, retired.

NEW YORK

Patrick L. Agnano, Ardsley, N. Y., in place of M. T. Goehren, retired.

Helen C. Coleman, Bridgeport, N. Y., in place of M. A. Fox, removed.

Lester E. Hendrix, Cazenovia, N. Y., in place of D. F. Flanagan, retired.

James H. Graham, Levittown, N. Y. Office established July 1, 1952.

Henrietta B. Heitmann, South Kortright, N. Y., in place of C. L. Proskine, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Guy E. Snyder, Bakersville, N. C., in place of J. F. Greene, resigned.

James M. Armstrong, Belmont, N. C., in place of E. W. Bullard, resigned.

Jesse T. Smathers, Canton, N. C., in place of W. C. Hill, retired.

James K. Ballance, Fairfield, N. C., in place of G. R. Cutrell, resigned.

Ray B. Wyche, Hallsboro, N. C., in place of M. C. Thompson, deceased.

Jesse Bennie Joyce, Madison, N. C., in place of F. P. Thomas, retired.

Brownlow Martin, Rutherfordton, N. C., in place of C. L. Biggerstaff, retired.

Howell W. Ratcliff, Weaverville, N. C., in place of Kate Reagan, retired.

Marion O. Elliott, Wilkesboro, N. C., in place of M. F. Bumgarner, retired.

OHIO

Howard L. Bricker, Galena, Ohio, in place of W. E. Reed, resigned.

Joseph M. Alcorn, North Lima, Ohio, in place of J. O. Entrikin, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Warren C. DeMoss, El Reno, Okla., in place of J. W. Moorman, retired.

OREGON

John P. Ivers, Oceanlake, Oreg., in place of R. J. Collins, removed.

Jack R. Bailey, Scio, Oreg., in place of Early Phillips, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Arthur C. Tidd, Avonmore, Pa., in place of W. G. Rumbaugh, resigned.

Louis Hertzog, Delmont, Pa., in place of A. L. Leonard, removed.

Thomas R. Lostrick, Ernest, Pa., in place of L. S. Helmick, deceased.

Victor Wolinski, Everson, Pa., in place of D. J. O'Brien, retired.

Roy D. Cunningham, Farmington, Pa., in place of W. R. Coleman, resigned.

Eugene E. Thompson, Foxburg, Pa., in place of C. B. Dunmire, retired.

Henry Vance Raab, Horsham, Pa., in place of W. S. Knipe, resigned.

Charles F. Yost, New Holland, Pa., in place of W. G. Stauffer, retired.

Reese Williams, Reynoldsville, Pa., in place of J. A. Yuengert, deceased.

Ludwig A. Drobnick, St. Michael, Pa., in place of Jean Burke, retired.

Nelly M. Nilsson, Skippack, Pa., in place of C. D. Farlin, deceased.

Frank A. Bialas, Wilmore, Pa., in place of N. P. McGuire, removed.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Donald L. Floyd, Kennebec, S. Dak., in place of G. L. McKeever, retired.

Winfield T. Wilt, Mitchell, S. Dak., in place of T. E. Callan, removed.

John H. Hallberg, Stockholm, S. Dak., in place of D. L. Berg, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Albert M. Houston, Woodbury, Tenn., in place of C. B. Stone, deceased.

TEXAS

Rabon O. Dews, Arlington, Tex., in place of J. B. Lawson, retired.

Tilman C. Richards, Banquete, Tex., in place of L. F. Cowart, retired.

Berniece C. Weatherford, Camden, Tex., in place of R. B. Martin, retired.

Floyd L. Tondre, Castroville, Tex., in place of O. M. Naegelin, retired.

Charles T. Boyce, El Paso, Tex., in place of M. L. Burleson, retired.

Andrew W. Valentine, Presidio, Tex., in place of Mills Awbrey, retired.

Felix R. Garza, Roma, Tex., in place of W. A. Ramirez, deceased.

UTAH

Laurie D. Holley, Bryce Canyon, Utah, in place of R. W. Pothier, resigned.

VIRGINIA

James W. Bell, Nassawadox, Va., in place of W. T. Roberts, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Elmer K. Beitz, Buffalo, W. Va., in place of L. R. Frazier, retired.

Kathleen M. Fry, East Lynn, W. Va., in place of E. M. Tabor, retired.

Walter L. Boggess, Gassaway, W. Va., in place of C. L. Perkins, retired.

Mary P. Evans, Minden, W. Va., in place of J. L. Dorsett, retired.

WISCONSIN

Robert H. Prideaux, Dodgeville, Wis., in place of A. G. Hoskins, retired.

WYOMING

Fred G. Dudley, Laramie, Wyo., in place of P. J. O'Dea, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 1 (legislative day of March 10), 1955:

UNITED NATIONS

John M. Allison, of Nebraska, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Japan, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America to the 11th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Joseph C. Satterthwaite, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Burma.

Joseph E. Jacobs, of South Carolina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Poland.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Joseph S. Davis, of California.

Raymond J. Saulnier, of New York.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

J. Reuel Armstrong, of Wyoming, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of the subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. John Hamilton Hinds, O12106.
Brig. Gen. Robert Alwin Schow, O12180.
Brig. Gen. George Bateman Peploe, O16246.
Brig. Gen. Victor Allen Conrad, O15546.
Brig. Gen. Rinaldo Van Brunt, O16225.
Brig. Gen. Herbert Butler Powell, O16684.
Brig. Gen. Frank Otto Bowman, O12090.
Brig. Gen. Louis Watkins Prentiss, O14672.
Brig Gen. Kenner Fisher Hertford, O15120.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Dale Bowlby Ridgely, O17797.
Col. Miles Merrill Dawson, O16079.
Col. Claude Franklin Burbach, O16184.
Col. Marcel Gustave Crombez, O16198.
Col. Harry Wells Crandall, O16238.
Col. William Livingston Bayer, O16372.
Col. William Edward House, O16406.
Col. Rothwell Hutton Brown, O16604.
Col. Walter Byron Larew, O16647.
Col. Charles Albert Sheldon, O16662.
Col. James Harold Banville, O28921.
Col. William Perry Pence, O16779.
Col. Raymond Wiley Curtis, O16784.
Col. Charles Richard Hutchison, O16796.
Col. William Jordan Verbeck, O16852.
Col. Theodore Scott Riggs, O17076.
Col. Thomas Fraley Van Natta, O17086.
Col. Mercer Christie Walter, O17151.
Col. Paul Amos Gavan, O17169.
Col. Samuel Leslie Myers, O17180.
Col. Wilhelm Paul Johnson, O17229.
Col. Evan McLaren Houseman, O17307.
Col. Robert Henry Wienecke, O41569.
Col. Aaron William Beeman, O29063.
Col. James Dreyfus, O29117.
Col. Joseph Horridge, O17555.
Col. Joseph Milton Colby, O17562.
Col. Edmund Chauncey Rockefeller Lasher, O17624.
Col. Joseph Reisner Ranck, O17647.
Col. William Kerr Ghormley, O17674.
Col. Bruce Easley, Jr., O17735.
Col. Stanley Walker Jones, O17747.
Col. Herbert Allen Hall, O41631.
Col. Francis Frederick Uhrhane, O18071.
Col. William Henry Harris, O18155.
Col. Herbert Lucian Scofield, O29462.
Col. William Edwin Barksdale, O29478.
Col. Albert Frederick Cassevant, O18456.
Col. Rush Blodget Lincoln, Jr., O18656.
Col. Horace Freeman Bigelow, O18775.
Col. Bogardus Snowden Cairns, O18798.
Col. John William Bowen, O18904.
Col. Richard Joseph Werner, O29107.
Col. Norman Hayden Vissering, O41603.
Col. Edgar Thomas Conley, Jr., O17665.
Col. William Richard Frederick, Jr., O29388.
Col. Briard Poland Johnson, O29393.
Col. Andrew Thomas McAnsh, O38667.
Col. Philip Campbell Wehle, O18067.
Col. Isaac Sewell Morris, O18806.

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Frank Needham Roberts, O12734.
Brig. Gen. Andrew Thomas McNamara, O17324.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Keith Richard Barney, O16377.
Col. Benjamin Branche Talley, O16668.
Col. Charles H. McNutt, O16751.
Col. Charles Granville Dodge, O18072.
Col. Alva Revista Fitch, O18113.
Col. Christian Hudgins Clarke, Jr., O18213.
Col. James Knox Wilson, Jr., O18218.
Col. William Frew Train, O18415.
Col. Robert Quinney Brown, O18520.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officer of the Reserve of the United States Navy for temporary promotion to the grade indicated in the line, subject to the prescribed qualifications:

To be rear admiral

George A. Parkinson

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade indicated:

To be major generals

Reginald H. Ridgely, Jr.	Joseph C. Burger
	Verne J. McCaul
Homer L. Litzenberg	Edward W. Snedeker
Robert E. Hogaboom	Thomas A. Wornham

To be brigadier generals

Russel N. Jordahl	Arthur F. Binney
Jack P. Juhan	Thomas G. Ennis
John C. Munn	Frank C. Croft
Frank H. Wirsig	Edward C. Dyer
Robert B. Luckey	

To be brigadier generals, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law

Harold D. Hansen	Carson A. Roberts
Randall M. Victory	James P. Berkeley

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 1 (legislative day of March 10), 1955:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

John F. Stevens and the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 1, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the history of the construction of the Panama Canal was marked by a series of grave crises. Fortunately for the future welfare of our Nation, able leaders were available to cope with the acute problems which arose. Those leaders included men such as President Theodore Roosevelt, Secretary of War William Howard Taft, Gen. William C. Gorgas, and John F. Stevens.

Of all these men, John Stevens has received the least recognition for his role in the construction of the Panama Canal. He served as Chief Engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission from 1905 to 1907, and was Chairman of the Commission, as well as Chief Engineer, in 1907. It was largely on his recommendation that Congress decided in 1906 to authorize construction of a lock instead of a sea-level canal. Of particular significance in this early stage was his determined support of General Gorgas, whose plan for exterminating mosquitoes as a first step to combating yellow fever was considered impractical by many people. Stevens drafted complete plans for most of the canal, assembled and organized the working force, rebuilt most of the Panama Railroad, and prepared specifications for and began the digging of Culebra Cut, which presented the greatest single obstacle. He resigned in 1907, when the canal project was placed under the War Department, and was succeeded by George W. Goethals.