

the bill. It seems to be the best measure we can get.

I voted against recommitting the farm bill because the only provisions that would increase the farm income for 1956 would have been stricken from the bill had it been recommitted.

The President, in his message to Congress on January 9, 1956, set up a 9-point program and urged prompt action in order to increase the farmer's income this year. The soil bank would have placed about \$1.2 billion in the pocket of the farmer. It is too late for the soil bank to take effect in 1956. It seemed to me that the only way to carry out the President's wishes to raise the income of the farmer this year would be by keeping parity prices up for 1 more year. Without this provision there would have been a reduction in the parity prices as well as in the acreage. You cannot help the farmer by taking land out of production, and at the same time reducing the prices he receives.

I feel there is more good in the bill than bad. The soil bank, which will go into effect next year, is designed to pay the farmer for taking land out of production. The present bill contains a domestic parity plan for wheat. This must be voted on in 1957 and carry, by two-thirds vote of the wheat farmers, in order to become effective. The bill carries a dual, modern price system for 1 year. This is designed to raise farm income until the soil bank can become effective. It contains a provision for \$500 million to process surplus crops and get them into channels of relief both in this country and in foreign countries. It contains a provi-

sion for a commission to study the proposition of converting surplus crops into industrial alcohol. It contains a provision to prohibit production of supported commodities on Government-owned land.

I am convinced that the buying power of the farmer is essential to the men and women in labor, industry, and business in all communities. Farmers find themselves in a price-squeeze situation which in many towns has severely affected all business.

Farm income was estimated in 1955 to be about \$10.8 billion. That is down 9 percent from 1954. In 1954 farm income was less than it was in 1953. The 1953 income was less than in 1952. The President said in his January 9 message, "Farm prices and incomes are depressing; unless corrected, these economic reverses are a direct threat to all of our people." I believe this bill as enacted, with the dual modern parity system, will bring income to the farmer this year. Dual parity and 90-percent parity will be the only means for a year to assure the farmer additional income. This is the only way you can carry out the President's desire to raise the income of the farmer, because the soil bank, which would have cost \$1.2 billion, cannot become effective this year. The 90-percent parity will cost less than the soil bank.

If the farmer approves the domestic parity plan for wheat by his vote in 1957, it will not cost the Government one thin dime. I think it is a good provision. There are some consumers who claim it will increase the cost of bread and flour, but the evidence shows that from 1948

to 1955 wheat prices declined 31 percent, while the price of bread went up 28 percent.

Under the present farm bill, wool and sugar are supported at about 100 percent parity; cotton, tobacco, and peanuts at about 90 percent parity. The only crops not being supported at near 90 percent parity would be corn and wheat.

When the soil-bank provisions become effective, there ought to be a reevaluation and a restudy of the parity situation.

I repeat, you cannot help the farmer by taking land out of production or by reducing the parity price he receives. I trust the President will consider this when he decides the question of signing or vetoing the bill. I trust his advisers will point out that the soil bank cannot become effective this year, and that if he really wishes to keep the income of the farmer in balance, then the dual-parity and the 90-percent-parity provisions in the bill will be in existence this year. They are only for 1 year's duration.

There are some provisions in the bill that I do not particularly like; but when you consider that 10 earnest, sincere men worked many days on the compromise, you must conclude that there is more good in the bill than harm. It cannot please everyone. Each Member of Congress has a duty to perform to his district, State, and Nation. I have followed the dictates of my conscience. I hope the advisers to the President will weigh carefully the pros and cons of the bill, particularly in the light of the President's message of January 9 this year.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 16, 1956

(*Legislative day of Monday, April 9, 1956*)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Charles Duell Kean, D. D., rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and most merciful God, who art the Sovereign Lord of men and nations, in whose hand the rise and fall of empires are but as grains of sand, yet who carest in infinite love for all Thy children;

We pray Thee for the Senate of these United States assembled in Thy presence, that Thou wilt bless its Members in the performance of their duties, and that Thou wilt prosper their undertakings as these can be related to Thy divine providence.

Give to the several Members of the Senate, we pray Thee, O Lord, wisdom, courage, and consecration; overcome their fears, support them when they are tormented by anxiety; enlighten them when they are perplexed and uncertain; strengthen them when they are under pressure; and comfort them when they face misunderstanding.

Relate their deliberations and counsels, O Lord, to the welfare of this Nation

and the physical, moral, and spiritual health of all its people; use their endeavors to bring peace and harmony in all the length and breadth of this land; and make their achievements serve Thy sovereign purpose through contributing to the wider peace of the world.

All this we pray in the name and for the sake of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BARKLEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 12, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Kibbe, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GEORGE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until a week from today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed

to the consideration of executive business and take action on the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George Cochran Doub, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Warren E. Burger, resigning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maurice E. Stans, of Illinois, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

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.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, with a 2-minute limitation on statements.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS. ETC.

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

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of February 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of two appropriation allotments; to the Committee on Appropriations.

CANDIDATES SELECTED FOR 1956 NROTC PROGRAM

A letter from the Chief of Naval Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of principal and alternate candidates selected for the 1956 regular NROTC program (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1953

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting pursuant to law, his report of operations under the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, dated April 13, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that bank, for the period July-December 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation, for the year ended December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT ON UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR EGYPT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the United States assistance program for Egypt, International Cooperation Administration, Department of State, dated June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CROOKED RIVER PROJECT, OREGON

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the Crooked River project, Oregon (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN FEDERALLY OWNED LAND TO LASSEN VOLCANIC NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to add certain federally owned land to the Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO CONFINEMENT IN CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE GRANT OF PROBATION

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18, United States Code, section 3651, so as to permit confinement in jail-type institutions or treatment institutions for a period not exceeding 6 months in connection with the grant of probation on a 1-count indictment (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Karl Yu from a report transmitted to the Senate on July 18, 1955, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to Armed Forces bombing and artillery ranges

"Whereas extensive areas of land and water within the State of California have been designated as bombing and artillery ranges and training areas for the Armed Forces; and

"Whereas use of land as a bombing area and artillery range precludes its use for other purposes; and

"Whereas many citizens believe that the Armed Forces do not have a program of maximum integrated land use in effect relating to areas which have been, or may be, designated as bombing and artillery ranges; and

"Whereas in order to insure the continued growth of California and prosperity of its residents it is mandatory that, in view of the limited areas of land within the State and the needs of future land development, further military use of such land be kept at a minimum: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly). That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to require that all Armed Forces requests for additional bombing and artillery ranges be accompanied by proof that all areas presently under their control suitable for use as bombing and artillery ranges are being utilized to their fullest extent; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from

California in the Congress of the United States."

Four joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution relative to providing increased benefits for survivors of military personnel

"Whereas action is now pending in the United States Senate on H. R. 7089, the Hardy bill, which provides for substantially increased benefits for survivors of military personnel; and

"Whereas in view of the reduced purchasing power of the dollar it is imperative that the benefits payable to survivors of military personnel be increased so that these people will not become a burden upon the communities in which they live; and

"Whereas although the cost of living has greatly increased in the past few years and, in line with such increase, most employees have received substantial raises in pay, nothing yet has been done to increase the meager benefits now payable to survivors of military personnel: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 7089; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to continuance of increased grants-in-aid for old-age security and aid-to-the-blind benefits

"Whereas the California Legislature at the 1952 second extraordinary session increased the old-age security and aid-to-the-blind benefits to California recipients by the maximum amount of \$5 per month by passing on to them the increase in Federal grants-in-aid; and

"Whereas this increase was made contingent upon the continuation of the increased grants-in-aid by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the increase in the Federal grants-in-aid will expire unless Congress enacts legislation at the current session continuing the increase; and

"Whereas the Governor of California, the Honorable Goodwin Knight, has requested the Senators and Representatives in Congress from California to support Federal legislation continuing the increased grants-in-aid; and

"Whereas at the 1955 session of the legislature senate bill No. 398 was enacted and signed by the Governor providing that if an additional \$5 per month increase in grants-in-aid for old-age security and blind aid is provided by Congress such increase would be immediately passed on to old-age security and blind-aid recipients in this State; and

"Whereas high living costs and the maintenance of a reasonably adequate and fair old-age security and aid-to-the-blind program in California warrant the continuation of the present \$5 increase as well as the authorization of an additional \$5 increase; and

"Whereas legislation is pending in the Congress of the United States which would accomplish these two objectives for the recipients of old-age security and aid to the blind: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the legislature respectfully requests that the Congress of the United States enact legislation at this session continuing the increased grants-in-aid passed in 1952 and give care-

ful consideration to an additional \$5 increase, and that support be given such legislation by the Senators and Representatives in Congress from California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 7

"Joint resolution relative to permitting recipients of aid to the aged to earn \$50 per month in addition to such aid

"Whereas in 1950 the Congress of the United States amended the social-security law to provide that the first \$50 per month of income earned by a blind person shall be disregarded in computing aid to such person, thereby allowing a blind person to earn this amount in addition to his aid; and

"Whereas legislation is presently before the Congress of the United States which would extend this same benefit to recipients of aid to the aged; and

"Whereas it is the belief of the Legislature of the State of California that there is an abundance of odd jobs and temporary employment in this State that could be capably filled by aged persons; and

"Whereas the present public-assistance program discourages these aged persons from seeking such employment by requiring that any and all earnings be deducted from their aid: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as is necessary to permit recipients of aid to the aged to earn \$50 a month, which amount shall not be taken into consideration in computing aid to such recipients; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 13

"Joint resolution relative to Federal disability payments for aged and needy veterans

"Whereas there are in this country today thousands of aged and disabled needy war veterans who are unemployable and who have little or no income on which to live; and

"Whereas the laws enacted by Congress to assist such veterans are being defeated by arbitrary and unjust interpretations given them by the Veterans' Administration; and

"Whereas it is particularly deplorable and discriminatory that the Veterans' Administration has ruled that a 65-year-old veteran, suffering from the disabilities and ailments that come with old age, remains employable if he can eke out a few dollars here and there by part-time work to supplement an otherwise inadequate income, and on that ground denies disability payments to such veterans; and

"Whereas the rise in the cost of living that has occurred since the scale for veterans' payments was established some years ago has also resulted in hardships on those who are aged and disabled; and

"Whereas the American Legion is solidly behind a program to correct these inequities by raising the monthly benefits for disabled veterans to bring them more in line with today's increased living costs, by raising the limitation on the annual income which a veteran may receive and still remain eligible for disability benefits, and by amending the pres-

ent law to include the automatic presumption that a veteran at the age of 65 becomes unemployable due to advancing years and physical infirmities and thus entitled to security benefits provided he can meet the income limitation and other requirements; and

"Whereas there is now pending in Congress the War Veterans Security bill, H. R. 7386, which embodies these provisions and will give some much needed help to these veterans who are now old and infirm, but who in their younger days answered their country's call: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact into law H. R. 7386; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to the proposed Washoe project

"Whereas there is presently pending before the Congress legislation to authorize the construction of the Washoe project, which project involves the waters of the Truckee and Carson Rivers, and which project originates in California, with some of its principal features located in California; and

"Whereas most of the benefits of this project, as planned by the United States Bureau of Reclamation, accrue to the State of Nevada, and the legislation before Congress contains no provisions to protect the State of California with respect to the potential future development of the areas in this State which may possibly necessitate the use of waters involved in this project; and

"Whereas the State Engineer of California has recommended at hearings before congressional committees (1) that storage and water supply for the Washoe project be based on stream runoff in the Truckee and Carson River basins as impaired by present and future use of water in the areas of origin in California, (2) that the amount of water to be available to the Washoe project be defined in an interstate compact and the project operated in conformance therewith, and (3) that the Washoe project provide a dependable water supply to lands in the Carson Valley in California as well as to lands in the same valley in Nevada, but such recommendations have not been adopted in pending legislation; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California believes that the storage and distribution of waters which affect the interests of two or more States should be accomplished in conformity with the desires of the States involved and in pursuance of this policy has created a commission to cooperate with a similar commission from the State of Nevada in formulating an interstate compact relative to the distribution and use of the waters of, among others, the Truckee and Carson Rivers; and

"Whereas the Interstate compact now under negotiation between the commissions of the State of California and the State of Nevada will determine the amount of water that can reasonably be made available for future development in the areas of origin in California; and

"Whereas it is not contemplated or believed that the provisions of such compact will have a detrimental effect upon the operation of the proposed Washoe project or that the negotiation of such compact should be cause for delay of authorization of the

project by the Congress if appropriate safeguards are included therein; and

"Whereas amendments have been proposed to S. 497, 84th Congress, first session, one of the congressional bills to authorize the construction of the Washoe project, to provide protection for the future development in the areas of origin in California and to provide that the operation of the Washoe project shall be in conformance with any interstate compact formulated and approved, covering the distribution and use of the waters of the Truckee and Carson Rivers; and

"Whereas there is precedent for the inclusion in statutes authorizing Federal reclamation projects of a provision subjecting project operation to requirements of State law, as exemplified by the statute authorizing the Santa Maria project (68 Stat. 1190); and

"Whereas it is not the intention of the Legislature of the State of California in adopting this resolution to voice opposition to the authorization of the proposed Washoe project, which project the legislature firmly believes is a desirable and necessary development, but rather only to urge that provision be made in the legislation authorizing such project to protect the future development of the areas in California involved in this project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing the construction of the Washoe project with appropriate statutory provisions to (a) afford water users in Alpine County, Calif., the opportunity to contract for project water made available by the Watasheam Reservoir before that water is made available for the development of any new land in Nevada, with the right of such Alpine County water users to exchange the water so secured for existing rights to the natural flow or stored water of the West Carson River; (b) provide that the use of the waters of the Little Truckee River solely for the generation of electric power by the Washoe project shall be subject to appropriation in the future for beneficial consumptive uses within the Little Truckee River watershed in California to the same extent that such waters may be presently available for appropriation in the State of California, unless and until an interstate compact is formulated and approved, covering the distribution and use of the waters of the Truckee and Carson Rivers; and (c) provide that the dam at the Stampede site shall be so constructed as to permit its ultimate enlargement to a height at which the reservoir behind it will have a capacity of approximately 175,000 acre-feet; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Senate Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution relative to compliance with State water laws

"Whereas under the California State water resources law of 1945, as amended, the State water resources board was authorized and directed to prepare a comprehensive and coordinated plan for the full development of California water resources, for which purpose said board has expended nearly \$4 million to date; and

"Whereas such comprehensive plan, known as the California water plan, pursuant to the direction of said board, is under formulation by the division of water resources and is approaching completion, and a preview thereof has been published; and

"Whereas in recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States construing the Federal Power Act, it has been held that licenses of the Federal Power Commission may construct and operate hydroelectric projects without compliance with State laws relating to the development and use of water; and

"Whereas application and extension of the precedents established in said cases might result in Federal domination of the use and development of the water resources of the States; and

"Whereas such precedents constitute an impediment to the continued exercise of the traditional rights of the States to control and develop their water resources in the public interest; and

"Whereas it appears that remedial legislation by the Congress is necessary in order to protect and preserve such traditional rights of the States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to promptly enact Federal legislation to require all Federal agencies and their licensees to comply with State laws relating to the development and use of water.

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 5
"Joint resolution relative to national minerals policy

"Whereas the Western Governors Mineral Policies Conference was called by Gov. Goodwin J. Knight, of California, in Sacramento, Calif., on November 7 and 8 1955, after consultation by Governor Knight with Gov. Charles H. Russell, of Nevada, who is chairman of the Western Governors Advisory Council; and

"Whereas this conference and the subsequent meetings of the Western Governors Mining Advisory Council produced the following recommendations for the development of a national minerals policy:

"MINERAL ECONOMICS—RECOMMENDATIONS ON MINERAL COMMODITIES

"1. Gold

"The council calls attention to the following conditions in regard to gold:

"1. The absolute and arbitrary control exercised by the United States Treasury over the production, disposition, and holding of domestic gold is in direct violation of the rights of personal liberty, personal security, and personal ownership of private property.

"2. The Government has usurped the right of individuals to sell newly mined gold to industry and to the arts, and has denied individuals the right to own, buy, or sell this commodity in a free market.

"3. The sale of gold from our Federal gold reserve for other than monetary use annually exceeds the total domestic gold production and is dissipating the United States monetary reserves.

"4. By making itself the sole buyer of newly mined gold in processed form and by fixing its arbitrary and low price, the United States Government imposes such hardships on the domestic gold producer that 95 percent of the primary gold mines have been forced to close operations.

"The council recommends that:

"1. Congress be urged to enact legislation to discontinue the sale of Government-owned gold from the monetary reserve to private industry and to restore to the people of the United States the right freely to buy, possess, sell, and otherwise treat gold. Such legislation is now pending in the Congress,

but references to gold therein should be amended so as to not limit the measure to newly mined gold.

"2. The respective State legislatures be requested to urge the Congress to support such legislation.

"2. Silver

"The council recommends that:

"1. The existing policy, whereby newly mined domestic silver may be tendered to the Treasury Department for coinage purposes, be continued.

"2. Senate bill 1427, "A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver and for other purposes," be rejected by the Congress.

"3. As longer range objectives, the council further recommends that:

"(a) The sale of Government-owned silver by the Treasury Department at less than its coinage value of \$1.2929 per troy ounce be prohibited; and

"(b) The seigniorage retained by the Treasury Department be progressively reduced in recognition of the steadily mounting cost of producing silver.

"(4) The council highly commends the governors and the legislators of the Western States for the vigorous support which they have given to the silver mining industry, and we respectfully call to their attention the fact that their continued support is urgently needed.

"3. Lead and zinc

"The council recommends that:

"1. An excise tax of 2 cents per pound be established on imports of zinc and lead to take effect whenever the price of zinc falls below 14 cents, East St. Louis, and the price of lead to 16 cents, New York.

"2. The present stockpiling of lead and zinc should be continued until such an excise tax is put into effect.

"4. Copper

"The council recommends that:

"The present excise tax on imported copper be maintained.

"5. Molybdenum

"The council recommends that:

"The national stockpile program on molybdenum concentrates be continued until maximum emergency defense requirements are met.

"6. Fluorspar

"The council recommends that:

"The fluorspar industry be afforded tariff protection and/or restriction of fluorspar imports sufficient to permit its survival.

"7. Uranium—Vanadium

"The council strongly urges that:

"The Atomic Energy Commission make a prompt public declaration regarding the continuation and extension of its uranium-purchase program. Upon the announcement of its proposed program the domestic industry at large should be provided an opportunity to appraise and evaluate said proposed program and to submit further recommendations before its final adoption. Meantime, so long as the Government retains control of the purchase and use of uranium, the council looks to the Atomic Energy Commission to maintain an adequate purchase program and to prepare plans for an orderly transition from the current monopolies to the period when industrial requirements predominate.

"The council strongly urges that more access and mine-to-market roads be planned and completed with all possible speed.

"The council favors the continued curtailment by the Atomic Energy Commission of its exploration drilling program and urges that funds hitherto allocated for that purpose be made available to the Defense Mineral Exploration Administration.

"The council further recommends that:
"The security program be reexamined in order that maximum information be made available to the industry for effective future planning.

"The Atomic Energy Commission should arrange to facilitate and plan continuity of studies of problems of the industry related to the marketing of uranium ores, in particular: (a) penalties now being imposed for high lime content; (b) the disposition of other metals produced in association with uranium including vanadium, copper, etcetera, and (c) the feasibility of establishing fixed uniform prices for uranium concentrates. These studies should enlist the personnel and experience of the Atomic Energy Commission, appropriate State and Federal agencies as well as private research organizations and the producing industry.

"The council urges that:

"In all future raw material purchase programs that the domestic uranium industry be given paramount consideration.

"8. Rare earths and thorium

"The council recommends that:

"1. The Atomic Energy Commission should establish a price and buying schedule for thorium similar to that for uranium, since it has complete control of both these fissionable materials.

"2. A tariff be placed on foreign monazite, bastnasite, and rare earth compounds which is sufficiently high to permit domestic producers to survive. A tariff of 10 cents per pound on contained rare earths metals is suggested.

"3. Until Nos. 1 and 2 above are effective the Federal Government should make new contracts to purchase monazite and bastnasite concentrates in sufficient quantities and at a price which will maintain an adequate mobilization base for the industry.

"9. Quicksilver

"The council calls attention to the fact the market for mercury is assured by GSA purchases until December 31, 1957, but it has no knowledge of any definite demand which could assure the continuation of the domestic industry much beyond that date.

"The council recommends:

"1. The establishment of a tariff equivalent in protection and at the same percentage of the selling price as at the time the present tariff was established (1922).

"2. If this is not possible, there should be established a plan of distributing the tariff paid by foreign producers to domestic producers in accordance with their production with the tariff adjusted from 25 cents per pound to 35 cents per pound.

"3. In the absence of 1 or 2 above then the General Services Administration purchase program should be continued until the present appropriation is expended.

"10. Tungsten

"The council recommends that:

"1. An adequate tariff be established to enable the domestic tungsten mining industry to stand on its own feet and compete with the low-cost foreign producers.

"2. If it is impossible to obtain such a tariff, then an adequate tariff on imported tungsten ore should be established, the proceeds of which must be distributed to the producers of domestic tungsten produced and sold within the United States, in proportion to their production.

"3. A purchase program for a reasonable period be established providing for reduced Government purchases at lower than current floor prices, based on the grade and impurities of the concentrates purchased, and with gradually reducing amounts and prices to enable complete withdrawal of the United States Government from the program by the end of that period.

"4. Until 1, or 2, and 3 above are put into effect, the principles and purpose, as expressed in H. R. 6373 (84th Cong.), be

reaffirmed as desirable objectives to provide a continuing and prosperous tungsten mining industry in order that an adequate mobilization base might be maintained.

"The council suggests:

"That the Department of Defense be advised that it is no longer necessary to "design around" tungsten. It should be used wherever and whenever it is best suited to the defense problem in hand.

"11. Chrome

"The council recommends that:

"In order to prevent the domestic chrome industry from being shut down in the fall of 1956 and in order that the industry might continue as a mobilization base for possible emergency, that:

"1. A tariff be established of 5 cents per pound on contained chromium metal in imported chromite ore;

"2. If it is impossible to obtain such a tariff, then a tariff equal to five-eighths cent per pound on contained chromium metal in imported chromite ore should be established. The proceeds of this tariff must be distributed to the producers of chromite produced and sold within the United States in proportion to their production. Then the chrome industry could continue into the foreseeable future as a strong, healthy industry, capable of expansion and able to act as a mobilization base in time of national emergency;

"3. Until such a long term program as outlined under 1 or 2, is adopted and put into effect, the General Services Administration purchase program should be continued on its present basis.

"12. Manganese

"The council recommends that:

"1. A tariff be established of 5 cents per pound of contained manganese in imported foreign ores;

"2. If the stipulation in paragraph 1 is impossible, then a tariff equivalent to one-half cent per pound of contained manganese be imposed, the proceeds being distributed to domestic producers on the basis of each domestic producer's unit production produced and sold;

"3. The limitation of 10,000 tons on the carlot program be eliminated until the provisions of either paragraph 1 or 2 are adopted;

"4. If the recommendations in paragraphs 1 and 2 are impossible, then a program similar to the present carlot program should be put into effect over a long term of years.

"The council suggests:

"Every effort be made to obtain a treatment plant at either the Deming, N. Mex., or the Wenden, Ariz., depot to benefit stockpile ores to usable grade.

"13. Antimony

"In order to reactivate domestic antimony production the council recommends that:

"1. Minimum tariff rates be established.

"(a) On antimony ore and concentrates at not less than 15 cents per pound of contained antimony; and

"(b) On antimony smelter products at not less than 30 cents per pound of contained antimony.

"2. If it is not possible to obtain such tariffs then a tariff of 6 cents per pound on contained antimony metal in imported antimony metal, ores or concentrates should be established. The proceeds of this tariff must be distributed to the producers of primary antimony, produced and sold within the United States, in proportion to their production.

"14. Asbestos

"The council recommends that:

"1. Unused funds now earmarked for the purchase of No. 3 fiber be made available to purchase additional No. 1 and No. 2 high grade fiber, thereby making usable all of the

funds allocated to the G. S. A. Globe warehouse. The purchase of No. 3 should be continued on the present ratio of 3 tons of No. 3 purchased to each ton of No. 1 or No. 2 (approximately \$1 million remains in the No. 3 fund to supply funds for the above change in the program).

"2. Fiber of national stockpile quality now in the Globe warehouse be transferred to the national stockpile and the Globe warehouse be credited accordingly;

"3. The life of the asbestos program be extended. This can be done by making available to Arizona asbestos producers part of the funds allocated to the national stockpile and changing the present Globe warehouse program as in No. 1 above;

"4. The inspection of fiber for transfer to the national stockpile be done by G. S. A. classifiers now inspecting Globe warehouse fiber;

"5. Fiber of national stockpile quality and sold to the national stockpile to be checked in at the Globe warehouse and paid for as now being done through San Francisco office of G. S. A.;

"6. The present standards of quality be retained.

"15. Coal

"The council recommends that:

"The governors give equal consideration to all of the available energy resources—uranium, coal, oil, gas, oil shale and water—before deciding which is to be used as the source of generating power in any given area.

"16. Aggregates—Clay—Talc

"The council recommends that:

"The congressional committees on interstate and foreign commerce be urged to investigate the encroachment by the I. C. C. regulations on many minerals and mineral aggregate in intrastate commerce.

"Lands and Water

"The council considers the objective of the general mining laws to be the discovery and development of the mineral resources of the public domain by private enterprise. To effect this objective the laws invite citizens to prospect for minerals and upon discovery to locate valid mining claims. The mining laws also provide for protection of valid claims and the possessory rights thereunder prior to patent, and for transfer of legal title to private ownership by patent. History has proven the soundness of this system, and the council reaffirms its confidence in it.

"The council holds that public lands are not the property of the Government of the United States or of any of its agencies but instead are lands held in trust for the people of the United States, and are destined for their eventual use under the principles of free enterprise. Vast areas of the West have in prospect many present and future uses, but they are most likely to find best use as a source of the national mineral wealth.

"The continued inroads upon the use of this land which are made by Federal withdrawal of the land from mineral entry, or by acquisition by various agencies of the Federal Government, have long been adverse to the economy of the West. Such inroads have been tremendously augmented in recent years by military acquisition of huge areas in the Western States. This has served to curtail seriously the productivity of private enterprise within the State, and to reduce State and Federal income, as well as the supply of materials for the defense of the country. Under present laws, no Federal-land State has the power effectively to resist such inroads.

"For those cogent reasons the council recommends that:

"1. As to Federal land withdrawals:

"(a) The western governors urge an immediate congressional investigation of Federal lands now withdrawn from mineral entry and other beneficial uses, whether withdrawn for military or other purposes, and

of western lands otherwise acquired by the various agencies of the Federal Government; that among other things such investigation determine the necessity for and the authenticity of the withdrawal, whether the land is still serving the purpose for which it was withdrawn or acquired and whether portions of it or the whole of it may be returned to the public domain or to private owners (with priority right for repurchase given to original owners); and that such investigation determine whether the various agencies and military units cannot combine their activities as to the use of such lands rather than making separate use thereof, in order to give such land the highest possible usefulness.

"(b) Congress be urged by the governors to explore the possibility of Federal legislation requiring the cooperation and approval of any State for any Federal withdrawal or acquisition within its boundaries.

"(c) The western governors request Congress to enact legislation to provide that in all further Federal-land withdrawals, for military use or otherwise:

"(1) Public hearings be held on the proposed withdrawals.

"(2) These hearings be held in at least one community within or near the area proposed for withdrawal.

"(3) Notice of these hearings be published in the Federal Register and in a newspaper having maximum circulation in affected areas, at least 90 days in advance of the hearings.

"(4) These hearings shall seek to determine the relative beneficial use of the land involved, and whether excessive acreages are being proposed for withdrawal.

"2. As to the Oil and Gas Leasing Act:

"The western governors opposed any further amendment of the Oil and Gas Leasing Act, approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 30 U. S. C. A. 181, et seq.), or any other legislative proposals which would add any further classes of lessees or any minerals or mineral deposits to those now named in said act.

"3. As to Mineral Leasing Act:

"The western governors urge the Department of Interior to reappraise the maximum acreage limitations presently existing on the leasing of Federal mineral lands withdrawn from location and increase the acreage to meet the requirements of modern mining and refining needs. Illustrative of such need is phosphate.

"It is the considered opinion of the council that no further restriction should be placed upon the noncompetitive lease rules and regulations and that such regulations should be so administered as to encourage the investment of venture capital.

"4. As to restrictive Federal legislation:

"(a) The western governors oppose any and all legislation in the Congress that promotes further control and withdrawal of Federal lands from the public domain.

"(b) The governors urge the Congress of the United States to return to the first principles laid down by our Founding Fathers, that the Federal lands of the United States are for the benefit of the citizens and should be sold and disposed of to the citizens as rapidly as is practically possible, so that those lands may be made the subject of private ownership by our citizenry and the subject of taxation for the support of local and State governments.

"(c) The western governors advocate the annulment of the rules and regulations promulgated by the many departments of Government withdrawing and otherwise prohibiting possession of public lands by the citizens of this Nation, so that the citizens may again be free to take up the land under the original laws relating to mining or agricultural classification and carry that land through to patent without interference by a multitude of governmental agencies.

"5. As to geophysical exploration:

"The governors urge Congress to give prompt consideration of constructive changes in the discovery provisions of the General Mining Laws so as to afford a reasonable period of protection to those who in good faith seek a mineral discovery where the object of exploration is a deep or hidden deposit and discovery can only be made following prolonged use of expensive equipment and modern scientific methods of prospecting.

"6. As to "in lieu" lands:

"The western governors recommend to Congress a thorough study of the need for legislation serving to permit the public land States to make "in lieu" selection from mineral lands, for the mineral lands lost to the State because of the preemption of numbered school sections before the State's right to such sections was determined by survey.

"7. As to State mining laws:

"The western governors investigate the desirability of making more uniform the laws of the various States governing location and annual assessment work, and other mineral land matters within their jurisdiction.

"Taxes

"The council holds that the continuance of a healthy and prosperous mining industry and the contributions it can and should make to the public revenue, to employment, to national security, and to the general welfare, depends upon continuing production from now operating mines and the continuing discovery and development of new deposits. Essential to this is the hope for profits commensurate with the difficulties, the effort, and the risks of losses involved. The inherent risks in mining cannot be avoided, and taxes should not be imposed in nature or amounts as will kill incentives for incurring these risks and will result in loss of Government revenues and harm to the domestic economy.

"The council recommends:

"1. As to depletion:

"(a) Full and adequate allowance for percentage as well as cost depletion should be provided for all minerals on a fair and equitable basis, not less favorable than present rates. We particularly note the necessity of such allowances in the development of so-called oil shales in the Western States.

"(b) Depletion should be recognized as an allowance to stockholders in determining the taxability of dividends they receive as well as being allowed to the corporation in determining its taxable income.

"2. As to exploration costs:

"Cost of exploration, as well as development, should be allowed as a deduction without the limitations imposed by present law.

"3. As to depreciation:

"The provisions for more reasonable depreciation contained in present law should be retained without fundamental changes. No amount should be considered as recovered by depreciation deductions which has not effectively reduced the taxpayer's income subject to tax.

"4. As to operating loss:

"The more equitable allowance of net operating losses provided by present law should be maintained.

"5. As to research expenditures:

"The allowance under present law as a deduction of expenditures on research and experimentation should be preserved.

"6. As to double taxation of corporate earnings:

"The small step recently taken to minimize double taxation of corporate earnings should be enlarged.

"7. As to new mines:

"New mines should be exempted from income taxes for 3 years after commercial production begins.

"8. As to capital gains:

"A further reduction of the rate on net long-term capital gains would be economi-

cally beneficial to the mining industry and, on the basis of past experience, would increase net revenue collected.

"9. As to severance taxes:

"In State taxation, no particular tax nor the combined Federal, State and local taxes should be such as to discourage the exploration and development or production of minerals. Severance taxes or taxes based on or measured by gross output should be avoided.

"Research

"The council recommends to the governors serious consideration of the following discussed facts and conditions affecting industry research.

"Research is the very foundation upon which growth of the mineral industries must depend. For the future health of the mineral industries and of the entire national economy, there should be vigorous research activity supported directly by private industry as well as by State and Federal agencies, each working in the sphere for which it is best fitted; and

"With respect to privately supported industrial research, economic factors should be such as to give maximum encouragement to industrial expenditures for research. This viewpoint is embodied in a recommendation on taxes, shared in by the research committee; and

"Since many research projects involve financial commitments over a long period of years, the lack of a clearly stated national mineral policy, has limited industry's willingness to undertake such long-term projects. It follows that the adoption of such a national policy, to which all these recommendations are devoted, will do much to encourage industrial research.

"With respect to State and Federal research, the council recommends the following:

"1. Establish at Federal level, and at State level where desirable, permanent mineral research advisory boards. These boards should consider and recommend initiation of research programs which, in their opinion, are particularly needed.

"2. Encourage Federal and State mineral research programs at appropriate State agencies, universities, and nonprofit research foundations.

"3. Expand or establish in each of the mining States a clearinghouse or library of pertinent technical information and records dealing with all phases of the mineral industries.

"The mineral industries of many of the Western States, particularly the small-mine operators, need some form of central clearinghouse for pertinent technical information which would be readily available in suitable form.

"4. Continue support of existing long-range research in Federal and State agencies.

"Geological and topographic mapping should be accelerated as an essential part of this long-range program.

"Public Information

"When and if the governors approve the recommendations the council recommends that the western governors authorize the Western Governors' Mining Advisory Council to undertake the following public relations activities to attain the widest possible public understanding of the policies adopted by them as a result of the Western Governors' Mineral Policies Conference:

"1. Distribute to all related and interested organizations the recommendations on national mineral policy affecting the mining industry as adopted by the governors as a result of this conference.

"2. Distribute basic information related to the recommendations necessary to promote the broadest possible public reception and understanding.

"3. Continue to distribute such additional information as should subsequently develop relating to those recommendations.

"4. Obtain the full cooperation of all organizations and agencies, private and public, whose interests are related directly or indirectly to the mining industry."

"Whereas these recommendations constitute a basic national minerals policy designed to strengthen the mining industry and the national security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the legislature recommend to the executive and legislative branches of the United States the consideration of the national minerals policy formulated by the Western Governors Mineral Policies Conference and the effectuation of such recommendations; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relative to petitioning the Federal Maritime Board for allocation of shipbuilding and ship repair

"Whereas the maintenance of a nucleus of skilled workers and shipbuilding facilities on the west coast is considered by national military leaders to be vital to national defense; and

"Whereas in recognition of the importance of maintaining the ability of west coast shipyards to respond immediately to a national emergency, west coast shipyards receive a 6-percent differential in bidding against eastern yards on Government merchant-ship construction, with the thought that thereby at least a minimum of experienced workers would be available immediately in a crisis; and

"Whereas the importance of maintaining the west coast shipbuilding industry, at least at a minimal level, is not merely a matter of regional interest but it is in the interest of national security; and

"Whereas bids on proposal OSC-11 T4 and T5 tankers have recently been opened and Pacific coast companies have submitted a bid on the T4's only \$5,000 higher than the Ingalls' bid (and \$203,900 higher on the T5's); and

"Whereas although this construction does not fall under the 6-percent limitation, it does involve public funds and consideration should be given to the desperate need for shipyard work on this Pacific coast; and

"Whereas whatever the efforts have been of our congressional delegation in Washington, the fact remains that we have not seen shipbuilding or ship repair work brought to this Pacific coast and the entire industry is imperiled by this dangerous situation we now face: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the members of this legislature do hereby respectfully petition the Federal Maritime Board to allocate some portion of this tanker work to the Pacific coast; and be it further

Resolved, That each Senator and Representative from California in Congress is requested to vigorously campaign for the assignment of a substantial portion of shipbuilding and ship repair to the San Francisco Bay area and to other shipyards in California, wherever located; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice

President of the United States, to each member of the Federal Maritime Commission, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 9

"Joint resolution relative to Federal legislation respecting the tunafish industry

"Whereas the fishing industry, which constitutes an important element of the economy of the United States, is in dire need of legislation to establish a national program for the stabilization of the industry; and

"Whereas there have been a number of measures introduced at the present session of Congress, among them being S. 3339, H. R. 9552, H. R. 9607, House Resolution 377, House Resolution 378, and Senate Resolution 186; and

"Whereas these measures contain various provisions to assist the fishing industry by establishing a top-level policymaking United States Fisheries Commission, creating a Fisheries Stabilization Corporation empowered to make loans to fishermen and fixing quotas on the importation of fish, shellfish, and their products; and

"Whereas the legislature has been informed that representatives of the fishing industry in California, New England and the Gulf States are in agreement that such remedial legislation is greatly needed; and

"Whereas it is particularly urgent that a quota formula for imports be enacted to prevent the threatened ruin of the southern California tuna industry by the American market being taken over by cheaper Japanese imports: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorizes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation protecting the country's fishing industry by establishing a policymaking United States Fisheries Commission, creating a Fisheries Stabilization Corporation empowered to make loans to fishermen, and fixing quotas on imports of fish, shellfish, and the products thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

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

"Assembly Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution relative to prohibiting minors, unaccompanied by a parent or guardian, from crossing the United States-Mexico border without a permit for such purposes

"Whereas there is pending in Congress action on two particular bills concerning the crossing of the United States-Mexico border by unescorted minors; and

"Whereas either H. R. 5108, introduced by Representative WILSON of California, or House Joint Resolution 168, introduced by Representative HOSMER of California, would require that a minor be accompanied by a parent or guardian before he could cross the border into Mexico; also H. R. 5108 would allow unescorted minors to cross the border if they had a proper permit issued by the United States Attorney General, and House Joint Resolution 168 would allow such minors to cross the border if it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the appropriate immigration officers that the purpose of crossing the border is legitimate and not for the purpose of obtaining narcotic drugs; and

"Whereas under existing laws there is no restriction on minors who cross the border

and many of such minors are entering Mexico for one paramount reason, to get free access to narcotic drugs; and

"Whereas the alarming increase in the use of narcotics by the youth of our country seriously threatens to undermine the foundation of our citizenry, the youngster of today—the voter of tomorrow; and

"Whereas many of our youths who could otherwise lead a constructive life are being consigned by the use of narcotics to a living death; and

"Whereas these bills, which would ban border crossings by unescorted minors, are deserving of full congressional support, and passage of either of them would be a tremendous stride in correcting this evil: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorizes the Congress of the United States to enact either H. R. 5108 or H. J. Res. 168 or in the alternative to enact such legislation as is necessary to close the border between the United States and the Republic of Mexico until corrective action is taken by the citizens of Mexico to prevent the simple and easy acquisition of narcotics and their derivatives; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution commending the Boy Scouts of America and supporting the 1957 Boy Scout Jamboree at Valley Forge

"Whereas the Boy Scouts of America, one of the greatest character-building institutions in the world, is holding its Fourth National Jamboree, at Valley Forge Park, Pennsylvania, July 12 to 18, 1957; and

"Whereas based upon the experience of the three prior national jamborees held under the auspices of the Boy Scouts of America it has been proven that there are innumerable benefits to the boyhood of America through such national jamborees, such as:

"1. An unforgettable scouting experience for approximately 50,000 American boys;

"2. An opportunity to see some of the wonderful country in which we live, and visit historic shrines located at Valley Forge and at Washington, D. C., and in places en route and returning from the jamboree;

"3. A practical method of teaching Americanism, good citizenship, and leadership training;

"4. A realistic opportunity to teach Boy Scouts the value of the Scout Law—A Scout is Thrifty, and encourage him to earn his own way to the jamboree; and

"5. For an unrivaled opportunity to accelerate the whole character-building program of the Boy Scouts of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California, in full recognition of the success of the Boy Scouts of America, earnestly requests the Congress of the United States, State legislatures, State executive officers, boards of supervisors, city councils, and other governmental bodies and officers to give the fullest support and endorsement to the Boy Scouts of America and the Fourth National Jamboree to be held at Valley Forge Park, Pennsylvania, July 12 to 18, 1957; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the

United States, to the County Supervisors Association of California, to the League of California Cities."

Five joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to flood control on the Mad and Eel Rivers, South Fork of Eel River, Redwood Creek, Klamath, Mattole, Russian, Smith, and Van Duzen Rivers

"Whereas the most devastating floods on record struck the lands of the northern coastal area of this State which lie along the Mad and Eel Rivers, South Fork of Eel River, Redwood Creek, Klamath, Mattole, Russian, Smith, and Van Duzen Rivers during December of 1955; and

"Whereas many communities were completely demolished by these flood waters which caused immense property damage and indescribable human suffering that is difficult to comprehend even after visual inspection; and

"Whereas adequate flood-control measures could have completely saved this area from these losses; and

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army has been authorized to make a comprehensive survey for flood control on the Eel River and a preliminary examination and survey with respect to Redwood Creek but no money has been appropriated therefor; and

"Whereas there is a like need for appropriate authorization and appropriation for flood-control examination and survey on the Mad, the South Fork of the Eel River, the Klamath, Mattole, Russian, Smith, and Van Duzen Rivers: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps to provide adequate safeguards against any recurrence of the devastating floods along the Mad and Eel Rivers, South Fork of Eel River, Redwood Creek, Klamath, Mattole, Russian, Smith, and Van Duzen Rivers, including the appropriation of funds for the already authorized surveys and examinations on the Eel River and Redwood Creek and authorization of surveys on the Mad River, South Fork of Eel River, the Klamath, Mattole, Russian, Smith, and Van Duzen Rivers and necessary appropriation therefor; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to the prevention of flood conditions in the Napa Valley

"Whereas during the year 1955 extensive loss of life and property occurred as the result of flood waters in California; and

"Whereas if proper measures are not taken to control streams and rivers floods may be expected at any time in the future with resultant losses; and

"Whereas it is in the mutual interest of this State and Nation to prevent the deprivations of flood waters as they affect the people and property of this country; and

"Whereas in order to prevent recurring flood conditions extensive planning and construction is called for both to prevent floods and control and utilize the vast power that is unleashed upon such occasions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the United States Army Engineers and Department of Public Works, State of California, are hereby requested to take the necessary measures to prevent future floods in the Napa Valley and city of Napa area; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, the United States Army Engineers, the governor of California, and to the Department of Public Works, State of California."

"Senate Joint Resolution 7

"Joint resolution relating to the construction of a dam on the San Luis Rey River

"Whereas the city of Carlsbad and the surrounding territory depends upon water from the San Luis Rey River, in the area known as Mission Basin, which is located between Bonsall Narrows and the Pacific Ocean; and

"Whereas the water supply for the city of Oceanside is also located in this same area; and

"Whereas the experience of this area has been that following prolonged periods of drought periods of extreme floods may be expected, and since a severe drought has existed in this area for approximately the last 10 years, it appears almost certain that a period of destructive floods can be expected which will cause extensive damage to persons and property located in this basin, and will also endanger the water supply of both the cities of Carlsbad and Oceanside; and

"Whereas studies by the Carlsbad Mutual Water Co. and the Division of Water Resources of the State of California indicate that a favorable site exists at Bonsall Narrows, on the San Luis Rey River, for a dam which would control these destructive flood waters, and would also permit these waters to be conserved for future use by way of controlled release into the Mission Basin: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States, the Army Corps of Engineers, the State water resources board, and the State of California Department of Public Works are hereby respectfully requested to consider and take all necessary steps to provide for the necessary studies for a dam on the San Luis Rey River, and immediate construction of the dam if it is found to be feasible; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, the Army Corps of Engineers, to the Honorable Goodwin J. Knight, Governor of California, the State water resources board, and to the Honorable Frank B. Durkee, director of the Department of Public Works of the State of California."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution relative to the prevention of floods in the Napa Valley area

"Whereas the people of the Napa Valley area were recently subjected to one of the worst floods in the history of California; and

"Whereas unless proper measures are taken to control and direct the heavy rains which may occur during any year losses of private and public property will again result; and

"Whereas flood-control dams and other measures taken for the protection of residents of this area in addition to alleviating the flood problem would also become a source

of water or power if a scarcity of one or both should occur; and

"Whereas there is a need for immediate action in order that comprehensive studies may be made in order to ascertain the most favorable method and means of flood control so that, in turn, construction may be initiated at the earliest possible time: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the United States Army Engineers and Department of Public Works, State of California, are hereby requested to consider and take action regarding flood-control measures in Napa Valley and the city of Napa; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Governor of California and to the Department of Public Works, State of California."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 11

"Joint resolution relative to flood-control project authorization by the United States Congress

"Whereas the recent disastrous floods made even more imperative than ever the immediate construction of flood-control works in the area between Chico Landing and Red Bluff; and

"Whereas House Document 272, 84th Congress, 2d session, sets forth the protection necessary for this area; and

"Whereas immediate authorization by the Congress of the United States for the Chico Landing to Red Bluff project has been recommended by the Division of Water Resources in its publication Floods of December 1955 in California; and

"Whereas State water resources board has recommended that this project be authorized; and

"Whereas bill No. H. R. 9595, introduced in the 2d session of the 84th Congress, would authorize the construction of these necessary flood-control works: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to take immediate steps for the authorization of the Chico Landing to Red Bluff project by favorable consideration of H. R. 9595; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Assembly Concurrent Resolution 42

"Concurrent resolution relative to the observance of Pan-American Week

"Whereas on April 14, 1890, the First International Conference of American States met in Washington, D. C., and adopted a resolution which resulted in the creation of the organization known as the Pan American Union; and

"Whereas the aims of the Pan American Union, known today as the Organization of American States, have been and continue to be the defense and mutual benefit of the 21 American Republics comprising the members of this organization; and

"Whereas the need for confidence and strength resulting from the affiliation of peoples with common ideals continues to be of the greatest importance in this age in which we live; and

"Whereas the Organization of American States has ably shown for 66 years that friendship and understanding together with a mutual desire for peace can forge a powerful unit of defense and in addition can lead to amicable and just settlements in all areas of dispute; and

"Whereas Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, has proclaimed Saturday, April 14, 1956, as Pan American Day and urges the people of this Nation on that day and throughout the period of April 8 through April 14, 1956, to give expression to their cordial good will toward the peoples of the other American Republics and of their intention to maintain the principles of freedom and equality fundamental to all: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California (the Senate thereof concurring), That the people of California are hereby requested to observe Pan American Day and Pan American Week in the spirit outlined by the President of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States."

A report of the Joint House and Senate Committee on Insurance Investigation of the General Assembly of the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce, Honolulu, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act so as to provide for reapportionment of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Republican Club of Castro Valley, Calif., favoring the enactment of the Dirksen amendment, in the nature of a substitute, for the Bricker amendment to the Constitution, relating to the treaty-making power; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTER-STATE COMMERCE—PETITIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, various individuals in Montana have written to me relative to a certain legislative proposal in which they are interested, namely, the Langer bill (S. 923) to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes. At their request I ask unanimous consent that their petition, and the names signed thereto, may be appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the petitions were received, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, with the signatures attached, as follows:

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages. At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increasing the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially

by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

Mary Downs, Iola M. Dunn, Mrs. Frank Ravnik, Mrs. Frank Lamb, John W. Fredrick, Vera M. Fredrick, Mrs. A. P. Lundbaug, Mrs. I. W. Martinson, Mrs. Merritt F. Maddux, Mrs. John Romell, Mrs. Arnold Iverson, William R. Schneider, Arnold L. Iverson, Dorothy J. Kindrick, Frances E. Baker, all of Helena, Mont.

E. H. Tucker, Bozeman, Mont.; Helen J. Roemer, Harold Kenison, Alma Kenison, W. J. Harper, Beulah Rood, Jerry Rood, Doris Altimus, Helen Potts, Cora Busby, Livingston, Mont.; Jeannette Busby, Bozeman, Mont.; Carl W. Rose, Virginia Rose, Rebecca Watt, P. A. Watt, Helen D. Ferris, J. J. Case, Mrs. J. F. Johnson, Livingston, Mont.; C. W. Rose, Clyde Park, Mont.; Howard E. Harper, Mary Belle Harper, Hilda Harper, Elva Skillman, C. T. Skillman, Livingston, Mont.; Harold A. Rose, Clyde Park, Mont.; Mrs. Mabel Raab, Mrs. Carrie Bray, Mrs. Fanny E. Niles, Livingston, Mont.

Lauretta King, Majorie Nielsen, J. W. Grif-
fin, Olive Powell, Mrs. Earl Wyman, Earl Wyman, C. V. Henderson, Mrs. J. C. Neely, Mrs. A. T. Ault, R. Blarnsworth, M. D., Melvin F. Kurtz, C. W. Eybert, C. O. Nyström, Mrs. C. W. Egbert, Mrs. G. E. Surface, G. E. Surface, Mrs. Emmett Carter, Joseph Jomsson, W. O. Kurtz, Mrs. D. A. Julson, Mrs. Dewey Brown, Mrs. Lucile Fry, Lydia Ehman, Dewey Brown, Eileen Allaway, Genvie McHenry, Lorna Kellison, David A. Julson, Mrs. M. E. Smith, Frank D. King, Mrs. W. O. Kurtz, Robert Alloway, Mr. W. L. Parker, L. W. Taft, E. Ehman, Mrs. W. L. Parker, William J. McHenry, Homer L. Morrison, Mrs. L. W. Taft, all of Bozeman, Mont.

Ernest P. Schaak, Mrs. Ernest Schaak, Elva M. Spes, Mrs. Bessie Surdal, Mrs. G. W. Lutes; Mr. K. Boucher, Thomas M. Sipes, Howard C. Lund, Mrs. Elmer Hadland, Elmer Hadland, Mrs. Dorris Taggart, Ferna Allen, Alfred Surdahl, Andrew Roedel, Paul E. Limerick, Mrs. Charles J. Hoffman, C. J. Hoffman, Mrs. Andrew Roedel, Mrs. Grace Adkin, Miss Beth Thomas, Mrs. Della M. Butts, all of Bozeman, Mont.; Mrs. Bill Black, Gateway, Mont.

Mrs. E. H. Tucker, Bozeman, Mont.; Mrs. Carrie Groom, Mrs. Josie Hanson, Carolina Albertson, Mrs. Jessie M. Peterson, Mrs. Gladys Fallang, Gale S. Wick, Mrs. Gale Wick, Evelyn Scheresky, Mrs. Onie Davis, Mr. Onie Davis, Mrs. Palmer Lomeland, Mrs. Harry McComb, Rudolph Fallang, Palmer Lomeland, Big Timber, Mont.

Mrs. H. G. Handford, Mildred H. Grawe, Mabel Felix, Rosetta M. Voelker, Bessie Chrisinger, Clara E. Olson, Mrs. Bessie Eichelberger, Mrs. Anna Marie Ziss, Carolyn C. Patterson, Vesta A. Perry, Rudah C. Enger, Mildred H. Carpenter, Alma Larson, Mrs. W. H. Rieman, Mabel O'Neil, Bertha W. Schnait, Caroline Walchli, Margaret F. Clifford, Gladys E. Kramer, Mrs. Dean King, Mrs. E. B. Noble, Mrs. Amelia Withrow, Mrs. Frieda E. O'Neil, Mrs. C. W. Short, Mrs. Richard C. Mattson, Kalispell, Mont.

Rev. C. F. Crowe, Bernie Heare, Mrs. Bernie Heare, Mrs. Collene Pedersen, Mrs. Peter Backema, Mrs. George Rawl, Mr. and Mrs. N. G. Hudson, Mrs. Al Elset, T. B. Foreman, Mrs. Gertrude Wahl, Mrs. Andrew Pressman, Mrs. F. Kampschior, Marion L. Cox, R. M. Mart, Glendive, Mont.; Marjorie Hoffmeyer, Billings, Mont.; G. B. Cox, Glendive, Mont.; Floyd Uglov, Savage, Mont.; Don Arnhart, Mrs. Roy Glasscock, Roy Glasscock, Mrs. E. C. Andrews, E. C. Andrews, Hugh R. Atwood, Mrs. Floyd Ewing, F. T. Ewing, Mrs. Tom Henderson, S. J. Daniel, Mrs. S. J. Daniel, Mrs. Ray Lowe, all of Glendive, Mont.

Mrs. Eva Sahn, Miss Jeannette Leland, Mrs. Einar Dahl, Miss Marion Leland, Glendive, Mont.; Mrs. Charles Barnaby, Wibaux, Mont.; Mr. and Mrs. George Finkbein, Mr. and Mrs. O. F. Roberts, Mrs. David Wold, Mrs. Pearl E. Eckes, Mr. and Mrs. Bill Bacon, Mrs. Grace

Lanktree, Pete Tady, Lorene I. Tady, Mrs. R. H. Johnson, Mrs. Ada Wilson, Mrs. E. H. Rigley, Arthur Kitchen, Glendive, Mont.; Mr. and Mrs. Leon Anderson, Lindsay, Mont.; Mr. and Mrs. Leo Finkbein, Albert L. Aker, Glendive, Mont.; Mr. and Mrs. Charles Green, Mildred, Mont.; Stella A. Eckes, Claude Robinson, Luella Robinson, Mrs. S. D. Blackwell, Glendive, Mont.

O. D. Harris, Mary Ridenour, Mrs. B. E. Horstman, Shelby F. Snell, Bessie M. Snell, Louise M. Storey, Alvina, Lyford, C. Wayne Mahugh, Dora W. Mahugh, Kalispell, Mont.; Allon R. Clark, Phyllis L. Clark, Creston, Mont.; Leslie A. Gunderson, Audrey V. Gunderson, Mrs. L. E. Fry, Iola M. Ruegsegger, Mrs. Caleb Jackson, Mrs. Ora Miller, Mrs. E. H. Beller, Kalispell, Mont.; Miss Florence Green, Mrs. Chas. De Voe, Somers, Mont.; Mrs. Ida Davis, Mrs. R. W. Carr, Irma P. Wagner, Mrs. A. Lyford, Augusta M. Rhodes, Mrs. L. E. Fry, Chester M. Mahugh, Clyde Williams, Unice Chapin, Elizabeth Wilson, Mr. and Mrs. Pete Hoffman, Don Pack, Milo W. Taylor, Kalispell, Mont.; Marjory Pack, Marion, Mont.; Mrs. Eva Dygert, Mr. and Mrs. L. E. Clayton, Ronnie Pack, Evelyn Naylor, Cletys M. Peterson, Thomas H. Shelton, Columbia Falls, Mont.

Grace Powell, Kalispell, Mont.; Mrs. Stanley Nees, Poplar, Mont.; Mrs. Lizzie Stubbs, Mr. and Mrs. Leonard Marshall, Mrs. Robert Haven, Mrs. Carrie Claridge, Lulu Barnard, Esther Ober, Mrs. Roy Verity, Mrs. Fern Adams, Mrs. T. W. Wagner, Lois Magar, E. R. Haven, Tom Wagner, W. Dan Adams, Mrs. Andy Christianson, Keith M. Snodgrass, Anna E. Dale, Marie W. Lawrence, J. O. Lawrence, Mrs. Keith Snodgrass, Kalispell, Mont.; Gertrude Chubb, Columbia Falls, Mont.; J. O. Shew, Mrs. Maude D. Shew, Mavis Shew, Kalispell, Mont.

Mrs. L. E. Mapig, Mrs. N. E. Gray, Elizabeth Nicholson, Mrs. Verne Lien, Mrs. Harry Viegut, Erma S. Bensington, Loree Williams, Sally Kennedy, Alice Deck, Lewis L. Bennington, Irvin W. Hirning, W. O. Hirning, Mrs. Lee Trowbridge, Lee Trowbridge, Missoula, Mont.; J. J. Hirning, Mrs. John Hirning, Lolo, Mont.; L. E. Magisic, Mrs. Mary E. Watt, Missoula, Mont.

C. J. Gustafson, Mrs. F. W. Buck, Mrs. Geo. C. Johnson, W. W. Wetzel, Mrs. Roy Young, Maxine Dollen, Judy Carter, Roy T. Young, Mattie Needham, May Ellen Henk, Mrs. Jim Ranger, Pearl W. Mack, Cora L. Millard, A. C. Millard, E. A. Ludwig, Mrs. J. D. Ruddy, Mrs. H. C. Koch, Benita Mahugh, Jim Johnston, Mrs. H. A. McDonald, Daniel Aaron Bradshaw, Signe Franzen, Ella Schloss, Gertrude D. Farth, Sallie B. Hollenay, Isabella W. Murphy, J. D. Holly, Mary A. Giles, Charlotte N. Wright, Ida J. Gertison, Kenneth F. Johnson, John A. Schloss, Mrs. John Holm, John Holm, Glendive, Mont.

Elizabeth Dunn, Harriet Jeffries, Albert Woods, Marjorie Birk, Mrs. Chas. W. Short, Mrs. Lizzie Dunham, Mrs. Julia Knudson, Mrs. M. R. Wood, Mrs. Christine Buch, Mildred D. Boline, Mrs. Paul Birk, Mrs. H. Madsen, Kalispell, Mont.

Mrs. F. S. P. Foss, Mrs. D. J. Healy, D. J. Healy, Glendive, Mont.; Father Patrick J. Ryan, assistant at Sacred Heart Church; Rt. Rev. Msgr. J. A. Pettit, pastor of Sacred Heart Church; Elizabeth Yundogilalo, Mrs. Edward Holzworth, Mrs. Mark Scarff, Glendive, Mont.; Vanda Knels, Mrs. Ray Lowe, WCTU president, Bloomfield, Mont.

Allen F. Potter, Bertha I. Maher, Helen Hedman, Pat Doyle, Clarence R. Nelson, Mrs. R. R. Hark, Lanora C. Wallace, Roy Wallace, Bertha Stephenson, Ira M. Olson, Mrs. D. L. Sherman, Elmer Wellhouse, Mrs. Angeline Adams, John F. Reagan, Irene M. Reagan, Mrs. Robert Hunter, Mrs. Orville Walters, Mrs. Henry E. Lee, Mrs. Ed Hedman, Mrs. O. Williamson, Mrs. R. R. Haake, Mrs. Myrtle Bowdish, Mrs. Harold Hawley, Mrs. Jeanie Patton, Mrs. M. E. Woods, Mrs. C. R. Nelson, Bertha L. Peterson, Mrs. H. H. Maher, Mrs.

Alfred Walters, Mrs. W. E. Forcum, Olivia Forcum, Bertha B. Larter, all of Whitefish, Mont.

RESOLUTION OF UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the United Nations Association, of Los Angeles, Calif., relating to the promotion of peace in the Near East by the United Nations.

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

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY THE MEMBERS PRESENT AT THE MARCH MEMBERSHIP MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS, LOS ANGELES CHAPTER

To President Dwight D. EISENHOWER:

Whereas the present local political tensions in the Near East endanger the peace of the entire world; and

Whereas the Arab countries believe that the United Nations is better able to deal with Near East problems and resolve these tensions; and

Whereas our Government helped in founding the United Nations for the purpose of promoting peace and has used the United Nations as an important instrument of our foreign policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge President Eisenhower to use the agencies of the United Nations to the fullest extent in his efforts to bring peace to the Near East.

Submitted on behalf of the Los Angeles Chapter, American Association for the United Nations.

CHARLES MACKINTOSH,
President.

MARCH 1956.

PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—LETTER AND PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Josephine C. Wheat, of Hollis, N. Y., transmitting a petition signed by sundry citizens of the States of Pennsylvania and New York, relating to the prohibition of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce.

There being no objection, the letter and petition, without the signatures attached, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLLIS, N. Y., April 6, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR: These 50 names also ask that the Civil Aeronautics Board requesting the Board to forbid alcohol service in the air.

We are shocked to hear that alcohol is allowed on the planes.

No wonder so much loss of life by plane. Yours for the cause.

JOSEPHINE C. WHEAT.

PETITION

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st

amendment to control the sale of such beverages. At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increasing the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

(Signed by Mrs. A. E. Buckner and 49 other citizens of Pennsylvania and New York.)

THE ADMINISTRATION OF GENERAL ALISSIMO TRUJILLO—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by friends, associates, and colleagues of Dr. Jesus de Galindez, relating to the administration of Generalissimo Trujillo in the Dominican Republic.

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

RESOLUTION

On March 12, 1956, Dr. Jesus de Galindez, valiant and effective fighter against all dictatorships whether Communist or neo-Fascist, vanished under circumstances which make it overwhelmingly certain that he was abducted and probably murdered. Dr. de Galindez had left written records, including his doctoral dissertation, the Era of Trujillo, exposing Generalissimo Trujillo's tyranny in the Dominican Republic. He had received numerous threats because of his activity in bringing to light Trujillo's crimes. Clearly his disappearance fits into the long series of crimes of violence, including murder, committed in this country and in Cuba against opponents of the generalissimo's regime. Therefore be it

Resolved, That we friends, associates, and colleagues of Dr. Jesus de Galindez, sorely stricken by his probable murder, petition:

1. That all police enforcement agencies, Federal, State, municipal, and international vigilantly prosecute investigation for the apprehension and punishment of the perpetrators of this crime;

2. That the press seek out and publish every development in this case and in related matters pertaining to the safety of political opponents of dictators;

3. That public and private support be enlisted for publication and distribution of Dr. de Galindez' writings, especially his thesis, The Era of Trujillo;

4. That Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and Republican and Democratic leaders in Congress be urged to initiate measures for the greater security of democratic political exiles here in the United States and in other member nations of the Organization of American States.

THE HOXSEY CANCER TREATMENT—LETTER AND TELEGRAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter and telegram sent me by Dr. Gerald B. Winrod, of Wichita, Kans., relating to the Hoxsey cancer treatment.

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

DEFENDERS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH,
Wichita, Kans., April 3, 1956.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: A local representative of the Associated Press called me a few minutes ago to say that the Food and Drug Ad-

ministration is issuing Wednesday of this week a formal public warning against the Hoxsey cancer treatment and lists among sponsors of the treatment Gerald B. Winrod.

He told me that the Washington office of the Associated Press requested a comment.

Thereupon I issued the following statement:

"The Hoxsey cancer treatment is precious to my heart because it saved my life as a boy at the age of 9 by removing a malignant growth near the jugular vein from which I have carried a scar for almost a half century. The treatment was in those days administered by the father of the present Dr. Harry M. Hoxsey."

With every good wish,
Faithfully yours,

GERALD B. WINROD.

WICHITA, KANS., April 4, 1956.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

There is a reason why I would appreciate having you give consideration to inserting my letter sent yesterday in the RECORD. Thanks and regards.

WINROD.

WAR VETERANS SECURITY ACT OF 1956—LETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Charles Hartman Post, 134, American Legion, Stanley, N. Dak., signed by Ralph Hamre, post adjutant, embodying a telegram adopted by that post, favoring the enactment of House bill 7886, the so-called War Veterans Security Act of 1956.

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

AMERICAN LEGION,
CHARLES HARTMAN POST, NO. 134,
Stanley, N. Dak., April 13, 1956.
Senator BILL LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed for your information is a copy of the resolution passed at our last Legion meeting urging passage of H. R. 7886:

"RESOLUTION"

"Whereas there is now pending in Congress H. R. 7886, commonly known as the War Veterans Security Act of 1956; and

"Whereas the passage of this bill will eliminate the confusion, redtape, and cost of administration of the present law and regulations by the Veterans' Administration as it pertains to World War I veterans who have reached their 65th birthday; and

"Whereas this bill now before the Congress would grant pensions to veterans over 65 years of age who are unemployable and meet income and service requirements; and

"Whereas as far as equity, justice, and previous Government policy regarding veterans of other wars are concerned, it must be remembered that World War I veterans were given no consideration when separated from service and faced two depressions at a time when they were attempting to establish themselves in civilian life; and

"Whereas the plight of many of these World War I veterans today is very serious, and the passage of this act would guarantee to them the security that they preserved for their Nation in time of war; and

"Whereas the passage of this legislation would entail no financial burden upon the increased economy of this Nation and would render justice to those veterans who are in dire need: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Charles Hartmann Post, No. 134, of Stanley, N. Dak., of the North Dakota Department of the American Legion,

meeting at Stanley, N. Dak., this 2d day of April 1956. That we vigorously support the passage of H. R. 7886; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to North Dakota's congressional delegation and members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in Congress."

Sincerely yours,

RALPH HAMBRE,
Post Adjutant.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 2424. A bill to provide that lock and dam No. 17 on the Black Warrior River, Ala., shall hereafter be known and designated as the John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam (Rept. No. 1728).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment:

S. 2712. A bill to authorize the charging of tolls for transit over the Manette Bridge in Bremerton, Wash. (Rept. No. 1729).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 2091. A bill authorizing the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill. (Rept. No. 1730); and

S. 2092. A bill transferring to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army the bridge across the Missouri River between the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation in Kansas and Platte County, Mo., and authorizing its removal (Rept. No. 1731).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain laws of the United States with respect to counsel employed by the special committee of the Senate established by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1733).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 146. A bill for the relief of Isabel Tre (Rept. No. 1739);

S. 1364. A bill for the relief of Eli Yorgiadis (Rept. No. 1740);

S. 1885. A bill for the relief of Mario Farabullini and Alla Farabullini, his wife (Rept. No. 1741);

S. 2095. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Culicasi (Rept. No. 1742);

S. 2244. A bill for the relief of Maria Novak (Rept. No. 1743);

S. 2563. A bill for the relief of Cecile Angele Chaffoo (Rept. No. 1744);

H. R. 1099. A bill for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung (Rept. No. 1745);

H. R. 1179. A bill for the relief of Salih Houghi, Bertha Catherine, Noor Elias, Isaac, and Mozeille Rose Hardoon (Rept. No. 1746);

H. R. 2796. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Khatoun Malkey Samuel (Rept. No. 1747);

H. R. 2948. A bill for the relief of Guglielmo Joseph Perrella (Rept. No. 1748);

H. R. 3276. A bill for the relief of George E. Bergos (formerly Athanasios Kritselis) (Rept. No. 1749);

H. R. 4466. A bill for the relief of Lois O. Jennings (Rept. No. 1750); and

H. R. 4588. A bill for the relief of Antonio Penna (Rept. No. 1751).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 586. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Laddomada, Antonietta Laddomada, and children, Concetta and Paolo Laddomada (Rept. No. 1752);

S. 1013. A bill for the relief of Melecio Acosta-Morales (Rept. No. 1753); and

S. 1101. A bill for the relief of Martino Palmeri (Rept. No. 1754).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H. J. Res. 457. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens (Rept. No. 1755).

By Mr. DANIEL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 3025. A bill to amend paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended (Rept. No. 1735).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Waymon H. Massey (Rept. No. 1736).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. J. Res. 444. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson (Rept. No. 1737).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

H. R. 9428. An act to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1756).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

S. 2854. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended (Rept. No. 1757).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments:

S. 2855. A bill to provide authority to stockpile temporary housing for disaster relief, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1758); and

S. 2859. A bill to provide rent-free accommodations in certain federally aided housing for needy victims of major disasters, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1759).

INCREASE AND REVISIONS IN GENERAL AUTHORIZATION FOR SMALL FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1732)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 3272) to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorization for small flood-control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended.

Last fall and early this year various sections of our country, particularly the northeastern and western areas, were subject to unprecedented and disastrous floods. Many lives were lost and damages totaling almost \$1 billion were sustained. Large cities were inundated, communities were paralyzed, major industries were shut down, in some cases for several months, and all activities were at a standstill.

Existing laws permit repair of existing flood-control structures and highways and emergency restoration of essential public utilities and cleanup work after such floods. Such laws also provide for construction of small flood-control projects not specifically authorized by Congress, with a limitation of allotment of \$150,000 for any single project at a locality and total of \$3 million for such work during any 1 fiscal year.

There exists the urgent need for expanding and broadening the present authority for construction of emergency

flood-control projects to care for flood problems in many localities and to prevent widespread damage and suffering caused by these severe floods, without the delay necessitated by surveys and investigations, and their specific authorization by the Congress under regularly established procedures.

These recent floods in the New England, New York, and Pennsylvania areas, in my own State of New Mexico, particularly at Albuquerque, and in California, Oregon, and Nevada, have caused tremendous damages, and these areas are still subject to recurring floods and consequent heavy losses.

S. 3273 would amend section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended, to provide for construction of projects, with an estimated cost of \$500,000 for any single project and a limitation of \$15 million for allotment for any 1 fiscal year for such projects. This increased authorization will take care of the increase in price levels that have taken place in the last few years and broaden and expand the present law to permit flood protection at critical locations that cannot now be covered.

The committee held extensive hearings on this bill. There was no opposition whatever to it. The committee reports it unanimously and believes it thoroughly warranted and desirable. It is hoped that the measure will be enacted into law at an early date to relieve the flood hazard that now exists at many localities in our Nation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, an original joint resolution, granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 1738) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 163) granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

PRELIMINARY REPORT ENTITLED "ADMINISTRATION OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' SECURITY PROGRAM"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1760)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, pursuant to Senate Resolution 20, I submit a preliminary report of that committee's Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Federal Security Program. I ask that the report be printed.

This is the first of at least two reports which will be made pursuant to Senate Resolution 20 and Senate Resolution 154. This first preliminary report was

adopted unanimously by the full Senate committee at its meeting last week.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

**WELFARE AND PENSION FUNDS—
REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS AND STATEMENT (S. REPT. NO. 1734)**

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for not to exceed 5 minutes on the report of the Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit the final report of the investigation of employee welfare plans and pension funds conducted by its Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds pursuant to Senate Resolution 225 of the 83d Congress, as amended, and Senate Resolution 40 of the 84th Congress, as amended, together with the supplemental views of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and a statement by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

In submitting this report to the Senate in compliance with the above resolutions, may I point out that the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare other than those who have served on the subcommittee have not found it possible to review and consider the subcommittee report within the time limits fixed by the resolutions, as amended, but transmit it to the Senate for the preliminary consideration of the Congress and the public while reserving judgment on the recommendations made by the subcommittee.

I also wish to thank the members of the staff, headed by Mr. Paul J. Cotter, as counsel, who worked with great ability and faithfulness in the preparation of this report.

I also wish to thank my colleagues, including my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

The Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds, whose authority expired on April 15, has been conducting studies and investigations in the welfare and pension fund field since May 1954, first under the chairmanship of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and, beginning in February 1955, under the leadership and direction of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. Committee membership since the latter date has included, besides the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

Legislation is being drafted to embody the recommendations of the subcommittee and will be shortly introduced, and it is hoped that it may be passed at this session of Congress.

The subcommittee also released the printed record of its hearings held in July, November, and December 1955.

Interim reports were filed in January and July 1955 with the subcommittee's initial findings. The final report comprises over 360 pages based, as the committee notes, on its studies of hundreds of individual welfare and pension plans. In this last report the subcommittee has submitted summaries of welfare and pension plans in a number of major industries and more detailed reports of the weaknesses and abuses in the welfare and pension plan operations of particular insurance companies, unions, and employers.

In its final report the subcommittee recommended the enactment of a Federal Registration, Reporting, and Disclosure Act to be effective for 3 years. Under the proposals advanced in the report, the Federal agency administering the act would, prior to its termination, and based upon 2 years' experience, make a comprehensive report to the Congress, outlining its findings, its evaluation of the act, and its recommendations with respect to the continuance, simplification, or modification of the legislation.

The recommendations call for registration by all types of employee welfare and pension plans covering 25 or more employees. Annual reports, based upon an audit and covering the complete financial operations, would be filed with a Federal agency by all plans including 100 or more employees, and also by plans which, though they have less than 100 employees, are operated or administered on some common basis with other plans and which in the aggregate include 100 or more employees. Pension plans would file a summary statement of investments, broken down by type of security and property, with the aggregate cost or present value, whichever is lower. Investments by a pension plan in securities or property of interested parties, investments of more than 5 percent of the fund in any one security or property, or investment of more than 10 percent of the fund in the securities or obligations of any one issuer, would be listed in detail.

Disclosure of the information in the annual report would be required by having copies available at the principal office of the plan and the public document room of the administrative agency, and by furnishing all the beneficiaries with information from the report in prescribed summary form by personal delivery or mail. The administrative agency would be given discretion to require reporting and disclosure by any plan covering between 25 and 100 employees if deemed necessary to accomplish the objectives of the act.

The subcommittee reported it had no strong feeling as to what executive agency should administer the act. After considering the various possibilities, it indicated that for the present it favored the Securities and Exchange Commission because of its organizational setup and its established success in the administration of disclosure type statutes.

Recommendations of the subcommittee also provide for an advisory council of 13 members to assist the Federal agency. Members of this council would include representatives of insurance, 1, banking, 1, and management, 2, to be appointed by the administering agency; labor representatives, 3, to be appointed by the Secretary of Labor; public members, 3, to be appointed by the President; and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Labor, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as ex officio members.

Federal jurisdiction for requiring enforcement of the act would be based upon the taxing authority, the general welfare provisions, and the interstate character of the many elements connected with such plans.

The report pointed out that over 75 million persons are now covered in some measure by employee welfare and pension programs, with annual contributions being made to them of over \$6.8 billion, and that there are between \$20 and \$25 billion in pension reserves at the present time. It was pointed out that private employee welfare and pension programs have grown to such proportions in this country and involve the use of such large tax-exempt funds as to place upon the Government a grave responsibility for their sound operation and the protection of the equities of the beneficiaries and the public interest.

The report stated that—

While the great majority of welfare and pension programs are being responsibly and honestly administered, the rights and equities of the beneficiaries in many instances are being dangerously ignored. In other cases, the funds of the programs are being dissipated and at times become the hunting ground for the unscrupulous.

It was also observed that—

The lack of standards and the inadequacies of State and Federal laws have permitted employee welfare and pension programs to operate in such manner as to give rise to many abuses, problems, weaknesses, and unsound practices which could jeopardize the operation of this system and give insufficient protection to the rights and equities of the employee-beneficiaries.

A major problem, it was stated, is one of assuring the immediate and long-range stability of private pension and welfare programs * * in order that they may better withstand the contingencies against which they were established. The breakdown of any significant part of either the pension or the welfare programs could, and undoubtedly would, amount to a major setback to our economy."

We do not propose Federal regulation. Regulation is left to the States. However, we do propose disclosure of essential information to a responsible Federal agency, believing that disclosure will be a preventive of most possible abuses in the future.

According to the report, the subcommittee felt that the proposed act is a moderate and sound approach, definitely necessary in the light of the evidence received, but still leaving room for action on the part of the respective States.

The subcommittee recommended criminal penalties for willful failure to com-

ply with, or violation of, the provisions of the act or the regulations promulgated thereunder, for a false statement or misrepresentation of a material fact, and for the unlawful and willful theft, abstraction, conversion, or embezzlement of the funds or property of any plan.

The subcommittee emphasized that it did not want to leave the impression that there is something wrong with every welfare and pension plan as "that is not the case." The report said:

Perhaps too little has been said of the many sound practices found in the great majority of these plans and of the conscientious and ingenious efforts on the part of industry, labor, insurance and banking to bring benefits to scores of millions of employees at low cost.

The subcommittee observed however, that it "is convinced that without some legislative direction the abuses, problems and weaknesses which do exist will not be self-correcting."

The report took note of the fact that labor had "condemned dishonesty, created committees on ethical practices established codes of ethics for the operation of employee welfare and pension plans, and recommended legislation toward that end." The subcommittee expressed the belief that such efforts would have a salutary effect but did not feel that the objectives would be quickly achieved by voluntary methods alone. The report further pointed out that representatives of labor had been involved in some of the worst abuses found to exist and, in some cases, had been found unprepared for the responsibilities of trusteeship under these programs.

Also taken up in the report was the fact that the insurance industry, while opposing Federal control or supervision, had not even set up a code of ethical practices to condemn the unscrupulous. The report concluded that—

Many of the worst abuses found in welfare-plan operations involve certain insurance practices. These abuses include high commissions, excessive administrative fees, high insurance company retentions, unequal treatment of the policyholders, activities of unscrupulous brokers and agents, including embezzlement of premiums, sometimes in collusion with union officials or management—mostly the result of inadequate control and nondisclosure to the interested parties.

Management, too, came in for its share of criticism, the report pointing out that it, management, "shares the responsibility for many of the serious problems and abuses" found, and that "management, as well as labor, has at times been unreasonable and unsound in positions taken with respect to benefit programs." Employers, it was stated, "in too many cases have abdicated their responsibilities under jointly managed plans."

With reference to the banking industry, the report observed that banks, while recognized as competently managing pension investments under corporate trusts, do not have the responsibility for actuarial soundness, often have too little control over proper investments, but still sell the features of this type of pension plan without assuming all of the responsibilities necessarily inherent in a complete pension plan.

According to the report, by far the largest percentage of employees included in health and welfare programs are covered in unilateral employer administered plans. In including this type of plan in those which should report and disclose detailed information, the report stated—

Since Congress has stated and the courts have held that employer contributions toward welfare and pension benefits are in the nature of compensation to employees, it must be concluded that whether the funds for such programs are contributed by the employers, the employees, or both, the employees have a right to know the financial details of such plans as well as to have their interest in such plans protected.

In support of its position, the subcommittee cited the Internal Revenue Code, the Defense Production Act of 1950, and court decisions which treated costs of and contributions to welfare and pension plans as part of employee compensation.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] filed supplemental views to the report, and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], who, because of other duties, had been unable to take an active part in preparation of the report, reserved judgment on the recommendations.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. The distinguished Senator from Illinois has just referred to what I think is a fine piece of work, which has just been completed by the subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I think I would be a little remiss if I did not comment on the fine work which has been done by the chairman and by the other members of that subcommittee.

While there are slight differences with respect to a few conclusions in the report as it is submitted, the subcommittee has approached the work and developed the report in a spirit of complete nonpartisanship, which the distinguished Senator from Illinois has been very careful to nurture and maintain throughout all the months of arduous work. I wish to pay tribute to him, as well as to the other members of the subcommittee, for the fine work they have done in this field, which I believe will result in shedding light upon a problem which has needed light for a long time. I believe that this effort will eventually lead to good Federal legislation covering this subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his overgenerous remarks. No one could have been more cooperative than he was during the investigation. He worked extremely hard. I think he attended almost every hearing. He went into the details of the report with great care, and it was a pleasure to work with him. I think the country owes him a great debt.

The work was begun under the chairmanship of the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives]. Initially the staff was engaged by him, and the preliminary report was the result of work conducted by the subcommittee prior to that time. We benefited greatly from the counsel and

advice of the distinguished Senator from New York.

I think this is a very happy occasion on which members of both parties can cooperate in good faith in solving a very perplexing problem. It has been a very fine experience for me. Again I wish to thank the Senator from Colorado.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I do not have the good fortune of being a member of the subcommittee so ably headed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. As I said, I do not have the good fortune of being a member of the subcommittee so ably headed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. However, I am a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I have had an opportunity to observe the great skill and devotion to duty and the energy and industry which the Senator and his colleagues on the subcommittee have brought to bear on this very important subject. The work which has been done by the subcommittee will make a great contribution to the welfare of our country. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Illinois and other members of the subcommittee on the work they have so well performed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator very much.

I submit the report and ask that it be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 3635. A bill to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

S. 3636. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 3637. A bill to establish an advisory board to assist the commission created by the joint resolution of December 20, 1944, in considering a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 3638. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by amending the United States Information and Education Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3639. A bill amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 3640. A bill to provide for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury of the unpaid balance due on defaulted joint stock land bank bonds under the supervision and direction of the Farm Credit Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3641. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to permit common carriers subject to such act to provide reduced rate transportation to individuals 65 years of age or older; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 3642. A bill to transfer to the government of the District of Columbia the Public Employment Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 3643. A bill to provide for the control of destructive aphids; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DUFF:

S. 3644. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the teaching profession on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the National Education Association; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3645. A bill to amend section 1343 of title 18, United States Code, relating to fraud by wire, radio, or television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

The following concurrent resolution was submitted and referred, as indicated:

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. Con. Res. 74. Concurrent resolution to designate May 30, 1956, as a day on which to pay respects to the four surviving veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. DOUGLAS, which appears under a separate heading.)

STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, AND LIMITING SERVICE OF SENATORS ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES

Mr. DWORSHAK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 237), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That, commencing with the 85th Congress, rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section 1;

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (1) of section 1;

(3) inserting in section 1 after paragraph (o) the following new paragraph:

"(p) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures, generally.

"2. Pensions of all wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life;"

(4) striking out section 4 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed 19 Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed 7 Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may serve on 3 standing committees and no more."

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT 1734, RELATING TO WELFARE AND PENSION FUNDS

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 238), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed 3,500 additional copies of Senate Report 1734, a report on welfare and pension funds, for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AMONG THE INDIANS"

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution to print for the use of the Judiciary Committee additional copies of the subcommittee report on Juvenile Delinquency Among the Indians."

Many requests have come to the subcommittee for copies of its report on Juvenile Delinquency Among the Indians. In a large number of cases the inquiries for these reports came from Senators from Indian States. The subcommittee supply of this report—S. Rept. 1483—has been exhausted for some time. I feel that considering the interest in this Senate document, especially from Senators from States having Indian populations, that it should receive favorable consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 239) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary not more than 2,000 additional copies of the report

No. 1483, 84th Congress, of the Committee on the Judiciary to the Senate on its study of juvenile delinquency in the United States.

SIZE AND WEIGHT LIMITATIONS ON FOURTH-CLASS (PARCEL-POST) MAIL

MR. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish uniformity of parcel-post size and weight at 65 pounds and 100 inches, length and girth combined.

I hesitated for some time before deciding to take this action, because the Railway Express workers in my State were told that a reduction in parcel-post service was a guarantee of prosperity for the express agency, and that, conversely, any move toward restoring parcel-post standards to those which prevailed before 1952 would hurt Railway Express.

However, the figures prepared by the Railway Express Agency and filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission do not show any discernible relationship between Railway Express volume and parcel-post volume. I would like to include those figures, together with the Post Office Department's figures on parcel-post volume, in the RECORD at this point so that my colleagues may see the facts for themselves.

	Total	Railway express shipments		Number of parcel post packages
		Car-load	Less than carload	
1951....	78,546,366	12,746	78,533,620	1,046,944,222
1952....	93,158,470	14,160	93,144,319	1,046,575,603
1953....	86,871,382	14,456	86,856,926	1,042,750,517
1954....	76,247,001	11,973	76,235,028	994,750,517
1955....	83,474,754	(1)	(1)	948,220,164

¹ Breakdown not available.

NOTE.—The less than carload lot shipments are the only ones which could conceivably compare with parcel post.

On the other hand, both the farm and urban people in North Carolina have been hurt by the size and weight limitations enacted in 1951. The Post Office Department states that parcel-post rates are 10 percent higher than they would have had to be had the 1951 limitations not been enacted. The added expense and the inconvenience of the present law is a continuing harassment to the small merchant and the city dweller.

The farmer has not only this extra cost but the constant danger of enactment of uniform size and weight limits which will seriously hamper his operations. The bushel of seed corn, for example, could, with the sack it is shipped in, weigh from 62 to 63 pounds.

I think our citizens are entitled to uniform size and weight limitations in the parcel-post service and it is important that they be set at figures which will meet the farmers' needs.

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

The bill (S. 3635) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADVISORY BOARD ON NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish an advisory board to assist in considering a site and design for a national memorial stadium in the District of Columbia. This board, representatives of which would be selected from sports, civic, and other organizations, would work closely with the commission on a national stadium which was authorized by Congress in 1944.

I think it is high time that the intent of Congress in 1944 be carried out. Our National Capital needs such a stadium, not only as a memorial to the heroic dead of both World Wars and the Korean hostilities, but as a living memorial for the use of sports groups nationally and locally. As Washington is the Capital of the Nation, this stadium could be the national capital of sports, to encourage recreation and participation, and as a solid weapon against juvenile delinquency.

The selection of representatives to this advisory board from leading national organizations would truly make the purposes of the stadium national in scope.

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

The bill (S. 3637) to establish an advisory board to assist the Commission created by the joint resolution of December 20, 1944, in considering a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1948, RELATING TO PROMOTION OF THE FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948. This bill is a consolidation of S. 2410, which I introduced on behalf of myself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. MUNDT on July 5, 1955, and S. 631 which Senator MUNDT and I introduced on January 21, 1955. S. 631 was also a proposal to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948.

The bill which we are introducing today is almost identical with the March 7, 1956, committee print of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. President, I want to make it clear that we are introducing this bill at the request of the administration in order that the proposals contained therein may receive the consideration of the Foreign Relations Committee this week. It is my understanding that certain changes will be suggested by the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee. Although we are in general agreement with the purposes of this bill, we reserve the right to offer amendments to it in committee, or to

question provisions which we feel need further explanation.

In general, this bill has two purposes: First, it contains provisions designed to make more effective our educational exchange program with other nations.

Second, it provides for a new career program for the personnel of the United States Information Agency along the lines of the Foreign Service career program of the State Department.

In introducing this measure today, we wish to state that we are acting in cooperation with the State Department, the United States Information Agency, and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Public Affairs, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING 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. 3638) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.), introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. MUNDT), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) so much of section 2 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 as precedes paragraph (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are to enable the Government of the United States of America to increase in other countries respect for and confidence in the United States, its purposes, its democratic practices, culture, and society, to increase mutual understanding, respect, and confidence between the people of the United States and the peoples of other countries, and to broaden the areas of cooperation between them in the educational exchange, cultural, and information fields. Among other means in achieving these objectives, the Secretary of State is authorized to establish—"

(b) Paragraph (2) of section 2 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) an educational exchange service to cooperate with other nations in—

"(a) the interchange of knowledge, skills, information, and experiences;

"(b) the interchange of technical and other services;

"(c) the interchange of developments in the field of education, the arts, sciences, and professions; and

"(d) the development of projects of interest and value to the United States and the other countries involved through diffusion of knowledge."

SEC. 2. (a) The heading of title II of such act is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE II—INTERCHANGE OF KNOWLEDGE,
SKILLS, AND EXPERIENCE"

(b) Section 201 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Persons"

"SEC. 201. (a) As a means of insuring interchange on a cooperative basis of leaders and potential leaders between the United

States and other countries, the Secretary is authorized to provide for and otherwise facilitate programs for the exchange of (1) students and trainees; (2) teachers, fellows, and lecturers; (3) professors and research scholars; (4) specialists in any of the arts, sciences, trades, or professions; and (5) leaders of thought and opinion at the national, State, or local level. Such exchanges shall be for the purpose of long- or short-term study or practical training, teaching, lecturing, or research, and observation, consultation, or other experience or activity which may be essential to the successful operation of the programs and which will not deprive American citizens or aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence of opportunities for gainful employment or professional training. The Secretary is also authorized to bring foreign nationals to the United States to interpret and present the art and culture of cooperating countries. The Secretary may also provide for the attendance of nationals of one cooperating country at selected institutions of learning or places of study in another cooperating country when he determines that urgent foreign relations objectives would be served thereby. The Secretary shall, wherever possible in connection with these programs, utilize the services of existing reputable agencies which are successfully engaged in such activity.

"(b) The Secretary may provide for orientation courses and other appropriate services and materials in the case of persons coming to the United States from other countries and going to other countries from the United States under provisions of this act or for other purposes which the Secretary determines to be in furtherance of the objectives of this act.

"(c) When any country fails or refuses to cooperate in the program provided herein the Secretary shall terminate or limit such program, with respect to such country, to the extent he deems to be advisable in the interests of the United States.

"(d) The foreign-exchange visitors provided for in this section shall be admitted as nonimmigrants under section 101 (a) (15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act for such time and under such conditions as may be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General. Exchange visitors so admitted shall not be eligible for a change of status under the provisions of section 248 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, nor for adjustment of status under provisions of section 245 of that act. An exchange visitor who fails to maintain nonimmigrant status and exchange visitor classification or who fails to depart from the United States on the termination of such status or classification, shall, upon warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and promptly deported pursuant to sections 241, 242, and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Exchange visitors who engage in activities of a political nature detrimental to the interests of the United States, or in activities not consistent with security of the United States shall be considered to have failed to maintain exchange visitor classification. Deportation proceedings under this section shall be summary and the findings of the Attorney General as to matters of fact shall be conclusive. Exchange visitors shall not be eligible for suspension of deportation under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. No person admitted as an exchange visitor under this section or acquiring exchange visitor status after admission shall be eligible to apply for an immigrant visa or for a nonimmigrant visa under section 101 (a) (15) (H) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, until it is established that such person has resided and been physically present in a

cooperating country or countries for an aggregate of at least 2 years following departure from the United States: *Provided*, That upon request of an interested Government agency and the recommendation of the Secretary of State, the Attorney General may waive such 2-year period of residence abroad in the case of any alien whose admission to the United States is found by the Attorney General to be in the public interest: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall apply only to those persons acquiring exchange visitor status or, who, having such status, obtain an extension of stay thereunder, subsequent to the date of the enactment hereof."

Sec. 3. Section 202 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Books and materials"

"Sec. 202. The Secretary is authorized to provide for interchanges between the United States and other countries of books and periodicals, including Government publications, and for the preparation, publication, distribution, translation, and interchange of such writings and other cultural and educational materials, including visual and auditory materials of all kinds."

Sec. 4. Section 601 of such act is amended by inserting after the words "*Provided, however,*" the following: "That the Commission on Educational Exchange shall recommend policies and programs to further cultural relations with participating countries by means of exchange of persons and other means, and shall recommend criteria for the selection of persons for participation in exchange programs under this act: *And provided further*."

Sec. 5. (a) Section 602 (a) of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "Provided, That no office under a State university, land-grant college, or other similar educational institution shall be deemed to be a compensated Federal or State office for the purposes of this subsection."

(b) Section 602 (c) of such act is amended by striking out the words "and public service" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "public service, professional, business, agriculture, and labor."

(c) Section 602 (h) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The Department is authorized to provide the necessary professional, technical, secretarial, and clerical assistance for the Commissions."

Sec. 6. Section 603 of such act is amended by striking out the words "a semiannual" and substituting the words "an annual" thereof.

Sec. 7. Title VI of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"Sec. 604. The Secretary is authorized to establish in any country in which a program under this act is in effect an advisory commission which may be composed of citizens of such country or citizens of the United States, or both. It shall be the function of any commission so established to advise the Secretary with respect to matters concerning the administration of such program. The Secretary is also authorized, wherever practicable, to utilize in the administration of exchange programs under this act the services of any binational commission established under authority of any other law providing similar exchange programs. Appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this act shall be available to the Secretary for payment of the expenses of any commission established or utilized pursuant to this section."

Sec. 8. (a) Section 801 (6) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(6) to create, with the approval of the Commission on Information and the Commission on Educational Exchange, such ad-

visory committees as the Secretary may decide to be of assistance in formulating his policies for carrying out the purposes of this act; and from time to time to hold meetings of representatives of United States cultural and educational institutions and other organizations interested in programs under this act for the purpose of making reports on, and obtaining comments and suggestions with respect to, such programs. Such persons will not be considered as persons 'employed or assigned to duties by the Government' within the meaning of the act. No such member of an advisory committee or representative of any such institution or organization shall be allowed any salary or other compensation for services, but he may be paid his actual transportation expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses at the rate prescribed by or established pursuant to section 5 of the Administrative Expense Act of 1948, as amended (5 U. S. C. 73 b-2) while away from his home in attendance upon meetings within the United States or in consultation with the Department under instructions."

(b) Section 801 of such act is further amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (5), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by adding at the end of the section the following new paragraphs:

"(7) to engage the services of experts and consultants, or organizations thereof, as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 55a), and individuals so engaged may be compensated at rates not in excess of \$50 per day and, while away from their homes or regular places of business, may be paid travel expenses, including per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence at the rates provided for in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations."

Sec. 9. Section 802 of such act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 802";

(2) by inserting "contracts of insurance, guaranty, and indemnity, and" after "including" in paragraph (2);

(3) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (3), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and by adding after paragraph (4) the following new paragraphs:

"(5) to pay emergency medical expenses and expenses of travel incurred by reason of illness; and

"(6) to pay the travel expenses, including a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence, of alien employees and their dependents when such employees are authorized to travel in connection with appointment, change of duty, or separation"; and

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The Department and any Government agency conducting any nonmilitary exchange of persons program or any program of furnishing technical information and assistance are authorized to pay, in the case of foreign nationals participating in such program, amounts necessary to meet United States income taxes where, except for participation in such program, the liability for such tax would not have been incurred."

Sec. 10. The first sentence of section 902 of such act is amended to read as follows: "If any other Government or any international organization shall express the desire to provide funds, property, or services to be used by this Government, in whole or in part, for the expenses of any specific part of the program undertaken pursuant to this act, the Secretary is authorized, when he finds it in the public interest, to accept such funds, property, or services."

Sec. 11. Section 1008 of such act is amended by inserting before the period at

the end thereof a comma and the following: "except that the report concerning activities under the educational exchange programs authorized by this act shall be submitted annually on or before the 31st day of December of each year to apply to activities conducted during the previous fiscal year."

Sec. 12. The United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 is further amended by adding the following new sections at the end thereof:

"Payment of certain claims"

"Sec. 1012. For the purpose of promoting and maintaining friendly relations abroad by the prompt settlement of meritorious claims arising in a foreign country, the Secretary of State and the Director of the United States Information Agency, and such other officers as they may designate for such purposes, and under such regulations as they may prescribe, are hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and make payments, where accepted by the claimants in full satisfaction and in final settlement, of claims on account of damage to or loss or destruction of public or private property both real and personal or on account of personal injury or death, including claims respecting personal property bailed to the Government and claims for damages incident to the use and occupancy of real property, whether under a lease, express or implied, or otherwise, whenever caused by any instrumentality, officer, agent or employee of the Department or Agency, incident to the performance of any official functions for the United States, when the amount of such claim does not exceed \$5,000: *Provided*, That in cases where the amount exceeds \$2,500 but does not exceed \$5,000, payment shall be made only after approval by the Secretary or Director.

"The Secretary or Director may certify to Congress any meritorious claim or portion thereof which is in excess of \$5,000 as may be deemed to be just and reasonable for payment out of appropriations that may be made by Congress therefor.

"No claim shall be considered unless presented within 1 year after the claim arose, except for good cause shown that the claim could not have been presented within that period of time.

"Every claim settled under the authority of this act shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary.

"United States Information Officers"

"Sec. 1013. (a) In accordance with regulations prescribed by him and after suitable examination, the Director of the United States Information Agency may appoint persons to be known as United States Information Officers. Such officers shall be appointed, promoted, and retained on the basis of merit and fitness and may be separated only in accordance with law. Except for the limitations of time contained in sections 522 and 527 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, all provisions of law not inconsistent herewith which are applicable to Foreign Service Reserve officers shall be applicable to United States information officers, and the Director shall be guided by the policies and principles prescribed in those sections. The Director shall establish such examining and selection boards or panels as may be necessary for use in the appointment, promotion, and separation of United States Information Officers.

"(b) Any United States Information Officer may be separated by the Director for unsatisfactory performance of duties, but only after a review of his case by, and opportunity for a hearing before, an impartial advisory board appointed by the Director. The Director shall also provide for the periodic appraisal of such officers and, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, may separate those who are consistently

ranked below a minimum level prescribed for their class.

(c) The Director may establish an independent retirement and disability system for the benefit of United States Information Officers based on the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as heretofore or hereafter amended. Any officer separated pursuant to subsection (b) hereof shall be entitled to the payments or retirement benefits prescribed in sections 634 or 637 of that act, as appropriate.

"United States Information Service"

"SEC. 1014. The agency established by section 1 of Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953, shall hereafter be known as the 'United States Information Service,' and all references in such reorganization plan or in any statute, regulation, agreement, or other legal instrument to the 'United States Information Agency' shall be construed to refer to the 'United States Information Service.' Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter or affect in any way the functions, authorities, or responsibilities of the agency."

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S RE-ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944, AS AMENDED

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, which would extend by 3 years the deadline for the GI home loan program for World War II veterans.

Unless legislation of this nature is enacted, the entire GI home loan program will, for all intents and purposes come to an end by the end of this year, even though the actual termination date is July 25, 1957.

No further commitments will be made, however, by the Veterans' Administration, beyond the end of this year, according to Thomas J. Sweeney, director of the VA's loan guaranty service.

I present a brief statement prepared by me, stressing the importance of at least a 3-year extension of the deadline. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING 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. 3639) amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I am introducing this bill for a great many purposes:

1. To assure justice for the millions of veterans who have not as yet availed themselves of this fine opportunity to own a home of their own.

It is estimated that 11 1/4 million World War II veterans have not utilized their GI home-loan privilege. In most instances, they simply have not reached the financial state where they feel they would be in a position to purchase and maintain a home of their own.

Only 26 percent of all eligible United States veterans have used their entitlement. But this percentage varies from city to city and from State to State. In Milwaukee, for

example, less than 17 percent of the veterans have used their privilege—17,000 out of more than 100,000 veterans in Wisconsin's largest city.

2. My second reason for introducing this bill is because I believe in the principle of home ownership in our country.

To my way of thinking, there are few things finer than to give a man and his family genuine roots—to give them an opportunity to call a piece of ground and a building on it their own—an opportunity to beautify it, improve it, and to contribute to the community in which they reside.

We are all aware that some folks will continue to like apartment dwelling, for a variety of reasons. But I feel that the rising percentage of Americans who own their own homes is one of the soundest single factors on the national scene.

Of course, we don't want people to go in financially over their heads. We don't want them to take on financial liabilities which they cannot meet. But we do believe that a sound home construction program is essential for the moral and spiritual values of the American people—wholly aside from the material advantages.

3. My third reason for doing so is to provide a continued stimulus to the great American construction industry.

One million two hundred thousand homes will be built this year. I am anxious that this level be maintained and, indeed, increased.

There are those who think that we have reached our peak of home construction. I believe to the contrary. I believe that millions of Americans who are now in old and often obsolete homes will want new homes, and that millions who do not own their own homes will want to buy homes—new or old.

Moreover, there are literally millions of homes which must be improved throughout our country.

If the construction industry falters, the entire American economy will feel the effects. If the construction industry continues to roll in high gear, it will pump economic health into every community of our land.

I have been in continuous contact with the Wisconsin Home Builders Association, with realtor groups through my State, and throughout the rest of the Nation, and I know how important a role all of the home industry plays in the life of America at its grassroots.

I should like to point out that the VA loan guarantee program has not been a burden on the taxpayer. More than a million veterans have already repaid their GI loans in full. In the 10-year life of the program, there has been almost an absolute minimum of defaults on home loans. Losses to the VA have amounted to 0.06 percent of the total amount of over \$82 billion in GI loans.

At the end of 1955, less than 1 percent of all outstanding loans were in default.

From time to time, various shortcomings have been found in the loan program. No program this large could possibly be infallible. But, in each instance where shortcomings have been found, after proper analysis and investigation, steps have always been taken to remedy such shortcomings.

I hope, therefore, that this extension legislation will now be promptly enacted in the public interest.

We only have a few months remaining in this second session of the Congress. If we do nothing, the program will lapse for all intents and purposes at the end of this year.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO FRAUD BY WIRE, RADIO, OR TELEVISION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to

permit prosecution of perpetrators of fraud who circumvent present laws by operating from outside the borders of the United States in either Canada or Mexico.

This proposed legislation has wisely been suggested in letters to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Attorney General has specifically recommended that title 18 of the United States Code be amended by adding a new section, 1343, so as to proscribe the use of foreign communication for purposes of fraud to the present law, which merely covers the use of interstate wire, radio, or television.

In the House of Representatives on April 9, Representative KENNETH KEATING announced introduction of a bill for this purpose. Mr. KEATING acted, however, to increase the proposed penalty for this interstate or foreign crime from \$1,000 to \$10,000. The Attorney General had proposed the figure of \$1,000, since that is now the figure in the law which is the penalty for fraud involving the use of mail.

To my way of thinking, Representative KEATING has raised a sound point in urging that these swindlers be hit by a penalty of \$10,000, rather than the lower figure of \$1,000.

Until such time, however, as the existing law is amended (so as to assure complete uniformity between the penalty for mail fraud and the penalty for fraud conducted through other means), I believe that the Attorney General's version should be the one which should be introduced and considered.

I am hoping, however, that the Senate and House Judiciary Committees will simultaneously take action to make the law uniform and hard-hitting by increasing penalties for all mail and wire frauds.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a release which the Attorney General sent out at the beginning of this month, emphasizing the importance of this proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3645) to amend section 1343 of title 18, United States Code, relating to fraud by wire, radio, or television, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That section 1343 of title 18, United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 1343. Fraud by wire, radio, or television: Whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, transmits or causes to be transmitted by means of wire, radio, or television communication in interstate or foreign commerce, any writings, signs, signals, pictures, or sounds for the purpose of executing such scheme or artifice, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

The release presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

RELEASE FROM DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., today asked Congress for legislation to permit prosecution of fraudulent stock promoters who circumvent present law by operating from Canada and Mexico.

The request was made in identical letters to the Vice President and the House Speaker. The text of the letters and of a proposed bill follow:

"Section 18 (a) of the Communications Act Amendments, 1952 (66 Stat. 711, 722) amended title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new section 1343 as follows:

"Whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme, or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, transmits or causes to be transmitted by means of interstate wire, radio, or television communication, any writings, signs, signals, pictures, or sounds for the purpose of executing such scheme or artifice, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

"Last year a case arose in which it was alleged that the subject in the execution of a scheme to defraud used the telephone, calling from a point in Mexico to Los Angeles, Calif. Because of the limitation in the statute to frauds involving "interstate" wire, radio, or television communication it was concluded that the telephone call from Mexico, being not an interstate communication but rather a foreign communication, was not covered by the section.

"This case demonstrates the need for amending the statute so that it will reach not only interstate communications but foreign communications as well. If so amended, the statute will cover, for example, telephone calls from Canada made by fraudulent stock promoters to victims residing in the United States. Furthermore, the amendment would remove any doubt as to the applicability of the statute to a communication between a State and a Territory or between a State and the District of Columbia.

"A draft of a bill to accomplish the suggested amendment is enclosed for your consideration and appropriate action.

"The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation."

DESIGNATION OF MAY 30, 1956, AS A DAY TO PAY RESPECTS TO FOUR SURVIVING VETERANS OF CIVIL WAR

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the eminent senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], I submit for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution which calls attention to the fact that four surviving veterans of the Civil War are alive today. Three of them are members of the former Confederate Army and one of the Union Army. All of them are over 100 years of age and represent the final remnant of the millions of Americans who, almost a century ago, served in these great armies out of a deep sense of duty and conviction of the rightness of their causes.

All of them have outlived the struggles and the issues which divided this great Nation, and have lived to enjoy the blessings of unity and peace. These men are William A. Lundy, of Laurel Hill, Fla., formerly of the Army of the Confederacy; John Salling, of Slant, Va., formerly of the Army of the Confederacy;

Walter W. Williams, of Franklin, Tex., formerly of the Army of the Confederacy; and Albert Woolson, of Duluth, Minn., formerly of the Union Army.

We ask that the Congress of the United States designate May 30, 1956, as the day on which one Nation, indivisible, and with liberty and justice for all, shall pay its grateful respects to these four men in recognition of the blessings of the unity and domestic tranquillity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 74) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas there are as of this day 4 surviving veterans of the Civil War, 3 from the Army of the Confederacy, and 1 from the Union Army; and

Whereas these Americans, each over 100 years of age, represent the final remnant of the millions of Americans who, almost a century ago, served in these great armies out of a deep sense of duty and conviction of the rightness of their causes; and

Whereas these men have outlived the struggles and the issues which divided this great Nation, and have lived to enjoy the blessings of unity and peace; and

Whereas William A. Lundy, of Laurel Hill, Fla., formerly of the Army of the Confederacy; John Salling, of Slant, Va., formerly of the Army of the Confederacy; Walter W. Williams, of Franklin, Tex., formerly of the Army of the Confederacy; and Albert Woolson, of Duluth, Minn., formerly of the Union Army, being the 4 surviving participants of the Civil War: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America does designate the day of May 30, 1956, as one during which one Nation, indivisible, and with liberty and justice for all, shall pay its grateful respects to William A. Lundy, John Salling, Walter W. Williams, and Albert Woolson, in recognition of the blessings of unity and domestic tranquillity: And be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each of the said surviving veterans referred to in this resolution.

DEFINITION AND CONTROL OF HOLDING COMPANIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], I wish to give notice that we have made a slight technical change in the amendment submitted by us to the bill (S. 2577) to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests. The amendment is identified as "4-9-56-A." The purpose of the change in the amendment is to eliminate what may be a loophole in the bill. We ask that the amendment in its new form be substituted for the text of the previous amendment, and be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

SALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF AUTOMOBILES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 28, 1956,

The names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3543) to protect the public in the operation, and in performance under warranties on, delicate, complicated, sensitive, or inherently dangerous machinery, mechanisms, or apparatus sold in interstate commerce, introduced by Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. PAYNE) on March 28, 1956.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 9, 1956,

The names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 159) to establish a Joint Committee on Scientific Research, introduced by Mr. TRYE (for himself and Mr. LANGER) on April 9, 1956.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION PROGRAMS—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR JOINT RESOLUTION TO REMAIN AT DESK FOR ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) to establish a joint congressional committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Information Programs, be held at the desk until April 24 for the purpose of cosponsorship by other Senators.

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

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS
ON NIAGARA RIVER, BLACK ROCK
CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HAR-
BOR, AND BUFFALO HARBOR, N. Y.
(S. DOC. NO. 113)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report, dated December 8, 1955, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Niagara River, N. Y.; Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y.; and Buffalo Harbor, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of June 5, 1951. I ask unanimous consent that the reports be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, 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. KUCHEL:

Address delivered by him at the Rodger Young Auditorium in Los Angeles on the subject American Doctrine for American Progress.

EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE IN-
DEPENDENCE OF THE REPUBLIC
OF ISRAEL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, today is celebrated as the eighth independence day of our sister republic, Israel. On this occasion, all freedom-loving men, everywhere, and certainly all Americans, have reason to take note of and to rejoice in the fact that Israel continues, as it has in the past, to defy the buffets of adversity to which it has been subjected from the moment of its rebirth.

Never—not since those heroic days of 1948, when the collective might of the Arab world, seeking to thwart the will of the United Nations, was focused and concentrated on the extinction of the vastly outnumbered defenders of the tiny state—not since those days has Israel faced greater dangers and difficulties than it does today.

But just as Israel survived the onslaughts directed against its creation in 1948, and has survived the hazards, both economic and political, which have loomed up since then, so will Israel, I am confident, survive the dangers that are gathered today.

There is a rope of faith to which all who wish for Israel's welfare may cling in these dark days. That faith is a faith in freedom, which is stronger than tyranny; in democracy, which is stronger than totalitarianism; and in moral law, which is stronger than jungle law.

These are but words, but in these words there is a truth which has shone through all recorded history. All free men, and all who love freedom, will

stand with Israel now, in her present danger.

The Soviets will not be permitted to succeed in their design of using the Arab States as cats paws to stir up conflict and war and destruction in this part of the world. And those elements of the Arab leadership who dream of Jeddah, and plan to achieve their own ambitions at the expense of the small democratic State of Israel, will not prevail. The conscience of mankind, which I believe to be stronger than the atom bomb itself, will not let this happen.

Israel will survive and prosper. She will observe her ninth independence day, and many, many more after that. Israel will survive, thrive, and prosper, and men of all nations will be glad of the fact.

Today, the urgent need is for defensive arms for Israel, so that she may be strong enough to deter aggression, and thus to prevent it. But as we scan the horizon of the future, we look for the time to come for Israel, as for our own country, when swords will be beaten into plowshares and the threat of war will be no more.

I am sure that peace will come. The Arab peoples will see the folly of their hates and prejudices. This I firmly believe. This I predict on the basis of my faith in mankind.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, today marks the eighth anniversary of the independence of Israel. On this day of celebration I am happy to join with millions of other Americans in expressing my sincere hope that the people of Israel will have many more years of freedom and independence, and that this small, new nation may have a great future in the family of nations.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to extend greetings to the nation of Israel on the occasion of the eighth anniversary of its founding. We in New Jersey have always had a warm feeling toward this young nation; journalists have frequently compared the size of Israel with that of our tiny State.

But, more significantly, we have been proud—as Jews and as gentiles—of the vigor and progress of this nation. With a population only a third that of New Jersey, she has managed to establish a government in the democratic tradition. And, by the tireless work of her pioneers, she has proceeded to build a fine economy. In addition to setting a model for other nations of the Middle East, Israel has been a humanitarian refuge for those fleeing from the Nazi tyranny.

It has been interesting to me that even though surrounded by many nations whose intentions have been far from friendly, Israel has been able to improve its own standard of living, increase literacy, health facilities, sanitation and education, and even stimulate culture. The contribution of the Israeli people to art and music are well known in this country.

It is most regrettable that what should be a happy occasion—a birthday of a young nation—should find it in the midst of great tension and uncertainty. These are difficult times, for the Israeli people

perhaps more than any other, but I do know that Israel is here to stay. Our country and the other great nations of the world who were present at the birth of the new nation will not stand by and see it go under. I am sure that Israel will live to celebrate many more birthdays—happier ones, I am sure.

Mr. President, with further reference to this anniversary, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record a statement prepared by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives].

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

April 16 marks the eighth anniversary of the independence of Israel. As one who was active in the establishment of the State of Israel, I am proud to salute her gallant people and her great achievements on this important occasion.

It is appropriate on this occasion to reemphasize the strong bonds of kinship which underlie the relationship between the United States and Israel. Their destinies are inexorably bound together, for they arise from the same ideals and principles and the abiding faith in the dignity of man, upon which nations are firmly built.

As the acknowledged leader of the free nations of the world the United States must point the way to the establishment of peaceful conditions in the Middle East through the encouragement of a settlement between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

More than any other nation, the United States was responsible for the creation of Israel. Whether by providing arms or by a mutual security pact or by any other effective means, we must now recognize and accept that responsibility. We must not let Israel down.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is generally agreed that there is a need for a review and reappraisal of the foreign policy of the United States. On occasion I have addressed the Senate on foreign policy, as have other Members of the Senate; and I am sure that in the months to come we shall have considerably more discussion of the world situation. It is my thought that out of such debate and review will come new ideas to fill the vacuum so as to stop the dangerous drift which has settled over foreign policy.

It is with this thought in mind that I recommend to all my colleagues in the Senate a series of searching articles on United States foreign policy which appeared in the New York Times during the past week. This paper has, in undertaking this series, performed an outstanding public service.

The correspondents of the New York Times have obtained the views of foreign and American officials and other competent observers on the strong and weak points of United States foreign policy and their suggestions for its improvement. The findings of this study were presented in a series of regional reports on Europe, the Middle East, foreign aid in Asia, southwest and southeast Asia, the Far East, Latin America, and a concluding survey.

This is the finest survey of the present world situation, as it affects America, that has come to my attention. The

Times' correspondents approach the regional situations with objectivity, reporting the strong points in our foreign policy, as well as pointing out areas where we are weak, and making appropriate recommendations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this series of articles be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all may have an opportunity to study this survey in its entirety.

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

[From the New York Times of April 8, 1956]

EUROPE FINDS UNITED STATES POLICY TOO RIGID, SURVEY SHOWS—TENDENCY TO BLAME DULLES IN TACTICAL LAG DISCLOSED—STRESS ON ECONOMIC WARFARE SUGGESTED AS A REMEDY

(By Harold Callender)

(First of a series)

PARIS, April 7.—Europeans are convinced that American foreign policy has lost much of the vision, resourcefulness, and flexibility that distinguished it from 1947 onward, when the United States departed from its traditions by accepting far-reaching commitments to check Soviet imperialism.

Many believe the far-sighted, imaginative bipartisan policy then developed in Washington probably saved Western Europe, the region of primary American concern. A far greater number, an overwhelming majority of informed observers, contend that this policy—a work of genius in its beginnings—has failed to move and evolve with the times.

That this view is held with something not far from unanimity by these Europeans best qualified to judge seems confirmed by a survey made in Western Europe's capitals by correspondents of the New York Times.

The survey was designed to elicit what competent observers, official and nonofficial, really believe in contradistinction to what may be said officially or publicly. It reflects rather what diplomats and others say when off duty.

The makers of United States foreign policy are widely suspected of failing fully to recognize that Stalin is dead, that the strategy or at least the tactics of Moscow have changed, that war probably is less imminent than in 1950, and that western policy (without neglecting security) requires corresponding readaptation.

If Moscow seems to maneuver faster and more adroitly than the West and to excel in propaganda by talking peace while the West emphasizes armaments, if the free world has been slow to react appropriately to Soviet proffers of economic aid as a means of penetration of uncommitted regions, the blame is placed largely upon what is called the rigidity and lack of imagination of current United States policy. Many interpret this policy as sustaining a static situation in most parts of the world, including Germany.

As one diplomat expressed it, "We have built a hedge about ourselves in the Atlantic alliance with no thought of what we should do when the hedge was completed."

This military solidarity has not been supplemented by a corresponding economic solidarity. The dominant partner in the alliance, the United States, is accused of pursuing in the economic field the nationalistic isolation that it has abandoned in the political field.

Half its economic aid to its allies must be delivered in American ships, even to nations having surplus shipping. The escape clause in American tariff legislation is a threat that if these allies manage to earn more dollars by exports to replace aid, they may find the tariff rising to prevent this form of self-help.

Washington leaders are accused of a tendency to speak and act independently of their allies, and to pay too much attention to domestic politics in shaping foreign policy while paying too little attention to European needs, views, and sensibilities.

They are accused of overindulgence in diplomacy by speeches and press conferences, which often display conflicting views within the administration that bewilder allies with whom the United States is committed to cooperate. Yet it appears to Europeans that when these public debates produce a given policy, Washington assumes the discussion is over and that it only remains for its allies to accept the United States decision even if they have not been consulted.

There is little tendency to criticize President Eisenhower. There is a virtually universal disposition to blame Secretary of State Dulles for taking too rigid positions; for speaking too often, too extemporaneously and without due regard for the ideas and interests of the other allies; for confusing his own reflections or impulses with settled Western policy.

When such criticisms of the policies and methods of the United States are made in Europe, the criterion by which they are judged is that established by the United States itself when it accepted what may be called a community of power in the form of the North Atlantic alliance.

TWO UNITED STATES ACTIONS PRAISED

What Europeans consider the merits and defects of United States policy are yardsticks giving approximate measurements of the adherence to or the deviations from the doctrine of Western unity adopted by the United States early in the cold war. This doctrine crystallized in two acts of high statesmanship that Europeans never cease to praise: the Marshall plan of economic aid and the North Atlantic alliance extending a United States guaranty of security over Western Europe.

The fairly sudden and involuntary acquisition of the predominant power by the United States was accompanied by a decline of European power. The United States sought to correct this accident of history by restoring to Europe some of its former strength and independence—not as an act of pure generosity but because the United States, as powerful as it was, needed allies.

It could not risk the loss to the Soviet Union of the vast industrial resources of Western Europe. So it agreed to pool and dilute to some extent its own power with the smaller but vital power of Western Europe to create a balance of power on a worldwide scale.

This principle was difficult to apply. The United States bears about 80 percent of the cost of Atlantic defense and its officials do not always live up to the necessary diplomatic fiction that the alliance is one of equals. The Nation most noted for its advertising skill is not used to understating its power or its virtues. The bright labels pasted on every piece of Marshall plan machinery to show its origin were understandable, but hardly conformed to the need to use American wealth and power in an unobtrusive manner, if the alliance were to work well.

A similar overindulgence in publicity was seen by Europeans in Mr. Dulles' statement that he had brought the United States, and with it the Western World, to the brink of war—a place where Europe certainly did not care to go. The earlier talk in Washington of massive retaliation seemed another way of moving to the same brink without the prior approval of the allies of the United States.

Such Washington tendencies to forget that the United States has allies are regarded as having taken extreme forms in Asia. In refusing to recognize the regime that effec-

tively rules China, the United States has created a complete breach with its European allies, all of whom consider this a hopelessly unrealistic policy dictated mainly by domestic political pressure. This policy, too, seemed to entail moving to the brink of war when Washington appeared ready to risk a conflict over the Chinese offshore islands and Taiwan (Formosa). This was an example of the rigidity of which Europeans complain.

KENNAN ADVICE UNHEEDED

Much of this rigidity is attributed to what Europeans call a moralistic and semireligious coloring given to United States policy largely by Mr. Dulles, contrary to the advice of George F. Kennan, former head of policy planning in the State Department. A similar propensity to preach is seen in the propaganda on the American way of life, which Europeans believe is neither attainable nor necessarily desired by other nations, which have their own ways of life but can be loyal allies for all that.

This way of life is associated by Europeans with the unique form of capitalism in the United States. It seems to have disproved Socialist doctrines as regards North America and to have prevented any extensive American understanding of the important Socialist movements in Europe, which were responses to a very different brand of capitalism.

In the United States, which enjoys a semi-socialized private capitalism, creeping socialism is widely abhorred as close to communism. In Europe, where socialization had to be done by the state, the resulting mixed economies reveal extensive creeping by socialism. For good or ill, this is a part of European life, and many consider socialism one of the best safeguards against communism.

This view is little understood by United States policymakers, or so Europeans believe. The socialistic British Labor Party suspects that Washington would do what it could to prevent that party again governing Britain.

The principal force working against United States policy is Soviet imperialism operating through Communist groups. Some European economists believe the test will come if the Soviet economy can offer to the Russians a few years hence standards of living above those of Western Europe.

The race, therefore, is regarded as one between Soviet and European productivity. This view lends weight to the contention that United States policy should concentrate in the economic field.

The disunity of Western Europe, handicapping its productivity, is, therefore, considered by many to be another obstacle to United States policy, which has sought to strengthen Europe by uniting it.

In resisting this union in the form of a single tariffless market, British governments have been motivated by concern for their links with the Commonwealth. They have also been influenced by the conviction that what Britons call the Anglo-American alliance entitles Britain to a rating above the continental nations of the wider Atlantic alliance.

BRITISH PRIDE HURT

Britain's pride was wounded when the United States lumped her with lesser nations as a recipient of Marshall aid. The British tend to believe they could use more skillfully the vast power that has fallen to the United States. They claim a special position in relations with the United States.

The French think this special position already exists to their disadvantage. They suspect that Washington and London get together behind their backs. The French complain of American anticolonialism, which they say injects a disruptive ideological element into the Atlantic alliance. But the Greeks, who are in the same alliance, wish that United States anticolonialism would

result in pressure on Britain for self-government in Cyprus.

The French sense of frustration in both North Africa and Europe, expressed mainly in indictments of United States policy, led to the recent statements by Premier Guy Mollet urging a more positive United States attitude toward the Soviet Union. By this he meant chiefly a more favorable response to his idea of trying to escape from the Geneva deadlock by giving priority to negotiations for reduction of armaments.

BONN OUTWARDLY CONTENT

This was criticized as coming close to the policy of the Soviet Union, which sought to put security agreements ahead of German unity. The West Germans want nothing put ahead of German unity.

West Germany officially appears a more contented ally. The Germans consider their Federal Republic was created by the United States—which, however, errs in apparently considering it more than just a provisional state pending an all-German state. Yet Germans believe the United States is the only power that may 1 day persuade Moscow to accept this all-German state. Privately, many Germans agree with the widespread European view that United States policy is too static, especially as regards Germany.

In Spain, too, many look to the United States to help them toward a new kind of state, one that would succeed the Franco regime. They complain that Washington pays too exclusive attention to the powers that be and not enough to the masses of the people, who may prefer and eventually obtain a different regime.

This seems to be a plea for United States interference in the internal affairs of a European State. Elsewhere in Europe the belief prevails that there has been too much of such interference. Thus there are numerous crosscurrents and still much nationalism in Europe, so that the United States could scarcely please everybody, whatever its policy.

RECOMMENDED REMEDIES

From the remarkably similar criticisms of the United States foreign policy noted by correspondents of the New York Times in the capitals of Western Europe there emerge suggestions for improvement. Each of the criticisms cited above is at the same time a recommended remedy. In addition, many critics replied to the question: How could United States policy be improved? There was no great diversity of replies except in emphasis.

While the general lines of policy laid down in the late 1940's are sound, there have been faults, delays, and confusion in their application. Strategy is good but tactics defective. There was wide agreement, often expressed in the same terms, that the United States, without abandoning the instruments of security, should now direct its attention more to a kind of economic warfare in which the Soviet Union is considered to have taken the initiative.

Just as the United States shifted its emphasis from Marshall plan aid to defense aid after 1950, it should now shift back again to economic aid, this time not mainly in Europe but in the so-called uncommitted areas where Soviet influence penetrates.

To do this effectively some suggest that perhaps Washington needs an independent agency for foreign aid, as was recommended by Paul G. Hoffman, former Economic Cooperation Administrator, so that this function will not get tangled up between the State Department and the Treasury. At any rate, policy should be clearer and more vigorous, in the view of European critics.

The almost universal emphasis placed on economic policy was equally by that on the need for greater flexibility in foreign policy generally. For this some suggested a return

to secret diplomacy would be necessary, since publicly taken positions tend to become non-negotiable.

Greater assurance of continuity of policy—of policies not subject to change with the election returns—was urged, especially in Britain, where this continuity has been largely achieved. The suggestion was that the world ought to be sure that there would be as much American thinking about foreign policy in 1957 as in 1947, when major decisions were boldly taken. The impression is that lately the United States has become the prisoner of cold war slogans, and that the professional diplomats should have more independence in shaping policy.

It was suggested that the United States would do well not to expect gratitude from allies and other aided countries. Although aid is seen as including a substantial admixture of generosity, it is regarded as being granted primarily in the interests of the United States, as Congress specified. Advanced European nations dislike aid. They would prefer to get dollars through trade if the United States would lower some of its bars. To remind them that they are aided injures their dignity, especially since they believe the need for aid is partly a result of United States protectionist policies.

The late President Roosevelt said the purpose of lend lease was to remove the dollar sign from the relations of the United States and Britain, and later with other countries. For that sign is the mark of the predominant United States power, which many Europeans and Americans believe will be the more effective if used without being flaunted before those who, having lost power, may naturally be slightly envious.

In the Atlantic alliance, that power has been somewhat diluted and disguised. In the North Atlantic Council, Foreign Ministers of small nations speak as freely as those of great powers, and wisdom is not necessarily in exact proportion to power or wealth.

In this council, originally for defense but now for political discussion also, the United States has occasionally taken its allies into its confidence regarding its foreign policy. The council has discussed policies not only in Europe but in the Middle and Far East. It is thus a community of power and of intelligence. Some Europeans believe the most important cure for the United States foreign policy errors cited in this article would be more frequent and more thorough consultation in this council on policy in all parts of the world.

—

[From the New York Times of April 9, 1956]
PRECISE UNITED STATES POLICY ASKED IN MIDDLE EAST—SURVEY OF AREA FINDS MIDDLE COURSE TOO OFTEN TAKEN FOR INDECISION

(By Sam Pope Brewer)

(Second of a series)

BEIRUT, LEBANON, April 8.—Any American who travels in these times has to get used to being taken to task over United States foreign policy.

The bases of criticism vary with different areas and even inside an area critics do not agree on what the faults are or how they should be remedied. Still there are certain criticisms and suggestions that recur more often than others.

The traveling Americans, for their part, tend to feel that much of the trouble arises from the lack of any firm and definite policy rather than from the existence of a mistaken one.

In the Arab world and the rest of the Middle East, from Gibraltar to India and from the Black Sea down to the Sudan, the United States has unquestionably lost heavily in prestige and friendship in the last few years. In the Arab countries, at least, that trend is continuing.

The reasons given by critics vary but the best simple generalization might be summed

up as "too much and too little." The United States has aided nationalist aspirations and fought colonialism enough to annoy and harm its British and French allies and not enough to win the solid friendship of local nationalists.

TECHNICAL AID WELCOMED

The Americans have given generously and yet have hesitated enough, made enough conditions, and refused enough requests to irritate those who are receiving the gifts and loans.

The phase of United States policy that has won the most favorable comments and made the most friends has been the technical and educational aid that is being so widely given.

Against that, the most criticized factor in United States policy is unquestionably its support of Israel. The Arab world looks on the United States as the principal force in the creation and protection of Israel as a state. When one sees how bitterly the Arabs feel about that, the most surprising point is that there is still so much friendliness for the United States.

Balanced Arab opinion does not hold now that it is possible to do away with Israel. But it does reproach the United States for what the Arabs believe to be a consistently strong bias in favor of Israel as against her Moslem neighbors.

The Israelis on their side feel the United States could assure their survival in peace by arming them heavily.

If the United States gave in on that point, there would be extreme alarm on the Arab side and an immediate rush to the Soviet bloc for arms that have been offered and that have been bought on a small scale.

The Israelis approve economic-aid policies and the plan advanced by Eric Johnston, President Eisenhower's representative, for rational development of Jordan Valley waterpower and irrigation resources.

They think the United States should arm them and keep arms from the Arab countries. They believe the United States puts too much faith in the ability of the United Nations to prevent a major war in the Middle East.

As an improvement on present policies, they urge heavy defensive armament for Israel and the use of all possible pressures to impose a settlement of Israel's frontiers that would involve recognition of Israel's existence as a state.

The Arabs oppose such a settlement, because they feel their whole position rests on the fact they have never consented to the establishment of a foreign state in an area inhabited by Arabs. Recognition of Israel, they believe, would weaken their claim to the area involved.

Special reports from correspondents of the New York Times in North Africa indicate that there, too, the United States has failed in an effort to be moderate, though not entirely neutral.

Nationalists think the Americans have made too little effort to back up their ideals of independence and self-determination for all.

The French think their American allies have betrayed them by encouraging nationalist aspirations. That is why feeling rose so high that a mob of infuriated Frenchmen wrecked the United States Consulate and Information Service library in Tunis early in March.

The nationalists in Morocco and Tunisia are less critical of the United States than are the French. But one qualified American observer remarked that "even the nationalists are a little cynical about us because they feel they cannot count on us against the French."

In Egypt, the Israeli question is the pivot of the attitude toward the United States. The Egyptians are elated with the success of their revolution. They believe Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser outmaneuvered the

United States when he obtained arms from Czechoslovakia.

Now they would be satisfied with no lesser change in United States policy than complete abandonment of Israel and full support of Premier Nasser's new Egypt in her aspirations to dominate the Arab world.

ALTERNATIVE IS LACKING

In common with other Arabs, they talk vaguely about the United States refusal to "face realities," but they produce no workable alternative to present American policy.

The Baghdad Pact provides an example of the vacillation that has brought criticism of the United States from all sides.

United States refusal to join has irritated and alarmed the member countries, organized for defense against Soviet aggression. The members, Britain, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, and Turkey, feel that the success or failure of the alliance depends on the active membership or absence of the United States, which first suggested it.

Foes of the pact include the Soviet bloc and "neutralist" countries, with Egypt leading the chorus of criticism. They resent United States moral support of this pact, even though it has not gone beyond lip service.

One senior United States diplomat commented bitterly recently that it was impossible to know where the United States stood as long as it refused to join the pact, although the State Department periodically proclaimed its support of the alliance.

A result is that the United States incurs the ill will of both opposed camps.

The Turks, too, have criticisms of United States policy, but they do not hinge on the Israeli question.

Turkey's objections are connected chiefly with financial questions. They accuse the United States of trying to shape everybody into the American mold. That criticism is heard elsewhere and Americans living abroad generally concede there is some justice in it.

The Turks are in financial difficulties and feel that the United States has been too reluctant to bail them out and unduly critical of some of the conduct that has landed them in that position.

In all these countries, another criticism frequently heard is that the United States focuses all its attention on the fight against communism and opposes even commercial relations with the Soviet Union and its satellites.

They believe the United States exaggerates the Red menace and they suspect mercenary motives behind the objections to their trade with the Soviet bloc.

The forces with which United States policy has to deal in the Arab world, Turkey, Iran, and the rest of the Middle East are multiple. Communism is not the most conspicuous.

Nationalism is the most notable force and in these countries has become virtually synonymous with anti-Western sentiment. For hundreds of years most of this area was ruled by the Turks. When World War I ended Turkish rule (even before that in some areas) the Turks were replaced by British, French, or Italian overlords.

Now that they are sovereign countries, the Arab States intend to exercise their rights. The United States as an ally of Britain and France is suspect in the present period of struggle.

One Arab jurist said recently to this correspondent:

"After generations of being taught that the Western Powers were their oppressors, the common people of our countries cannot be convinced that those same powers have suddenly become their friends and protectors."

PERIL IN COOPERATION

The Communists manipulate those nationalist forces. Sometimes the Reds pose as having nationalist aims themselves. Sometimes they convince the nationalists that

"after all we have the same enemies—the Western imperialists—and party names do not matter."

Communism as an open political force is not dangerous in most of these countries. The danger lies in the fact that the nationalists think they can cooperate with the Communists as long as it suits them and then drop them. The nationalists overlook the damage done meanwhile.

In Syria, for example, there appears to be strong Communist influence though the party as such does not amount to much. There is one Communist member of Parliament, Khaled Bagdash, but the greatest danger again lies not in him but in some of the young officers and officials who believe Communist agitation and Communist aid from abroad are useful weapons against the Western Powers and who do not realize the danger of falling into the Communists' grip.

In the Arab countries, simple hostility to Israel and fear of her supposed ambitions for expansion may also be classed as a specific force working against the United States. Until after World War II Americans were known in these countries only as benefactors. They had neither colonies nor mandates. They did provide schools and colleges, encourage the Arab political revival and send aid when there were disasters.

That vast fund of goodwill is not exhausted but it is depleted by the struggle over Israel and because of United States inability to abandon its French and British allies to please the Arab nationalists.

In north Africa, the effort to steer a middle course brings the United States up against another force—the reaction of French colonials to the alleged American encouragement of the Arab forces that are fighting a guerrilla war with the French.

The nationalists remember that the United States, especially in the Franklin D. Roosevelt administrations, encouraged aspirations to independence. They are not getting the support they would like from Washington but they do not look on Americans as enemies.

FRENCH COLONIALS BITTER

Embattled French colonial officials and settlers also remember United States encouragement of such movements and they are bitter about it.

Their view was expressed by Pierre Vignau, a French landowner and member of the Algerian Assembly, who said to a correspondent of the Times:

"The question now is whether the United States intends to change its policy regarding north Africa and the Middle East. If the United States means to continue and reinforce the defense of the West, it must not only be on the side of France in her efforts to restore security in Algeria but must also undertake a concerted action designed to help bring Tunisia and Morocco back into the European-Africa bloc. Such a bloc is indispensable to western defense and desirable also in the interests of native populations for independence has put Morocco and Tunisia on the road to anarchy."

Each group offers simple and impractical solutions to its complaints about United States policy. The Arabs want Israel dropped. The Israelis want unqualified support against the Arab States. The nationalists want aid in the fight for independence. The French want help in suppressing rebellious natives.

All want money in loans and grants and all object to the policy that requires a check on what is done with the money after they get it.

The United States obviously would not gain by plunging recklessly onto one side or the other in each controversy, or by lading out money without knowing what was being done with it.

There do stand out in the opinions from various countries certain calls for policy

changes that seem to occur to many persons of different groups.

DEFINITE POLICY URGED

The basic one is a plea to decide on some definite policy, whatever it may be. In most cases, this means a demand for a policy backing up the speaker's particular group.

In the instances mentioned above, it is clear the United States cannot well drop its moderate position and back one side fully. But the so-called middle-of-the-road position too often looks like indecision.

The call is for a clear-cut policy. It would still not please the partisan groups but they would have fewer false hopes.

On less general lines, there are clear indications that money put into education facilities, libraries, and technical aid is well spent. There are different views about the efficiency of existing operations in that field but there is no doubt about the demand among Middle Eastern peoples for the facilities provided.

That effectiveness is presumably why the United States Information Service library in any city is normally the first target of hoodlums whenever political disturbances start. The Communists invariably seize the chance to steer violence into channels that suit their purpose, and the American library is almost invariably their first objective.

The library in Amman, Jordan, for instance, has been wrecked twice. However, a high Jordanian Government official, when asked what he thought was the most useful work the United States carried on in this area replied: "Education and books." He then drew a handful of United States magazines and pamphlets from his desk drawer.

Several observers think policies on loans and grants might be reviewed.

The Soviet Union has been making much headway directly and through satellites in providing underdeveloped countries with things they want, whether they are arms, industrial equipment, or other material. They give no gifts but make business deals on terms that amount to the same thing without calling for acknowledgment of that fact. Payment may be in surplus products, the aid recipients could not sell elsewhere or in weak currencies and spread over a long period.

The Soviet does not moralize about whether a country should have the arms it seeks or whether it needs the type of factory it wants.

A result is that each deal creates much goodwill at relatively low cost. Carefully supervised American loans and gifts, however lavish they may be, tend to leave the recipients with the feeling of the tramp who is required to sing a hymn to get a free cup of coffee.

[From the New York Times of April 9, 1956]

AFRICAN ISSUES LOOMING

(By Leonard Ingalls)

JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA, April 8.—In Africa south of the Sahara, the foreign policy of the United States is not particularly strong or well defined beyond the fundamental attitude of good neighborliness. The chief aim is to keep Africa aligned with the West.

Very soon, however, the United States probably will be forced to take a more vigorous stand in a number of developing situations. These include both white and African nationalism, the emergence into independence of such places as the Gold Coast, the spread of communism, and the new interest the Soviet Union is taking in the difficulties African Negroes are having in rising above a position of extreme underprivilege and the continuation of colonial rule.

Of all the problems troubling this part of the continent, nationalism is perhaps the most serious. It is the basis of sub-Saharan Africa's greatest conflict. On one hand are

whites striving to maintain their identity and position as rulers. On the other are Negroes clamoring for political, economic, and social recognition, and in some places, such as Uganda, for outright control of their homelands.

The force of Negro nationalism throughout the continent is not yet great because the majority of Africans are primitive and illiterate. In South Africa the picture is further complicated by the intense rivalry for national predominance between the white descendants of English and Dutch settlers. Meanwhile, in the Central African Federation, and Kenya and Tanganyika, efforts are being made to establish multiracial nationalism through governments in which all races are represented.

Thus far in this complex and sometimes baffling situation United States policy has been one of almost complete noninterference and at most gentle suggestion. State Department representatives here, in the absence of a precise African policy from Washington, act as observers and do what they can to stimulate trade and further the prestige of the United States. Their activities, however, and the whole impact of United States operations in sub-Saharan Africa are severely restricted by a shortage of funds.

American financial aid in sub-Saharan Africa, an area desperately in need of money for such things as education and communications, has been small compared with direct Government grants elsewhere. The tightly limited opportunities for Africans to study and travel in the United States at Government expense have caused some resentment among Negroes.

Present United States African policy seems to have offended no one in official positions. However, African leaders frequently ask why the United States does not help them more in the United Nations in their struggle for human rights.

Africa's dilemma arising from conflicting racial aspirations also creates a dilemma for the United States. Should it, for example, ignore the plight of the Negro in South Africa and antagonize Africans all over the continent, or should it denounce apartheid (racial segregation) and risk losing South Africa as a strategic and commercial partner?

The most effective policy for the United States in Africa, observers here believe, appears to be one that would provide tangible support and encouragement to sincere efforts at multiracial governments and societies, with emphasis on equality of opportunity. Assistance to independent Negro states to enable them to achieve stable governments and sound economies, it is believed, also would be in harmony with such a policy.

[From the New York Times of April 10, 1956]
ASIA SURVEY FINDS NEED OF MORE AID—SOME
SEE CUT IN UNITED STATES LIVING STANDARD
TO PROVIDE HELP

(By A. M. Rosenthal)

(Third of a series)

COLOMBO, CEYLON, April 9.—The great challenge, and the great opportunity, facing United States foreign policy is communism's eager pursuit of nationalist movements all over the world.

The challenge springs from the fact that the Russians have grasped the enormous emotional and political drive behind what Asians like to call the age of nationalism.

Not long ago, at one of those earnest diplomatic garden parties that make up a good deal of New Delhi's official social life, an Indian Foreign Office man was talking about a favorite topic—where the United States goes wrong.

"You don't seem to be able to realize that countries see the world in different ways, that problems unimportant to you are primary to us," he said.

"That's why you are finding yourself losing out to the Russians on this colonialism

business," he continued. "They have the wit to see that nationalism is the force of this decade. Intellectually you see it, too, certainly. But you expect the impossible. You expect Algerians, for instance, to take a world view, not the Algerian view."

The United States is no longer counted a sure friend of nationalist movements.

This is a bitter thought for the United States, remembering that freedom was given to the Philippines, and help to India and Indonesia. It is made more bitter by the fear that the Western age of colonialism is being replaced by Soviet political and military conquests.

But there is no point in giving argument for argument. It is enough that Asians have lost trust.

The national elections in Ceylon, which resulted in a crushing defeat of the openly pro-Western Government, were fought on domestic rather than international issues. But certainly they showed that being identified with the West has no great political asset to an Asian politician. And they showed, too, that the West's policies had not struck a real spark in the minds of the Ceylonese.

This is a problem made infinitely more acute by the fact that the Russians, with no political commitments to the colonial powers, can and do eagerly push themselves forward as friends of nationalism everywhere.

The opportunity springs from the challenge. It is the opinion of many Asians and some important United States officials in this area that the United States, in its concern for physical and military security, is letting the political battle go by default. They believe too that Americans do not realize that good will toward the United States is ebbing. But they believe that the plain threat that the Communists will be able to identify themselves with nationalism may prod the United States into restating its own traditional friendship for independence movements.

Among some Americans here there is a belief that the best step the United States could take now would be a straight and unequivocal statement of its intention to see that every land capable of self-government attains it.

For the sake of political effect, it might help the United States to bring up the issue itself at the United Nations. It certainly would help if a declaration were made formally by the President of the United States.

This reporter has not heard that last suggestion put in as many words by Indian or United States officials. But there have been many comments that the time has come for clarification of United States policy. Putting that hope together with the fact that President Eisenhower's personal prestige is high here, it is obvious that a Presidential declaration would have more force than any other kind.

ALL CANNOT BE PLEASED

It is the opinion of most westerners in India that for the time being at least the United States cannot evolve a foreign policy that will make New Delhi or all other Asian capitals entirely happy. The reason is in the basic difference in attitude toward the Communist philosophy and toward the danger of that philosophy.

India and other Asian countries are ready to believe the danger of military aggression has passed. As far as the United States is concerned, military containment and preparedness will have to remain the skeletal structure of United States foreign policy. That means something the Indians will never like—military pacts in which their neighbors are armed.

It has to be recognized—and this comes from a number of Asians—that the United States cannot satisfy all Asians' wishes.

But, especially in connection with nationalism, Asians say that Americans must also recognize that they need not keep all their allies happy all the time.

The United States would have to pay a price for meeting the Soviet challenge on nationalism head on—the anger of some United States allies.

But the history of the last 10 years has proved that sooner or later the United States has had to take public stands that its Western allies did not like, and that too often—Cyprus, for instance—those stands were taken too late for maximum political effect. Put another way, opinion in this part of the world is that the time has come for the United States to lead the parade instead of running after the Soviet Union.

The nationalist question cannot, of course, be considered without taking the free world's military security into account. But if the last decade has shown anything—consider Suez, Cyprus, Indochina, and North Africa—it is that military security depends on political security and that democratic countries cannot hold down military bases surrounded by hostile populations.

This is not a suggestion for abandoning military security but for reconsidering the essentials for military security. To give just one example, there are United States military men in Saigon who believed that the presence of the French expeditionary corps in South Vietnam was such a political liability that it amounted to a threat to military security.

And it is being asked whether the British naval base on Cyprus is more secure now than would have been if the British had given up sovereignty and signed a long-term lease-treaty with the willing Greeks.

ECONOMICS AN ESSENTIAL

Some American officials in Asia might disagree with the emphasis on pushing to the front on the colonialism issue. But few would disagree that economics becomes every day a more essential part of our foreign policy. One obvious reason, of course, is that the Russians have entered the picture—in Egypt, India, Syria, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Burma, the Sudan, and Yemen.

But just as important is the fact that the newly independent countries are aware more sharply than ever before of the gap between them and the developed countries. That gap is growing because Western industrialization is outpacing the painful development efforts of Asia and the Middle East.

Sooner or later in a discussion of foreign policy, the talk boils down to this: The United States will have to spend still more money and share still more of its wealth with Asia.

What is more, there is a belief among Americans in Asia that the time may be coming when the United States will have to cut down its continually rising standard of living to meet Soviet competition and to help underdeveloped countries get ahead. Indian businessmen say the United States is pricing itself out of the market.

An example among many: The Tata Iron & Steel Co., part of the biggest industrial-commercial enterprise in India, was negotiating with the United States Export-Import Bank for a loan to double its steel producing plant. The negotiations fell through because under a loan, say the Tata spokesmen, the concern would have been obliged to buy all its equipment in the United States and prices were too high, when measured against the high interest rate demanded by the bank.

One of the problems the United States must face in Asia is a drift toward nationalization of economies. Nearly everyone believes it would be unwise and impossible to try to pressure India, for instance, away from socialism.

But among Americans there is the opinion that, without interfering with Asian lands bent on some form of socialism, there is a great deal Washington can do to promote the spirit and philosophy of enlightened private enterprise.

AID TO PRIVATE INDUSTRY

One American businessman said in New Delhi recently that since the United States was willing to give hundreds of millions of dollars to governments, it should be willing to give private Asian industry a hand by making low-interest-rate loans. He mentioned the Tata episode as a case in point.

The Tata organization is now negotiating with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a loan. That means the Indian Government would have to stand behind the loan and would have a stronger voice in Tata affairs.

The point this businessman and others made was that where opportunities presented themselves to help reliable private enterprises in Asia, the United States should take them.

High United States prices and interest rates take on political importance because the Soviet Union will make sacrifices to supply goods at prices underdeveloped countries can afford.

There is a feeling among westerners that sometime soon the people of the United States may have to learn the painful lesson that continuously rising wages and profits may wreck their country's ability to compete with the Soviet Union in the economic struggle for Asia. Already India is buying most of her cement from Communist countries. Multiply this by a hundred products and the political consequences need no underlining.

The job of strengthening the economic foundations of underdeveloped countries was started by the United States a decade ago. Still the insistence of western and Asian officials is that more and more money must be appropriated because on this now hangs the future of Asia. Not only more money is needed but more imagination and more planning.

CONFERENCE SUGGESTED

So far, planning and spending have been on a national basis and sometimes without clear goals in mind. There are United States officials here who believe that one of the things the United States could do would be to call a technical-level conference to work intensively to map out Asia's needs, resources, foreign-aid requirements, and attainable objectives. There is a good chance the United States would find itself ahead of the Asian countries in the desire for regional planning, but there is nothing wrong with leading the field.

India needs more money, large quantities of it. If the United States was willing to lend India the money—\$1 billion, at the least—it could assure that her own democratic way to a mixture of socialism plus private enterprise had stood the test when compared with Communist China's totalitarian economy.

It is in the interest of the United States to help noncommitted countries, but there is no reason why it should be ashamed of making a special economic effort for its allies—Pakistan, for instance. The recent meeting of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization at Karachi expressed some fond hopes about emphasizing the economic aspects of the alliance. But beyond appointing one economist the conference did nothing about it. Here, too, is a field for United States imaginativeness.

The problem of Afghanistan is one of the most difficult the United States faces. For one thing, the Soviet loan of \$100 million faces Washington with a decision as to whether to be drawn into the endless, sapping process of trying to outbid the Soviet

on loans. That is just what leaders of this area think Washington did in the case of the Aswan high dam in Egypt, and the action did not enhance the reputation of the United States.

But the bigger problem the United States faces in Afghanistan is the same one it must deal with in many countries in Latin America, the Middle East, and Asia. That is whether United States funds are to be used to bolster dictatorial governments just because they happen to be in power.

There is no easy answer to this. The Russians certainly have no compunctions about supporting any government in power so long as it suits their purpose. But whether that approach and that philosophy in the long run suit the objectives of freedom is questioned by many Asian friends of the United States.

Assuredly the United States cannot change the governments of the world to suit itself. But it would be in keeping with United States traditions to make it clear through Presidential statements that Washington is not ready to build up dictatorships of the right in its fight against dictatorships of the left.

The world struggle is as much as anything a struggle for minds and attitudes. And there is something the United States could do that would not cost astronomical sums, would pay off handsomely and would be welcomed by most Americans who have spent any time in the area. That would be to step up scholarships for foreign students to study and live in the United States and for Americans to study abroad. This correspondent has met many Asians who have lived in the United States and virtually every one has returned with more understanding and sympathy toward United States goals.

Many Asians feel that knowledge of their lands is almost nonexistent in the United States. An increasing number of Americans living in Asia could do much to remedy that.

It might help prevent incidents like the one involving the Member of the United States Congress interviewed at the Karachi Airport, who was asked what Americans thought about Pakistan.

"Think about it?" he asked. "My boy, they never even heard of it."

[From the New York Times of April 11, 1956]

UNITED STATES NEEDS TO EMPHASIZE PEACE, SURVEY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA SHOWS

(By Robert Alden)

(Fourth of a series)

SINGAPORE, April 10.—The tides of change are running strong in southeast Asia. The newly sovereign states just emerged from cast-off colonial shells are in danger of being swept away in the shifting groundswells.

The most important currents that tug at the nations of southeast Asia and shape their thinking are nationalism, hatred of war and a feeling of pride that Asia and the Asian people are now taking a deserved place of importance in the world.

In the last several months, this correspondent has talked with 50 or more persons here in southeast Asia with regard to the effectiveness of United States foreign policy in southeast Asia.

Some of these persons were American State Department personnel, others foreign government leaders. Some were newspapermen, local and foreign.

There was a virtual unanimity of opinion that these main forces at work in Asia must be fully appreciated if the United States is to shape an effective foreign policy for the area.

After years of living under the rule of strangers and seeing their wealth exploited by those strangers, the people here are choosing their own leaders and trying to run their own countries.

There are poverty, illiteracy, and disease in these countries. They need help to overcome these burdens. But they do not want that help if it is going to rob them of their hard-won independence.

The hatred of war is a dominant force in shaping the thinking of these countries. All have experienced war. Burma, Indonesia, Malaya, Laos, and South Vietnam are even now plagued by internal strife.

For these people, war means burned-out villages, sudden death, and the fear of sudden death. They want an end to it.

Linked with their nationalism and hatred of war is a feeling of pride in Asia itself. The dark-skinned and yellow-skinned peoples are coming into their own.

These peoples find unity in a feeling that their culture is older than the white man's, in a common past experience and common present problems. Thus any achievement in any country of Asia develops now a shared pride of achievement.

What can the United States do to harness these main forces now at work in southeast Asia so that these countries will not become the dupes of communism?

PRINCIPAL SUGGESTIONS

The general opinion was that, in spite of its global commitments, the United States, recognizing that colonialism is dead, must denounce it in clear terms.

As Secretary of State Dulles did during his visit to Indonesia, the fact should be emphasized that the United States once suffered under colonial rule itself; that it threw off that rule by force of arms and that, because it has shared their experiences, it understands the problems of the newly sovereign states.

The opinion was that the United States should support the principle that the people should have the right to choose who should govern them.

Such a stand, it was felt, is in the democratic tradition of the United States, and the Asian people should be helped to understand that this is the traditional United States position.

It is felt in diplomatic circles here that Mr. Dulles cannot uphold the principles of the United States Declaration of Independence in Indonesia while the United States Ambassador to France, C. Douglas Dillon, speaks of United States support for the French in north Africa.

The day after Mr. Dillon spoke in Paris his remarks were printed in the Communist Indonesian press parallel to those of Mr. Dulles. The Communist press considered the remarks as proof that Secretary Dulles was lying and that here was fresh evidence that the United States traditionally supported—and supported with arms—the colonial powers.

EMPHASIS ON PEACE URGED

The comment of a missionary's son who has spent all of his life in Asia represents a fair cross-section of opinion. He said:

"Putting aside the traditional American position with regard to independence and to colonialism, do we really think that in the long run the French, with all the arms at their disposal, will be able to wipe out nationalist feeling in north Africa any more than they were able to do it in Indochina or the Dutch were able to do it in Indonesia?"

He went on to say:

"If there is one lesson we should have learned in Asia, if we hadn't already learned it during the American Revolution, it's that you don't stop popular movements by killing people. You only provide martyrs and that means that there will be even more devoted followers of the cause of the revolution."

"The United States should not lose out to communism by backing unworthy causes that are already lost."

As a second point, emphasis should be put on the United States love of peace, its desire

to disarm, and President Eisenhower's "open-sky" plan for mutual aerial inspection of atomic arsenals. The feeling was that an end should be made to the continual United States talk about its armed might, its military alliances and its atomic striking power.

While diplomats in this area probably more keenly than most realize the need for such military strength, they also feel that it does great harm to publicize United States strength. It lends credence to the Communist propaganda line that the United States is bent on destroying peace in the area.

American aid is badly needed here, but it was felt the United States must not give the impression that it is trying to buy the goodwill of the Asians.

NEED FOR VIEW OF GOOD WILL

It was agreed that men of good will and ability are worth more than hundreds of millions blindly poured into the area in the hope that somehow the countries of Asia will resist communism.

There was complete agreement among those interviewed that the United States overseas-aid program must be streamlined and improved. Redtape must be cut away so that needed supplies, equipment, and men can be put at the disposal of countries quickly and efficiently.

In this connection, one idea that had been put forward met with wide approval. It was suggested that to accomplish the program the United States must call on the technical and manpower resources of American industry on a patriotic basis.

In most instances, the United States is not putting its best foot forward in recipient countries.

The proposal, therefore, is that personnel should be borrowed from large industry, with industry agreeing to lend some of its good employees to the Government for a year or two at a time to help the Asian countries and thus, in turn, help win the "cold war" for the United States.

In that way, the southeast Asian countries would have the advantage of utilizing the full abilities of good American technicians. The recommendations of the people in the field should then be trusted so that much of the Washington redtape, which now often holds up projects for a year or more, could be eliminated.

There was virtual unanimity of opinion also that the United States should stress more its own cultural and intellectual achievements. In this way, a greater appeal would be made to the students of southeast Asia, who are the potential leaders of the area.

More of these students should be sent to the United States to study, not for a few months or a year but for a full 4-year college course. It has been found that the United States is well able to "sell" itself to such visitors.

LESS TALK OF REDS ASKED

Another point that was made frequently, particularly by Asians, was that the United States should cut down sharply on the talk about communism. The United States has already made it clear that communism is a dangerous and evil system.

The feeling is that harping on communism gives Asians an impression that the United States is a narrowminded and undemocratic nation.

Sympathetic Asian officials maintain that, instead of concentrating its fire on communism, the United States should now give more emphasis to its own positive accomplishments, its rising standard of living for working people and the high health and education standards for its children.

In connection with this matter of continual emphasis on communism, one Asia newspaper editor said:

"It seems to us that the United States will not take any stand in world affairs— includ-

ing the matter of colonialism—without first relating the subject to communism and mentioning the matter of communism. We get fed up with America's one-track mind."

Despite these suggestions as to redirection of United States foreign policy, there is agreement that the present policy has achieved some results in Asia.

Much of the United States effort has stressed the essential evil of communism and the trap that communism sets for unwary people. The United States has had some success in propagating this idea and many Asians have learned to recognize and detest communism.

But communism is not yet a bad word in Asia. A villager in Indonesia, just as a villager in Thailand, might very well go out and vote for a Communist in an election if the Communist promised him things that he desired.

However, probably the most important achievement of United States foreign policy has been the propping up of newly sovereign states. These states were thus able to withstand the internal pressure of communism and the external threat of aggression.

DANGER SEEN IN ALLIANCE

If it were not for United States aid, South Vietnam would almost certainly have collapsed, as might Laos and Cambodia. Aid to Indonesia in the early days of independence helped that republic to survive.

The United States has also succeeded in shaping a military alliance whose purpose is physical containment of communism and thus serves as a deterrent to war.

However, Asians in neutral countries are not kindly disposed toward the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. They are afraid it might cause rather than prevent a war.

Among those countries sensitive to foreign interference, the fact that there are only 3 Asian members as compared to 5 non-Asian participants is a glaring weakness of the pact. That imbalance leads credence to the Communist position that the alliance represents an outside threat to the peace of Asia.

The members are the United States, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, Pakistan and the Philippines. The agreement covers their territories and in addition those of Cambodia, Laos and South Vietnam.

Many persons interviewed compared what the United States had accomplished by its foreign policy with what the Communists had accomplished.

It is apparent that the Communists have concentrated on trying to channel the main currents in Asia to their advantage. Thus they talk continually of their desire for peace. Conversely they try to link the United States with the word "war." In this respect, United States saberrattling has helped them.

Colonialism is continually denounced by the Communists and every effort is made to link the United States with colonialism. Mr. Dulles' statement on Goa gave the Communists good material with which to work. From it New Delhi inferred that the United States upheld Portuguese colonialism in India.

PAN-ASIANISM EMPHASIZED

Both the Russians and the Chinese have been laboring hard on the Pan-Asia idea. Nikita S. Khrushchev, the Soviet Communist Party's First Secretary, told the Burmese flatly: "We Russians are Asians."

Chou En-lai, Red China's Premier and Foreign Minister, took a leading role in last year's Asian-African Conference.

During his tour through south and southeast Asia, however, Mr. Dulles appeared to gain a better grasp of the situation and now seems ready to modify United States policy, at least in some measure. Some elements of the problems, however, appear to resist easy solution.

Among these is the fact that the neutral countries of southeast Asia are wary of the United States close relationships with President Syngman Rhee of South Korea and President Chiang Kai-shek of Nationalist China.

It is not that they object to the anti-Communist programs of those leaders but the fact that both avowedly would like to start a war to reunify their countries. Close American support of these leaders links the United States with a threat to touch off a third world war.

Conflict of interest within the United States has also snarled American foreign policy in Asia. Thus Burma made the point that she would not accept technical assistance from the United States unless she were allowed to pay for such assistance. She could pay only with her surplus rice crop. Washington was perfectly willing to give free technical assistance but it could not accept rice because the United States had its own rice surplus.

It was not until the Soviet Union sent technicians in exchange for Burmese rice that the United States became alarmed to the point where it would take some Burmese rice in exchange for assistance.

The United States foreign policy program needs flexibility, in the eyes of those familiar with the Asian scene. Required is a flexibility that will allow the United States to give as much economic aid as possible to a neutral Burma or an Indonesia, where it appears it will do some good, and a flexibility that will allow it to cut off military aid to Cambodia, where military aid appears wasted.

[From the New York Times of April 12, 1956]
UNITED STATES SAID TO LACK TACT IN FAR EAST—SURVEY IN REGION SHOWS MOST ALLIES FEEL THEY ARE CAST IN JUNIOR PARTNER ROLE—TALK OF WAR DEPLORED—CLARIFIED AMERICAN ATTITUDE TOWARD TAIWAN'S DEFENSE EVIDENTLY IS DESIRED

(By Robert Trumbull)

(Fifth of a series)

TOKYO, April 11.—Among America's best friends in Asia, Washington's apparent disregard of Asian nationalist motivations is one of the principal complaints against United States foreign policy affecting the area.

There seems to be a feeling in most of the countries of this region that Washington, instead of soliciting local opinion and tailoring policy accordingly, is inclined "to tell 'em, not ask 'em."

Where United States foreign policy has accommodated itself to this rising nationalism, it has succeeded. Where it has not done so, it has failed.

There is no basic difference in principle with the United States or its announced aims among the four countries of Northeast Asia—Japan, Korea, Nationalist China, and the Philippines. All are opposed to communism, as is the United States. All practice democracy, in varying degrees. All are seeking to raise the living standards of their people and appreciate the help the United States is giving them to do so.

POINTS MADE BY CRITICS

In these four countries, friendly critics of Washington policy as now practiced list these points of criticism, in addition to the failure of United States officials to take Asians fully into their confidence.

Too much accent on military strength and not enough on the economic and social advancement of the area.

Too much talk of war and not enough of peace.

An unclear attitude, or a failure to make it clear, just how far the United States would go in defense of Taiwan (Formosa) and its western approaches.

Last, but none the less important, what is construed as a lack of tact in administering aid programs.

A COMMON DENOMINATOR

All four countries have in common one characteristic that helps explain their sensitivity to any slight to their pride: All have been freed of foreign domination in recent years.

Korea and Taiwan were Japanese colonies till the end of World War II. The Philippine Islands were separated from United States rule only in 1946. And Japan, though never a colony, emerged 4 years ago from a brief but nonetheless humiliating military occupation by the United States.

Compared with the problems in other Asian countries, such as India, the obstructions facing United States foreign policy in the East Asian group are relatively minor. But conversations with local officials and competent foreign observers here, and the reports from correspondents of the New York Times in the other capitals, indicate that fundamental weaknesses in the American approach elsewhere may be highlighted by the apparent failures in this most friendly area of all.

In all four countries, the strength of United States policy seems to lie in its inflexible determination to support the free nations of Asia in opposition to Communist expansionism. The four friendly governments frankly recognize their dependence upon the United States for military support to maintain their democratic integrity.

The effect of some policies of the United States is to make its allies feel like junior partners. Their sense of nationalism cries out for equality in consultations. Sometimes, as the following country-by-country analysis may show, local attitudes may call for some forbearance and understanding in Washington if the Asian sense of propriety is to be appeased.

OPINIONS OF THE JAPANESE

The Japanese feel that the Americans still think of Japan, perhaps unconsciously, in terms of the occupation and of the Korean war—in other words, as a base for American military excursions elsewhere. The use of United States troops stationed in Japan for the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization demonstration in far-off Bangkok furthered this impression.

There has been too much public emphasis by the Americans on the buildup of Japan's own defense forces, and too little on the strengthening of Japan's economy. Officially, Washington's policy today is to avoid pushing Japanese military expansion at the expense of economic and political stability. But the United States has not yet succeeded in making this clear to the Japanese public.

The Japanese people, 4 years ago after the San Francisco peace treaty came into effect, still don't feel independent, and it galls them.

The security arrangements between the United States and Japan appear to the Japanese to have been forced upon their Government as a price of the treaty. They recognize their inability to defend themselves without United States help, but they would like the present agreement, under which United States forces are stationed here, to be superseded by a new defense pact in which Japan could have a sense of equal partnership instead of dependence.

What many Americans forget is that the present pact neither obligates the United States to defend Japan, nor Japan to come to the assistance of the United States. It merely gives the United States the use of Japanese bases to preserve peace and stability in the Pacific.

The free world's strictures on trade with Communist China, to which Japan adheres, are an embarrassment to the Tokyo Government in the fact of local business interests.

Japan would like the embargoes reduced at least to the levels governing Western trade with the Soviet Union.

More irritating than that, however, is a feeling that Washington may at any time make an important decision relative to Communist China, one of utmost concern to Japan. Without consulting Tokyo or even informing the Japanese Government in advance. For some reason, hard to pin down but obviously traceable to developments in the past, Japanese leaders lack this confidence in Washington.

PATIENCE NEEDED IN KOREA

The South Koreans also feel some sensitivity in what they conceive to be their subordinate role to United States officials. The situation in Korea, a country that plunged almost overnight from 35 years of colonial rule into devastating war, no doubt calls for patience and understanding on both sides.

In its simplest terms, the Korean policy under President Syngman Rhee is for the sternest possible military attitude against the Communists, who control the country north of the 38th parallel, and for a policy toward Japan that carries caution to the point of suspicion.

Aside from these two questions, the comments of Korean officials on United States policy in East Asia tended to criticize the tact with which it is administered in Korea, but not its substance.

TAIPEI FINDS UNCERTAINTY

As viewed from Taipei, United States policy on the China question appears to be marked by confusion and uncertainty. Continual exploitation of the China problem in domestic American politics has produced an impression of complete indecision, which in turn has led to a feeling of frustration among our Nationalist Chinese allies.

What is Washington's long-range policy on the whole China question? Will the United States defend the offshore islands? Is the United States really trying to make Taiwan self-sustaining economically or is it merely maintaining the island as a military base against mainland China?

All our allies—and many Americans—would like to know the answers to these questions.

Informed Filipinos, looking at Asia's problems from offshore and yet from the viewpoint of an Asian people long influenced by Western thought, agree with Japanese critics that the United States places too much emphasis on the military phase of the world ideological struggle. This is from a country that is one of the three Asian partners in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

The Filipinos want to see Taiwan and Japan defended against communism, for those islands are on the flanks of the Philippines. But, in the opinion of astute observers in Manila, the United States does so much talking about the military protection extended by Americans that the Filipinos feel a sense of inferiority.

SLOGAN CALLS FILIPINOS

"And let's forget about the slogan 'Show Window of Democracy,'" a Philippine Government official says, "We are a democracy all right, but when Americans call us a show window other Asians think we are just puppets."

In none of the East Asian countries is communism the principal opposing force to be considered in formulating United States policy, except as the military power and growing prestige of Communist China among other Asians constitute an influence counter to that of the United States. This is indeed a major factor, or should be, in guiding the American approach to Asians.

A survey in this area leads to the conclusion that issues stemming from nationalism are the basic conditioners of Asian thinking.

Defense of the region's integrity against aggressive communism is one factor. But no less important to the healthy development of a free Asia are economic and social improvement, as Secretary of State Dulles said on his most recent visit here.

Underlying all these considerations must be a genuine solicitude for national consciousness. United States popularity suffers because of the feeling of junior partnership that permeates the East Asian free nations today.

[From the New York Times of April 13, 1956]

LATIN NATIONALISM CHALLENGES POLICY OF UNITED STATES, SURVEY INDICATES

(By Tad Szulc)

(Sixth of a series)

RIO DE JANEIRO, April 12.—There are signs of restlessness in the huge land mass that is South America. As it does elsewhere, the United States faces there a challenge to its leadership and foreign policy.

The challenge stems from a rising nationalism that is sweeping the continent from the Panama Canal to the bleakness of Tierra del Fuego. It takes various forms and seeks various expressions in accordance with the needs and conditions of each republic. On the whole, it is a new type of nationalism, finding its roots in the dynamism of the immense development of South America in recent decades, and particularly since the end of World War II.

It is not an exaggeration to say that a social and economic revolution is under way on this continent.

As the most powerful force now in being here, nationalism can be directed into channels useful to the South American countries themselves and can further strengthen the inter-American system and democracy in the hemisphere.

COMMUNISTS AWAIT CHANCE

But if allowed to take the wrong course, it could spill over into extremisms of left or right and the general harm that could ensue would be beyond estimation. Communism, its influence already growing noticeably in some parts of the continent, stands ready to take advantage of any such turn of events.

The challenge thus facing United States foreign policy in South America is to come to terms with the formidable new force of nationalism so it can be used for the common benefit.

Yet in the opinion of thoughtful South Americans and of many United States diplomats stationed in the region the problem does not often receive the urgent attention it deserves.

In their considered view, the United States lacks so far a coherent long-range policy tailored to meet the new situation. In this view, the present policy, too often based on improvisations, fails short of meeting the challenge.

A dramatic New Look policy, it is felt, requires a readjustment of political as well as economic relationships between the United States and its South American neighbors.

The two form part of an overall policy approach, of course, and any adjustments in the economic field are bound to have political repercussions. Of this the Soviet Union is keenly aware, as seen in Moscow's recent overtures for greater trade with Latin America and for possible technical aid.

These overtures are not likely to turn Latin America into an area of Soviet influence in the foreseeable future, but they have had political echoes the United States would be wise not to underestimate.

COLONIALISM MAJOR ISSUE

This is how United States problems of foreign policy in South America break down:

In the political field, South Americans no longer want to be taken for granted. They

resent being looked upon by Washington as an automatic majority in the United Nations and insist that more attention be given to their views in world affairs. This, they say, should mean more consultations with their diplomats in New York and Washington and more personal attention to the continent as a whole.

Though the consultations process has been improved lately, South Americans take offense at the fact that in 4 years Secretary Dulles has visited South America only once despite his extensive globetrotting.

One area of global policy where South Americans are growing particularly restless is the question of colonialism. Though their natural sympathy lies mainly with the colonial peoples, they often vote in the United Nations with the so-called colonial powers because of United States pressure. But there have been deep breaks in this front in recent votes in New York.

In terms of the East-West conflict, Washington has been successful in welding the continent into a solid anti-Communist bloc. South American traditions and the influence of the Roman Catholic Church have been helpful in this endeavor. But at the same time there is a growing feeling that United States policy is negative insofar as it concentrates on anticomunism and has little else to offer.

What looms as the most important and yet most difficult aspect of political relations is the question of democracy versus dictatorship in Latin America as a whole.

In a speech in New Orleans last October, Henry F. Holland, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, stated United States policy objectives in the hemisphere as follows:

"Consistent with our inter-American treaties and the principle of nonintervention, we shall try always to help those who work to perfect political institutions based on spiritual and moral principles, institutions that stand for personal freedom, and the sanctity of every man and woman."

However, liberal friends of the United States in South America contend that Washington has not lived up to this principle entirely. They deplore what they call the tacit support given by the United States to the existing dictatorships in Latin America—as well as to that of Juan D. Peron in Argentina before his ouster last September.

They contend the United States has been doing more than maintaining correct relations with these dictatorial regimes. This, they say, does not harmonize with the United States tradition of supporting democracy everywhere. It is, incidentally, also a strong argument for the Communists in those countries where they do not work along with the dictator, as was the case in Argentina at different times.

Local liberals are often dismayed when the United States seemingly goes out of its way to pat a dictatorial regime on the back. The award of the Legion of Merit to Venezuela's President Marcos Perez Jiminez is a case in point.

One experienced United States diplomat commented in this connection that relationships should be maintained with existing governments, such as they may be, but without appearing to endorse dictatorships.

It is evidently a difficult political undertaking and one that has plagued the Department of State for many years. But in the face of growing Communist infiltration in South America some form of solution is urgent if the liberals and the still uncommitted masses are to be kept on the side of democracy.

What is seen by many as a great failing of United States policy is that it is not employing its immense influence to encourage democracy and democratic processes in South America before communism and other extremisms make further inroads.

With political ferment in South America stemming from the growing social and economic pressures that follow the continent's development, extremisms are on the rise and some think it may soon become too late to check them altogether.

Thus in the political field, the United States must take care to maintain good relations with South America on the level of both world and domestic policies.

South Americans are beginning to have second thoughts about their relationship with the "colossus of the north." While nothing has happened so far to alter the basic policy orientations here and the reservoir of good will toward the United States is still brimful, it is imperative to maintain these orientations and good will in the face of changing conditions.

JUNIOR STATUS DISLIKED

South Americans who complain that they are treated as junior partners in political relations offer the same grievance about economic treatment from the United States.

Though their claim that they are kept down as suppliers of raw materials and obligatory consumers of United States finished goods is exaggerated, there is a powerful feeling among South Americans that they are not receiving the share of United States aid they demand necessary for orderly and rapid development.

They are bitter that the economic aid channeled to South America since the end of World War II is insignificant in comparison with what the United States has been spending elsewhere. This hurts nationalistic feelings here and the complaint is widely heard that Latin America's importance is not sufficiently recognized by the United States.

The contention is that, with pressing economic and social problems in this region, the United States should be as concerned over what is happening in its own backyard as it is elsewhere. This viewpoint, on both the economic and political level, finds considerable private support among veteran United States diplomats in this area. There is also resentment that too many promises have been left unfulfilled. South Americans would prefer less talk and more deeds.

A remark often repeated here half jestingly is that South America needs a bad Communist situation to attract United States attention. More seriously, the quick economic aid given Guatemala after the overthrow of her pro-Communist regime in 1954 is adduced as proof that there might be something to the remark.

South Americans—governments and private persons alike—also take exception to the basic philosophy of the Eisenhower administration toward aid to Latin America.

This philosophy is that the bulk of the aid should take the form of investments by private United States capital, with the Washington Government providing funds, usually as loans, only where private capital is unavailable and to create investment conditions.

But the South American problem is that where money is most needed is for such unprofitable yet fundamental projects as railroads, ports, highways, and dams, for which private investments are not forthcoming. Though the Export-Import Bank, a United States Government agency, has liberalized greatly its lending policies in Latin America in the last 2 years, it is felt that even these loans hardly scratch the surface of this continent's pressing development needs. This also holds true of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which also has recently expanded its operations in this region.

The current United States approach also has a side effect of attracting European competition to South America. Whereas loans from the Export-Import Bank usually finance United States equipment and technicians, European equipment is coming here

at an increasing rate as European financial syndicates make easy-term loans available to find export markets for their heavy products.

By far the brightest phase of United States aid here has been the point 4 program.

Working with limited funds, the program has done marvels in helping in basic economic and social projects in the American Republics. It also has generated much vital- ly needed good will for the United States. Policy specialists feel that a considerable expansion of this program would be an essential part of any "new look" hemisphere policy.

Thus the big problem facing Washington policymakers in South America is how to work out an adjustment to the enlightened nationalism that is rising here. That nationalism is backed by the power of 100 million awakening people and their immense natural resources. It is clamoring for recognition.

[From the New York Times of April 13, 1956]

LATIN-AMERICAN ISSUES

(By Paul P. Kennedy)

MEXICO CITY, April 12.—United States foreign policy for the Latin-American area north of Colombia is basically the same as that applying to the south, but there are differences of emphasis because of the region's geographic and historic position.

Policy in this region, which includes Panama, the five Central American Republics and Mexico is aimed more pronouncedly at the two objectives of establishing a solid community of interests and combating Communist encroachment.

In many respects, particularly in technical and educational assistance, the implementation of United States policy in this region generally has been highly successful. In other respects, particularly the economic field, the United States appears to be losing ground.

Aside from advances in technical and educational assistance, the most rewarding United States operation in this region is an increasing willingness to listen to the troubles of the seven nations and sincere attempts to do something about them.

This means an alacrity not only to iron out differences within the framework of the inter-American system but also to furnish material assistance where it is proved to be wanted and needed.

The weaknesses of foreign policy involve many factors, some of them beyond the control of policy planners. This is particularly true in the matter of price stabilization of commodities and the sale of United States surpluses abroad. The fluctuations in the prices of this region's basic export commodities can and usually do leave a residue of sourness toward the United States that goes far toward neutralizing the good will accumulated by those policies that have proved successful.

GROWING NATIONALISM

Growing nationalism, especially in Panama, Guatemala, and Mexico, is being generated largely because of the region's proximity to the United States and the latter's vast influence over the entire area. Essentially this growth points to a lack of that community of interests that is one of the basic objectives of United States policy.

Responsible Latin Americans of this region who are nominally friendly to the United States feel there are a number of ways to improve the potential of United States policy.

To begin with, they say, Washington could strive for greater understanding and sympathy for Latin-American problems, not from the North American point of view but from the Latin point of view. In this connection it is felt that Europe, which is not remotely so involved in this region's welfare as is the

United States, has a far greater understanding of the area's problems.

Another area in which it is felt United States policy could be improved is the abandonment of what is viewed as an increasing tendency to trade financial and technical assistance for political advantage in the inter-American system. This is felt to be diametrically opposed to the original concept of the assistance program.

Many responsible observers, North American as well as Latin American, are convinced some of the United States policy planners see a moral lapse in any country that accepts assistance but disagrees with any of Washington's views on American affairs.

[From the New York Times of April 13, 1956]

METHODS IRK CANADA
(By Raymond Daniell)

OTTAWA, April 12.—With the broad over-all aims of United States foreign policy, most Canadians, official and unofficial, are in complete sympathy. Indeed these aims are almost identical. However, the application of these policies often occasions surprise and sometimes suspicion.

Responsible officials here are wary of criticizing the action of their big neighbor and partner in defense. However, among some of them and among Western diplomats and students of foreign affairs there is a growing feeling that all is not so rosy for the West and the free world as it has been painted recently in Washington.

It is feared that Washington has been lacking in bold, daring leadership and that the policy of containing the Soviet Union has become too rigid and inflexible and that too great a reliance has been placed on military alliances without accompanying political understanding. The feeling is strong that to meet the new Soviet challenge in the Middle East and Far East new "policies and methods" must be evolved, although there is little agreement on what form they should take.

Canadians would like to see greater coordination of policy between the United States and its allies on such matters as the Middle East crisis, more emphasis on economic cooperation and less stress and reliance on military alliances.

Canadians feel that there is no future for Chiang Kai-shek. They see no possibility of his returning to the mainland short of a general war. They would be happier if the United States were not so firmly committed to him. The idea of the ultimate evolution of two Chinas is received with skepticism.

Lester B. Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs, frequently has dissociated Canada from any commitments in the Far East other than as a member of the United Nations. He also has said that while the future of Taiwan (Formosa) remains to be settled, he regards Matsu and Quemoy as part of mainland China.

In most quarters here, it is felt that the United States would be wise to adopt a similar view. Mr. Pearson also has said often that sooner or later the West must recognize the reality of Communist control of China.

Canadians are inclined to dislike the boastfulness and bombast with which policy is sometimes enunciated in the United States. They feel also that military leaders are inclined too much to make policy statements. Secretary of State Dulles comes in for a good deal of editorial criticism for talking too much.

The chief problem for the United States in dealing with Canada is to avoid offending national sensibilities. Since the war Canada has grown in stature. Sometimes it is felt here that the United States is inclined to act as if Canada were an appendage of the United States that need be neither considered nor consulted—just told.

There is no Communist movement in Canada worthy of the name and, in fact, socialism is on the wane.

[From the New York Times of April 15, 1956]

UNITED STATES AIDES MAINLY REJECT FOREIGN POLICY CRITICISMS—HOWEVER, CONSENSUS IN WASHINGTON SEEMS TO ACCEPT NEED FOR REEVALUATION OF NATION'S COLD WAR STRATEGY

(By James Reston)

(Final of a series)

WASHINGTON, April 14.—Uncle Sam, policeman, banker, and babysitter to the world, is defensive and a little resentful about all the recent overseas criticism of his foreign policy.

As the old gentleman sees it, here he is with the Communists at the back door, a house full of complaining relatives, politicians yawping all over the place, the dishes piled high in the kitchen sink—and instead of appreciating his efforts, everybody criticizes him and nobody loves him.

That is the official attitude, and well-informed observers here are more sympathetic than their fellow grumbler in other capitals. They agree with most of the criticisms reported in this series of articles by correspondents of the New York Times, but they think these criticisms must be evaluated against this background:

This is a time of extraordinary change. The strategy of the cold war, the location of the struggle, even the nature of power itself are all in transition.

British power has declined beyond all Washington's calculations.

The same with French power, only worse. German and Japanese power, which contained the expansion of communism in Central Europe and Asia for most of this century, has collapsed.

Since 1947, 2,800,000,000 people—half the population of the world—have changed their form of government. Most of them have achieved independence for the first time, and are struggling with misery and clamoring to be heard.

The post-Stalin rulers of the Soviet Union, allied to the might of Communist China, have changed their methods and the arena of the "cold war." Their tactics of wooing the Socialists in Europe and exploiting the anti-Western, anti-Israeli sentiments of the Middle East and South Asia are much more cunning than Stalin's.

The United States, engaged in a national election campaign, with underdeveloped areas of its own to worry about, is the only nation in the free world with power equal to the power of the Communists. And it is administered by a party that has a long tradition of opposing the collective security, low tariff and foreign aid policies it is now supporting.

CITICISMS HEARD IN CAPITAL

Against this background, what is the reaction of well-informed men in and out of the Government in Washington to the major criticisms reported in this series? This reporter has discussed them with 18 of the most experienced diplomats and officials in the capital. What follows are the major criticisms and a summary of their observations:

Criticism No. 1: The United States has been slow and ineffective in reacting to the smiling subversion of the Communists, and has placed too much emphasis on military solutions and not enough emphasis on political, economic and social solutions to present world problems.

Officials here reject this criticism. As a matter of fact, it should be said at the outset that the official line here is to reject almost all adverse criticism as ill-informed and unfair.

This reporter has not found a single official who has read all the articles. The Secretary

of State would make no comment about them, and the officials who discussed them did so on the condition that they were talking for background and could not be quoted.

However, the official line is this:

The military balance has not changed. The Soviet Union retains its objectives of world conquest and its capacity to attempt that conquest by force of arms. Therefore, someone has to maintain the military balance and oppose the drift in the free world to mental and military disarmament.

From July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1955, the United States net expenditures for foreign military and economic aid totaled \$51,300 million. It gross expenditures in the current fiscal year, ending June 30, 1956, will be \$4,200 million for the same purpose, making a total of \$55,500 million for the 11-year period.

The United States has maintained a high level of military expenditures for a permanent Military Establishment, based on conscription, without which nobody would have the freedom or energy today to criticize Washington.

ARMED FORCE EMPHASIZED

These expenditures since the Eisenhower administration came to power were: fiscal 1954, \$40,300,000,000; fiscal 1955, \$35,500,000,000; fiscal 1956 (estimated), \$34,600,000,000; fiscal 1957 (estimated), \$35,900,000,000.

The United States has emphasized military defense, because this is the primary deterrent to an attempt by the Communists to achieve their aims by force of arms. Maybe it has overemphasized this side of the cold war in the light of changing circumstances, but it has done so because of the natural tendency in free societies to let down whenever fear of imminent war declines.

At the same time, despite opposition in the Republican Party to foreign economic aid, the Eisenhower administration has made the following expenditures for foreign economic aid:

Fiscal 1954: \$1,300,000,000 (military, \$3,600,000,000); fiscal 1955: \$2,000,000,000 (military, \$2,300,000,000); fiscal 1956 (estimated), \$1,700,000,000 (military \$2,500,000,000); fiscal 1957 (estimated), \$1,800,000,000 (military \$2,500,000,000).

Moreover, officials here emphasize that by his atoms-for-peace plan and his insistence on dramatizing the peaceful rather than the military aspects of the atom, the President has produced the most imaginative nonmilitary international plan since the Marshall plan, and has been the first American politician to announce publicly that foreign aid has to be placed on a more or less permanent basis.

This, then, is the answer of the officials. The reaction of the non-Government observers to all this is that the administration was right in backing these programs, but that it was imprudent to emphasize them as much as it did.

MAJOR STRATEGIC DEFEAT

The result of this emphasis, these officials feel, was to damage the cause of the United States in Asian eyes by raising fears of war. They feel this worked greatly to the advantage of the Communists in the so-called uncommitted parts of the world; and that it was unfair to the peaceful objectives and great economic sacrifices of the American people.

Beyond this, many non-Government observers here believe that President Eisenhower, more than anybody else in the world, was responsible at the Big Four meeting in Geneva for encouraging the wishful thinking about the Communists his administration now deplores.

Almost all agree that he enjoyed a great personal success at Geneva but suffered a major strategic defeat. For it was there that the Communists really dramatized their policy and propaganda for peaceful coexistence, and got the pictures of President Eisenhower and Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin that

they scattered all over the world with General Eisenhower's public statement that he believed the Russians were as sincerely devoted to peace as anybody else.

Indeed, the fact that the Eisenhower administration is now turning around and trying to emphasize the economic, political, and social aspects of the world struggle is taken as concrete evidence that the previous emphasis on massive retaliation with atomic weapons was unwise.

Veteran diplomats here are constantly saying that history is full of evidence of policies that were good at one time and in one place but not so good or worse at another time and another place. They point to the North Atlantic Treaty as a vital military deterrent, which did much to create stability in Europe.

But they contend that Mr. Dulles' insistence on extending this same policy to the alliances involving Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan did not change the military balance in this area. These diplomats contend it resulted in infuriating the Indians, the Egyptians and finally the Russians, who leapfrogged over it into the new Moscow policy of economic and political penetration in the Middle East.

Criticism No. 2: The United States foreign economic policy has not kept pace with its policy of military solidarity, and the United States, meanwhile, has been urging upon its allies trade and political-union policies it is not prepared to adopt itself.

On this one there is little difference in Washington between Government and non-Government opinion. The Eisenhower administration is not happy about its policies on trade, ship subsidies or customs, or at least some members of it are not. The President, for example, favors a more liberal trade and aid policy.

One Cabinet member said to this reporter: "We don't have one foreign economic policy; we have 49 different foreign economic policies, some of them administered by one department and some by another. The whole thing needs to be pulled together."

He added that this should be done very slowly and carefully. His point was that the United States was probably approaching the fiercest competition from the Soviet Union, West Germany, Britain, and Japan since before World War I, and that it had to be extremely careful that it did not give away its weapons in this field.

As to the political-union pressure on the allies out of Washington, everybody here agrees that this is a good idea for Europe but out of the question, politically, here. Good idea but bad politics, Washington says. And, of course, that is what London and Paris say, too.

Criticism No. 3: The United States has been the prisoner of its own domestic political slogans in the presidential election campaign of 1952 and of the cold war slogans of liberation and massive retaliation thereafter.

It is generally admitted here, at least by observers outside the Government, that this is a valid criticism. The Republicans had been out of power for 20 years. They concentrated in the 1952 campaign, as all political parties do, on the weakness of the opposition. The best target in that opposition was that China had been taken over by the Communists during President Harry S. Truman's last term, and the Republicans set out to exploit this historic development.

In the process, they contended that this loss was the Democrats' fault, that the liberal New Deal, being oriented to the left, was soft on communism, that this was proved by Washington's half-way war in Korea, and by its policy of bridling Chiang Kai-shek, and its policy of "containment." This last was portrayed as a policy of acquiescing to the vast wartime gains of the Soviet Union.

Probably none of this was as potent in the 1952 election as the popularity of General

Eisenhower, the fierce antipathy among the people to the bloodshed in Korea and the general public boredom with a party that had been in power for a generation.

WARLIKE TALK CONTINUED

Nevertheless, the combination of all these factors broke the Roosevelt coalition of the Deep South and the minority groups in the large urban areas of the North. So the Republicans carried on the aggressive talk after they got into office, while at the same time cutting their economic commitments.

Thus, they unleashed General Chiang, threatened massive retaliation, and warned the French that if Paris did not accept the European Defense Community as a means to the political union of Europe, Washington would undertake an "agonizing reappraisal" about its whole policy of alliance with Western Europe.

At no time, however, did this administration ever have the courage of its propaganda. It soon leashed President Chiang when the consequences of unleashing him became apparent. It aquiesced in the partition of Indochina. It swallowed France's rejection of EDC, and when it took a hard look at the consequences of trying to "liberate" territories taken over by the armies of the Soviet Union and Communist China, it withdrew in a torrent of aggrieved rhetoric.

Nevertheless, it hung on to its cold war slogans about Communist China, put pro-Chiang figures in key positions in the State Department (Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, for example) and placated the bloc embracing Mr. Robertson and Senator William F. Knowland, Republican, of California; Senator Styles Bridges, Republican, of New Hampshire, and Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. These four leaders opposed any change in the legal status of China.

Thus the administration found itself frozen between its allies who wanted to recognize Communist China and its political opposition within the Republican Party, which wanted an aggressive policy toward Peiping. This compromise pleased nobody—not President Chiang or the Taiwan bloc in the party, or the Chinese Communists, or the Asian neutrals.

Criticism No. 4: The leaders of the free world coalition in Washington have no effective plan for waging the more subtle second phase of the cold war. They are inflexible and inexperienced moralizers who preach against the old pragmatic diplomacy of the past but have nothing practical to put in its place.

Again the Government officials reject and resent this criticism but the non-Government observers think there is a lot to it. The view of the Government officials is that the United States is between the acts in the great world drama, and that the critics should wait until the United States, which is a democracy that must move by persuasion and congressional consent, gets the stage properties in order for the next act.

It is true that after years of experimenting with planning boards at the State Department level, and at the Cabinet level, psychological warfare experts, cold war strategists in the White House, and the National Security Council, the United States still operates largely on a temporary basis, one crisis at a time.

UNITED STATES MUDDLING THROUGH

Washington put pressure on the British to get out of Suez without insisting on a quid pro quo. It was enamored first with King Farouk, and then with Farouk's two dictator successors, Gen. Mohammed Naguib and Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser. It took credit for settling the Suez situation, which is now creating havoc with the whole Western coalition.

It risked the defection of India to placate Nationalist China and Pakistan, and by getting itself involved everywhere on a mediator basis, found itself in trouble with the Arabs and the Israelis, the French and the Algerians, the Portuguese and the Indians (over Goa), the British and the Greeks, and the Turks (over Cyprus), and the Dutch and the Indonesians (over New Guinea).

Thus, say Mr. Dulles' critics, the United States has merely replaced London's "muddling through" with Washington's "muddling through," and has sought to please everybody and ended by pleasing nobody.

Much of this is laid to the Secretary of State. The general feeling here is that the President leaves almost everything to him unless it is an issue of peace or war, and that Mr. Dulles has a weakness for trying to please the side he is talking to at the moment, and a fatal flaw of talking and moralizing too much the rest of the time.

One diplomat, who is friendly to the Secretary of State, put it this way:

"It is obviously impossible for Mr. Dulles to please everybody or to follow a consistent policy in situations all over the world which are contradictory. If he would only proceed in a hardheaded way, and with a series of clear priorities, to do precisely what he thought was in the best interests of the United States, he would get along better."

"He wouldn't be liked for that, but in the end, he would be respected, for the selfish pursuit of a nation's interests is a reality everybody with any experience understands."

In summary, the general feeling here is that there is a need in Washington for a reevaluation of the United States cold war policies, and particularly its tactics and public attitudes. There has been a loss of confidence in American leadership. This much is widely felt here, but all knowledgeable observers go back to the big point:

In short, to be policeman, banker, and babysitter to a restless and changing world when the coalescing force of fear has been largely removed, is a tough assignment.

[From the *New York Times* of April 15, 1956]

THE UNITED STATES AND ITS CRITICS

During the past week this newspaper completed a survey by its correspondents of the impacts and impressions made by American foreign policy on free public opinion in five continents. The survey registered so much, and such diverse, criticism as to suggest a certain failure by this Nation, which prides itself on its advertising genius, to sell its own policy or to meet Soviet competition in this field.

Some of the criticism seems to us to be justified and well worth heeding. Some of it derives from emotion, ideology, or self-interest, but mere refutation does not solve the problem. All of it should be made subject to further analysis, deliberation and consultation with our friends and allies to correct faults, to devise remedies and thereby to strengthen free world unity.

Two central facts emerge. One is that the United States, because of its wealth and power, must assume primary responsibility for the destiny of the free world. The other is that, barring only occasional suspicions to the contrary, the United States is not being accused of any selfish ambitions for conquest or self-aggrandizement. On the contrary, our contributions to economic rehabilitation and military security are freely acknowledged, even if without gratitude in some cases or full realization of the contrast between our policy and the predatory policy of the Soviets.

Taking these central facts into account, the most common criticism boils down to this—that in contrast to the bold and even revolutionary policies represented by the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic alliance, which saved Western Europe, our policy

has become too static, too rigid, and even too timid to solve the world's pressing problems. Some of this criticism may sound strange to American ears, considering President Eisenhower's efforts at Geneva, his bold atoms-for-peace, open sky, and other disarmament proposals, and his pressure for an expanded, continuous, and more flexible foreign-aid program.

But the criticism is not directed against the aims of our policy, nor even its strategy, but rather, against our tactics. Here we are being criticized both for doing too much and for doing too little. In the eyes of Europe, especially its leftist elements, and even more in the eyes of neutralist Asia, we concern ourselves too much with the Communist menace, now said to be reduced by Stalin's death, and concentrate too much on military security to the point of saber rattling. Europe still values its alliances with us, but neutralist Asia fails to realize that only the protective umbrella of these alliances permits it to be neutral with impunity.

On the other hand, we are being criticized for not doing enough by refusing to take sides in quarrels between our friends and allies, which disappoints both sides; by failing to give adequate support to anticolonial nationalism and also to colonial powers seeking to suppress rebellion, which makes both sides mistrust us; above all, by failing to share both our power and our wealth even more freely than heretofore. Much of this criticism is obviously contradictory and cancels itself. Some of it goes beyond practical possibilities. If this survey makes some of our critics realize this, it will have served both us and them.

All this, however, still leaves room for improvement. We firmly believe that we are more realistic about the Communist menace than our critics, and we shall continue to maintain and develop our military power and our alliances to deter Communist aggression. But it is still a good maxim to speak softly when carrying a big stick, and to do that will prevent the Soviets from exploiting unwise remarks for the benefit of their "peace offensive." We will also have to develop new and more comprehensive programs not only for foreign aid but also for foreign trade, investment, and development to meet the Soviet economic offensive without impairing the interests or offending the sensibilities of other nations.

Such programs can be developed only in consultation and cooperation with the rest of the free world. But the initiative will have to come from the United States, and this fact confronts us with a task worthy of the best brains we can command.

VETO OF THE FARM BILL

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, President Eisenhower has again demonstrated the courage of his convictions in vetoing H. R. 12, the so-called farm bill.

It was with keen disappointment that the President felt impelled to veto a bill containing the soil-bank provisions which he himself had recommended. However, in deciding whether to approve or disapprove proposed legislation, all provisions of a bill must be taken into account, not just its good features. In the case of H. R. 12, the President found that the bad features of the bill outweighed the good, and he made his decision accordingly.

The fact that there may be no general farm legislation this year, as predicted by the majority leadership in the event of a veto, does not mean there will be no marked improvement in the farm situation. The Agricultural Act of 1954

is on the statute books, and has recently taken full effect. Under this and other existing legislation, it will be possible to do administratively many things to make conditions better. The President has already indicated what some of these steps will be.

Had the soil-bank provisions not been encumbered by other provisions which many of us consider to be unsound and actually income-reducing, and had the bill been enacted early enough, it could conceivably have made 1956 a record year for agricultural income. However, we may still look forward optimistically to a good year—a far better year than 1955. Producers of livestock, dairy and poultry products, feed grains, and basic commodities will all benefit by the programs which the President and the Secretary of Agriculture have already approved. Markets should be recovered and expanded for some commodities.

Above all else, the farm people may be assured that their administration is constantly on the alert for means to enhance the general level of farm income.

Like President Eisenhower, many of us still hope that Congress will decide to approve a sound soil-bank program not encumbered by barnacles of either defeatism or fear.

Whether this eventuates or not, however, we have reached the point from which the American farmer, under the inspiring leadership of a great President and his Secretary of Agriculture, may look to the future with greater confidence.

FARM INCOME AND SUBSIDIES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on this occasion it seems to me only appropriate that we consider some of the fundamental things the farmers themselves are thinking about. One of the fine publications in the western section of the Nation is *Western Farm Life*, which has just conducted a poll in regard to Government subsidies, limit payments, livestock shows, and farm income. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial showing the results of the poll.

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

WFL'S ACROSS THE FENCE—A SURVEY OF FARM AND RANCH OPINION IN THE INTERMOUNTAIN REGION

Government subsidies: Do you believe agriculture would be better off going it alone in a free market with no Government regulations and no Government payments in the form of subsidies?

Percent
Yes..... 56.8
No..... 37.6
No comment..... 5.6

Limit payments: Would you favor stopping all Government payments to farmers and ranchers who have a net income from all sources of more than \$5,000?

Percent
Yes..... 71.7
No..... 24.6
No comment..... 3.7

Livestock shows: Do you think the major livestock shows which are held around the

country are a benefit to the livestock industry?

Percent
Yes..... 77.4
No..... 16
No comment..... 6.6

Farm income: Do you think your farm or ranch income will be more, or less, or remain the same in 1956, compared with 1955?

Percent
More..... 14.2
Less..... 47.1
Same..... 33.9
No comment..... 4.8

Over 50 percent of the farmers and ranchers of the West, who took the time to answer a recent *Western Farm Life* survey, believe agriculture would be much better off going it alone in a free market with no Government regulations and no Government payments in the form of subsidies.

An Idaho farmer says the methods used by our lawmakers and the Department of Agriculture are not doing the farmers and ranchers any good, but keep getting us into more difficulties in every attempt.

An operator from Montana thinks subsidies and regulations should go. He believes there would be more competition and the inefficient operator would be forced to quit. And, better still, city farmers would be forced to quit because they would no longer be guaranteed a price for their commodities.

A Nevada producer says it might be tough on some for a short time, but as soon as the markets reached their levels everyone would be better off.

With labor and industry organized to protect their interests, the family-type farm cannot survive without subsidies, is the opinion of a farmer from Wyoming.

A Nebraskan thinks that we should not only keep our present subsidies but increase supports to 90-100 percent.

Nearly three fourths of western farmers and ranchers can't understand why the Government should pay subsidies to anyone with a net income of over \$5,000.

A Wyoming farmer says the big operators are running the little fellow out of business as it is without paying him subsidies. A New Mexico lady said she couldn't see why business and professional men, who own farms or ranches, should be paid farm subsidies when their net income is already well above the average farmer.

An Idaho producer can't see any reason for holding down farmers when \$5,000 is just a starter in many businesses. A Colorado farmer wants to continue large subsidies as long as other industries receive large Government payments.

A large majority of western farmers and ranchers believe the major livestock shows around the country are a benefit to the livestock industry. A Utah rancher says the shows encourage better breeding which in turn brings better prices to stockmen. An Arizona breeder says the shows give other people an idea of what better breeding can do for livestock.

A Colorado rancher doesn't think much of the shows because no commercial grades are shown and therefore shows do no good for the great bulk of the cattle industry. A Montana cowman says that in his opinion this is an altogether different industry than raising cattle for slaughter.

Most westerners feel their income will remain the same or be less in the coming year. A Utah farmer said besides the cost-price squeeze he is faced with a water shortage. A Nevada farmer says his income will be the same if costs remain the same. And a Colorado farmer says if his income doesn't go up it will be the first time in 7 years.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO
WEDNESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until Wednesday next at noon.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO REPORT
INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may be authorized to file its report on House bill 9390, the Interior Department appropriation bill, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may not be in session.

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

PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED
STATES IN THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL
LABOR ORGANIZATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

VETO OF THE FARM BILL (H. DOC.
NO. 380)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a veto message which is now being read in the House of Representatives, whereby the President returns without his approval H. R. 12, designated as the "Agricultural Act of 1956."

Mr. President, the veto of the farm bill can be described only as a crushing blow to the hopes and the legitimate desires of American agriculture.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, my statement will be very brief, and at its close I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. President, the President has now drawn a line which puts his administration without any ifs, ands, or buts on the side of those who believe that low farm prices are the answer to the agricultural problems of the day. Farmers are now—by the President's own decision today—completely at the mercy of Ezra Taft Benson.

In return for depriving the farmers of more than \$2 billion in income this year,

the President holds forth a bone. He says Secretary Benson will set price supports on the basics at 82½ percent of parity and increase the supports on milk and butter.

Mr. President, what is significant is that, after 3 years of falling farm income and after the Congress has debated the bill for weeks, yes, even months, the administration is finally going to use administrative powers it has had all along to help the farmers. And while it accuses us in the Congress of passing a farm bill which it says is inconsistent, how does it propose to help the farmers? It proposes to help them by raising price-support levels. The only difference is that the administration's price-support levels are not quite so high as are the price-support levels set by the Congress.

Mr. President, I do not believe our farmers will find that their very real and pressing needs are met by this compromise of principle. In effect, it is merely a rigid price support set at a level too low to be useful.

The President offers to abandon the principle of flexibility if Congress will abandon the principle of adequate farm income. This cannot be considered a justified compromise in any honorable sense of the word.

In the course of his statement, the President requests Congress to pass a straight soil-bank bill as soon as possible. This is a strange request to be making at this late date.

The President himself—by deciding to set rigid price supports at 82½ percent of parity—has already conceded that it is not enough to solve our agricultural problems. If he truly wants—or truly has wanted—the soil bank, he has had ample authority to institute one all along.

All he had to do under existing law is to request funds and go ahead.

I deeply regret the action the President has taken. It is not responsive to the needs of agriculture, but it is obvious that this administration does not want to meet these needs.

By his veto, the President has created a stalemate. I have talked to prominent Members of the Senate who are deeply involved in agricultural legislation.

They are not receptive to the prospects of another long, frustrating effort to compromise what cannot apparently be compromised.

Congress is seeking to raise farm income to adequate levels. The administration is seeking to keep farm income down. There can be no answer until one or the other is changed.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, while the message itself has been read in the House, or is to be read—I assume it is now being read—in view of the statements made by the distinguished majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that there may appear in the RECORD at this point—because the veto message is not long—the message of the President of the United States.

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

The veto message is as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H. R. 12, designated as the Agricultural Act of 1956.

It is with intense disappointment and regret that I must take this action. I assure you my decision has been reached only after thorough consideration and searching my mind and my conscience. Our farm families are suffering reduced incomes. They had a right to expect workable and beneficial legislation to help solve their problems. This bill does not meet their needs.

I am disappointed at the long delays which this legislation encountered. My first special request in this session of the Congress was for prompt remedial farm legislation. A sound, constructive 9-point program to this end was submitted on January 9, with an urgent request for action. It was a program that came from the grass roots. Suggestions and criticisms from large numbers of farm people, in every type of agriculture, from every section of the country, were analyzed and used. It offered no magic panacea because, we can all agree, there is none. It did strike directly at the root of the low price-low-income problem.

The problem is price-depressing surpluses. Excess stocks of certain farm commodities have mounted to market-destroying, price-depressing size as a result of wartime price incentives too long continued. Any forward looking, sound program to meet the needs of farm people must remove the burden of these accumulations. They are depressing net farm income by many hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

H. R. 12 would not correct this situation. It would encourage more surpluses. It would do harm to every agricultural region of the country and also to the interests of consumers. Thus it fails to meet the test of being good for farmers and fair to all our people.

The bill is self-defeating. The soil-bank proposal has been incorporated. This would be constructive, had it not been encumbered by contradictory provisions. The soil bank would provide an income incentive to farmers to reduce production temporarily so that surplus stocks might be reduced. Other provisions of this bill, however, would result in an equal or greater incentive to increase production and accumulate more surplus.

Among the provisions which make this bill unacceptable are: (1) The return to a wartime rigid 90 percent of parity supports for the basic commodities; (2) dual parity for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts; (3) mandatory price supports for feed grains; (4) multiple price plans for wheat and rice. The effect of these provisions would be to increase the amount of Government control and further add to our price-depressing surpluses.

Specific objections relative to each of these provisions may be summarized as follows:

1. Price supports at wartime 90 percent of parity on basic crops were in effect in each year from 1944 through 1954. They were not responsible for the high commodity prices and high farm income of wartime and the immediate postwar years. Prices were then above support levels, due to wartime inflation and the insatiable markets associated with war. Neither did 90-percent supports prevent prices from falling as postwar surplus stocks began to accumulate.

Price supports at wartime 90 percent on the 6 designated basic crops did encourage production of these crops relative to others. At the same time, consumption was discouraged and the use of substitutes was stimulated. Market outlets shrank and surplus accumulations mounted. Acreage controls had to be invoked, thereby rationing the right to produce. Wheat acreage was

reduced from 79 to an allotment of 62 and then to the present 55 million acres. Cotton was cut from 25 to 20 and then on down to the present 17 million acres. These drastic reductions, forced by the application of the price-support law, penalized many farmers directly by resulting in shrunken volume and uneconomic farming operations. In addition, acreage diverted from the basic crops shifted surplus problems into many other crops and livestock. Now almost every farmer is adversely affected, regardless of what crops or livestock he raises.

If wartime rigid 90-percent supports were the answer to the problem of our farm families, there would now be no problem.

Farm incomes have declined in every year except one between 1947 and 1954, and in all these years 90-percent supports were in effect.

Farmers are not interested in price alone. What they really want for their families is more net income, which is affected by volume and costs as well as by price. The 90-percent-of-parity approach focuses on support price alone.

To return now to wartime 90-percent supports would be wrong. Production would be stimulated. Markets would be further destroyed, instead of expanded, as must be done. More surplus would accumulate—and surpluses are price depressing. Regimentation by ever-stricter production controls would be the end result.

It is inconceivable that we should ask farm families to go deeper into this self-defeating round of cause and effect.

2. The provision for dual parity would result in a permanent double standard of parity for determining price supports. Four crops would receive preferential treatment out of 160 products for which parity prices are figured. There is no justification in logic or in equity for such preferential treatment.

Particularly is this true because, under the working of the modernized parity formula enacted by the Congress, increasing the parity prices of some commodities automatically lowers the parity prices of all other commodities. If parity prices for wheat, corn, cotton and peanuts are to be higher, then parity prices of the other products must be lower.

To whatever degree prices would be further artificially raised there would be a corresponding stimulus to production, more controls on farmers, reduced consumption, increased accumulations, and lower prices in the market.

Such a device for parity manipulations could destroy the parity concept itself. It places a potent weapon in the hands of opponents of all price supports for farmers. We have no right to place the welfare of our farm families in such jeopardy.

3. The provision for mandatory supports on the feed grains would create more problems for farmers. The market for feed grains would shrink as livestock production would come to depend more on forage and less on grain. The flow of feed grains into government stocks would increase and production controls would necessarily be intensified. Price relationships between feed, livestock and livestock products would be distorted. Producers of feeder cattle, feeder lambs, and feeder pigs would be faced with downward pressure on prices. An imbalance would develop between feed crops and livestock products, with all its adverse consequences.

4. The multiple-price plans for wheat and rice would have adverse effects upon producers of other crops, upon our relations with friendly foreign nations, and upon our consumers.

There are other serious defects in the bill such as certain provisions found in the section dealing with the dairy industry. Still other features are administratively bad and

would require the hiring of thousands of additional inspectors and enforcers.

I recognize that the restoration by H. R. 12 of wartime mandatory 90-percent price supports applies only to 1956 crops. This, in combination with other objectionable features of the bill, would put us back on the old road which has proved so harmful to farmers.

Bad as some provisions of this bill are, I would have signed it if in total it could be interpreted as sound and good for farmers and the Nation.

After the most careful analysis I conclude that the bill is contradictory and self-defeating even as an emergency relief measure and it would lead to such serious consequences in additional surpluses and production controls as to further threaten the income and the welfare of our farm people.

Because the good features of the bill are combined with so much that would be detrimental to farmers' welfare, to sign it would be to retreat rather than advance toward a brighter future for our farm families.

We now have sound and forward-looking legislation in the Agricultural Act of 1954. Neither that act, nor any other, can become fully effective so long as it is smothered under the vast surpluses that have accumulated. We imperatively need remedial legislation to remove this burden and enable the fundamentally sound program provided in the act of 1954 to become workable. Such remedial measures were proposed in my message of January 9.

I am keenly mindful that the failure of the Congress to enact a good new farm bill can have unfavorable effects on farm income in 1956, unless prompt administrative efforts to offset them are made immediately. Particularly the failure to enact a soil bank before planting time this year makes such administrative efforts imperative.

Consequently we are going to take prompt and decisive administrative action to improve farm income now. I have conferred with the Secretary of Agriculture and the administration is moving immediately on four major fronts:

1. In 1956 price supports on five of the basic crops—wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and peanuts—will be set at a level of at least 82½ percent of parity. Tobacco will be supported as voted in the referendum in accordance with existing law.

Within this range of price support flexibility, the administration intends to set minimum support levels that will result in a national average of wheat at \$2 a bushel, corn at \$1.50 a bushel, rice at \$4.50 per hundred pounds.

A separate support for corn not under acreage control in the commercial corn area will be announced at an early date.

Price supports on cotton and peanuts have not yet been announced but will be at least 82½ percent of parity.

The Secretary of Agriculture will announce shortly the details of the new cotton export sales program.

2. For this year the support price of manufacturing milk will be increased to \$3.25 per hundred pounds. The support price of butter fat will be increased to 58.6 cents a pound.

3. We will use Department of Agriculture funds, where assistance will be constructive, to strengthen the prices of perishable farm commodities. We will have well over \$400 million for that purpose for the year beginning July 1.

These actions, the administration will take immediately.

I now request Congress to pass a straight soil bank bill as promptly as possible. It should be in operation before fall seeding for next year's crops. It is vital that we get the soil bank authorized in this session of the Congress. There is general agreement on it. I am ready to sign a sound soil bank act as soon as Congress sends it to me. That

can be accomplished in a very few days if the leadership in Congress will undertake the task.

This combined program of administrative action and legislative enactment will begin now to improve the income and welfare of all our farm families.

Here is a challenge for both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, April 16, 1956.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not think anyone in this country believes the President of the United States desires to keep farm income down. There apparently is, as is the case with most public questions, an honest difference of opinion as to how the agricultural problem can best be met. But certainly, President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson have a desire to have an American agriculture that is participating in the national economy along with all other segments of the national economy.

The President feels that the piling up of the huge surpluses which have amounted to more than \$9 billion have been detrimental to a sound American agriculture. Great efforts have been made, and successfully so, to eliminate many of these surpluses, and such efforts will continue to be made by the administration, and, I hope, with the full support of the Congress of the United States. Only time will tell which procedure would be best for the Nation. I have a deep conviction that President Eisenhower has as vital an interest in American agriculture, and in seeing to it that the farmers receive a greater share of the national income, as has any Member of this body on either side of the aisle.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I deeply regret the action taken by the President in vetoing the farm bill. Heretofore, Secretary of Agriculture Benson has been blamed for the present depressed plight of our agriculture, but now the farmers of the country will blame the President. They have no other alternative; the choice was the President's. He has chosen to let our farm population dangle at the end of Secretary Benson's flexible noose.

As was pointed out by the majority leader, the President has found it necessary to repudiate the flexible price-support principle and has fixed, or will fix, administratively, rigid price supports on all basics at 82½ percent of parity, with the exception, of course, of tobacco, which will remain at 90 percent.

Mr. President, I am sure that President Eisenhower was not fully acquainted with the contents of the bill. It may be he was too busily engaged in playing golf at Augusta to give our bill the study and consideration it obviously deserved; and it is my personal opinion that he had little or nothing to do with the writing of this veto message. The veto message expresses in almost identical words the position heretofore taken by Secretary Benson. The idea of the President stating in his veto message that 90-percent price supports would increase production. The idea of the President blaming Congress for being slow in enacting a farm bill. Mr. President, the

inferences are both unconscionable. All acres for the basic crops this year have already been either allocated or planted.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held extensive grass-roots hearings for nearly 2 months last fall. We went to the farmers of this country. We took their views, and from those views we hammered out a farm bill which was reported to the Senate on February 10. Of course, the Senate was unable to act upon this report immediately. Why? Because a "recess" for Lincoln Day speeches had to be taken.

The Senate passed a farm bill on March 19. All during the Easter recess, the Senate-House conference committee worked to iron out our differences. We came into agreement on April 6. On April 11 the House and Senate both passed a conference bill and sent it to the President.

Now, he has vetoed it. Now, he blames the Congress for delay. He shall not evade the responsibility for his pre-meditated action by seeking to place the blame on Congress. If there was any delay, Mr. President, it was the delay of Secretary Benson to recognize the economic plight of our farmers. It was his consistent effort to raise farm income with rosy words, broad generalities, and partisan politics, instead of taking action.

As I have stated, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry began hearings last October, in order to be able to present a bill to Congress in January. As chairman of the committee, I invited the Secretary of Agriculture to send some of his experts to the hearings. He took advantage of the invitation and sent two men. The basis of the President's message to Congress on January 9 was those hearings. If they had not been held, the President would not have conceived the soil-bank idea. As a matter of fact, his Department of Agriculture was opposed to a soil bank as recently as July 7, 1955.

I am not here to blame anyone for delay; but, as every Senator knows, I, as the chairman of the committee, set a goal of February 15 as the date on which to introduce an omnibus farm bill in the Senate; I expected and hoped to have it enacted before March. I did not have in mind then that the usual Lincoln birthday holidays would take place. Because of them the Senate was delayed for from 10 to 12 days.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and also the House Committee on Agriculture worked hard and diligently on the bill all during the Easter recess. It was a complicated measure; our chore was not an easy or pleasant one, but we worked at it nevertheless. I regret, I repeat, that the President did not sign the bill we agreed upon. It was a good bill; I am sorry that the President relied upon his Secretary of Agriculture's judgment instead of asking a few dirt farmers for their thoughts.

So far as price supports are concerned, as I pointed out on the floor of the Senate only a few days ago, the inclusion of 90 percent of parity price supports was the only provision in the bill which offered immediate income relief to the

farmers of the Nation. Yet the President has vetoed this bill, he has cast aside 90 percent of parity in favor of 82½ percent of parity. How can the Secretary of Agriculture, who has already set the price support for wheat at 76 percent of parity, now raise the support level to 82½ percent? Such action is simply beyond my comprehension. If it is his prerogative to do so now, then the Secretary could have set the support price at 89 percent, 87 percent, or even 90 percent a long time ago, why has he waited until now to think about raising farm income, Mr. President? I simply cannot understand his proposed action except to assume that it is a calculated effort to forestall the inevitable political upheaval which will take place among the farmers of the Nation because of the action taken by the President—by his decision to toss the farmers a crumb instead of giving them their due. The President and Mr. Benson are obviously attempting to buy the good will of our farmers by offering them now, at this late date, 82½ percent of parity. This proposal, Mr. President, is a political sop and I think our farmers will realize what it is.

If the Secretary can now, by some administrative sleight of hand, raise support prices, raise farm income, then he could have done so a year ago. Think of the small farmers he could have assisted if he had chosen to do so.

The President's veto message states there are other serious defects in the bill, such as certain provisions in the section dealing with the dairy industry.

Mr. President, the provision to which he refers merely would have done by legislation what the President says he expects to do administratively in regard to the price of manufactured milk, namely, to raise the support price to \$3.25 a hundredweight. That was all the bill provided. There were no other provisions in the bill which affected the administration of the milk program; the sole provision was that which set the price support for manufactured milk during 1956 at \$3.25 a hundredweight, and fixed the support for butterfat at 58.6 cents per pound.

Here we have a pure anomaly—one typical of this entire veto message—in that the President has criticized the legislative provision affecting the dairy industry, while administratively he intends to do what Congress proposed to do in the bill.

The veto message criticizes the price support which would have been afforded the growers of small grains. I predict that with the 70-percent price support, which the President has heretofore ordered to be administratively fixed for small grains, the Treasury will lose many more millions of dollars than would have been the case if the bill had been signed—if our small-grain provision had been enacted. It is true that in the bill the price support for small grains was raised; but in order to have been able to obtain high price supports, it would have been necessary for the growers of the small grains to cut back their base acreage by 15 percent. They would have had to restrict their planting to 85 percent of their base acres in order to make

themselves eligible for price supports. But today the door is wide open. The producers of the small grains can grow all they desire, but the support price will be at 70 percent of parity. They get 70 percent on 100 percent or more of their base acreage instead of 85 percent on 85 percent of their base acreage.

I repeat, I cannot understand the President's position on this bill. I am confident he did not know what the bill contained. He was told, I presume, by Mr. Benson last Saturday that it was a bad bill. I am wondering why it was that the President did not seek advice from some of the Members of Congress of his own party, who worked hard and diligently on the bill; but he seems to have shunned them.

The President criticizes the two-price systems for wheat and rice which the conference bill contained. In order for the two-price wheat program to have become effective, a two-thirds affirmative vote of the wheat-producing farmers would have been required. There was nothing mandatory in the two-price plan for wheat. The choice would have been up to the farmers. The President has denied them that choice. I feel confident, as I stated during debate on that provision, that it probably would have been a long time before the two-price wheat program would have become effective, for the simple reason—and I am certain the President must not have been advised of this—that the program, if it had gone into effect, would have meant continued curtailment of acreage. Acreage would have been controlled, notwithstanding the fact that there was a two-price system in effect. Some advocates of a two-price system for wheat have fostered the plan as a means of planting all the acres they might desire to plant; but the bill as we sent it to the President did not provide for that unlimited planting.

The two-price system for rice was to have gone into effect automatically, but only on a trial basis. It was a plan which I personally discussed with members of the administration. They said that although they could not support it openly, nevertheless they thought, since there was so much talk about two-price plans for basic commodities, that rice was a good commodity with which to start the system. It was an effective method of giving the two-price-plan theory a trial run, so to speak.

The President suggests that Congress should enact a soil-bank program without delay. As chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, it is my belief that the President now has ample authority to proceed with some kind of soil-bank program under existing law. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to assist him in that respect all I can. However, there can be no justification for the President seeking passage of a soil-bank bill this year. The President said on April 4 that a soil bank could not become effective this year, even if one were provided in the bill which was subsequently passed, because of the lateness of the year. It is my belief that we can wait until next year for a soil bank.

I am very hopeful that there will be a change in the administration by that

time, and that we shall then be able to take the matter up on an effective basis. It is entirely possible that next year the occupant of the White House may be more sympathetic to an effective way of assisting the farmers of the Nation.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to ask one question, if the Senator will yield to me. Are all the things which the President says he and Secretary Benson are now going to do responsive to some suddenly discovered powers, or have they had such powers for the past 3 years and 3 months—powers which, if they had been put into operation, would have helped the farmer and have stopped the decline in farm income, which has been in excess of 20 percent under the present administration during the past 3 years and 3 months? Are they newly discovered powers, or are they old powers?

Mr. ELLENDER. The powers must have been available for quite some time, since they require no new legislation. They have been available for at least 2 years, since the passage of the 1954 act. What prompts their mention at this time, I shall leave to the Senator to judge. As I indicated a while ago, the price support for wheat was announced months ago as 76 percent of parity. Now, with all the surpluses we have on hand, the price is going to be raised to 82½ percent. I think it might require a little investigation to find out how the laws which are now on the statute books can be so manipulated. I myself would like to find out how it is possible to increases the support level of wheat from 76 percent to 82½ percent, when wheat is coming out of our ears and the storage facilities are strained. That is under the same law under which the support price was fixed at 76 percent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will yield further, I want to say to him that the Senator has a point there. I hope that, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, he will look into this particular matter and find out why nothing has been done for 3 years and 3 months by this administration to assist the farmers.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am going to try to get Mr. Benson, within the next 48 hours, if possible, to find out how he can do so, and if he can, why he did not help our farmers a year ago, by raising their income instead of relying upon a barrage of rosy predictions and partisan attacks to do the job.

I would also like to ascertain how he manages to square his theory of flexible price supports, which the President cited as one of the compelling reasons for his veto, with the fixing by administrative action of rigid 82½ percent price supports. Certainly the principle involved is the same, whether support prices are fixed at 82½ or 90 percent of parity. The only difference is in degree—and thus, in the amount of increase in income our farmers will receive next year.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, from his ivory tower at the Augusta Country Club, where he has been completely insulated

from the voice of the people, the President has again acted on the advice of little men who made his decision for him, and has vetoed the farm bill passed by the Congress. With complete disregard of the economic depression and threatened bankruptcy of millions of farm families, he has crucified them on the cross erected by Benson, Aiken, True D. Morse, and others.

The bill which Congress passed, Mr. President, provided the only available way to increase the income of the average farmer this year. It would have increased farm income \$3 billion in 1956 above the pitiful low of 1955. When men talk about the degree to which farm income has decreased, they should advise themselves of reality. They should disregard the myths being foisted upon the American people by the Department of Agriculture. The reality is that the take-home pay of the farm families of our country is down 40 percent in 3 years.

A few days ago in Oklahoma, Mr. President, representatives of the Federal Reserve bank district of which Oklahoma is a part participated in a panel discussion before a convention of Oklahoma bankers. The headline in a great metropolitan Oklahoma newspaper read: "Bankers Find Farm Income Drastically Reduced." I think it is marvelous that the bankers of that convention, after deterioration had been progressively in operation for over 3 years, finally found it. God grant that someday the President of the United States will find it, Mr. President.

The report of the panel of economists from the Federal Reserve district headquarters was to the effect that the average annual income of farm families in Oklahoma in 1955 was \$1,200, a decrease of \$1,000 a farm family in 3 years. That is the reality of the degree to which farm income has decreased, Mr. President. By Eisenhower's veto, he has imposed on American farmers an economic penalty which will result in still further declines this year. At the same time, all costs of business operations, including farm costs, are still rising, and national prosperity, other than for farmers, is at an all-time high.

The farm bill as passed by Congress would have increased farm income in Oklahoma at least \$75 million this year over last year. The veto of the President will drive it down below the level of last year. So, Mr. President, by the act of the President of the United States, he has imposed on Oklahoma farmers an economic penalty of a minimum of \$100 million for this year.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The figures given by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma are, in my opinion, conservative as to the difference it would make in the income of the farmers of the country had the President signed the farm bill. Most significant to me is the effect the action of the President will have on the independent farmer who operates the family sized farm. He was the type of

farmer I think most of the Members of this body were undertaking to preserve and save in passing the bill, so that farm income for such farmers could be stimulated and be brought back to somewhere near where it was at the time this administration assumed power in January 1953.

It occurs to me, Mr. President, one of the most tragic days the farmers of the Nation have ever known was the day President Eisenhower changed his farm advisers. He had some good advisers during the political campaign of 1952. He stated that the Republican Party was committed to 90 percent support prices for all the basics and that the party would make good on that pledge. In another speech in Minnesota he even indicated he would seek to get 100 percent of parity for the basic commodities. Somewhere along the line, after the election, the President changed his farm advisers, and brought gloom, despair, and, indeed, actual suffering into many farm homes. We should not forget there are more than 1½ million farm families in the United States—not farmers, but farm families—whose gross cash income is less than \$1,000 a year, who would have benefited by the bill. It would have enabled those people to hold up their heads and to be thankful they were American citizens.

Mr. President, I wish we might be able to ascertain the exact date when the President changed his farm advisers. Under the existing order of things, it will not be long until we shall be compelled, if we have any respect for the independent family-size farm operator, to build a memorial to him, because if present conditions continue he will soon be extinct. So I wish we could ascertain the exact date—in order that we might carve it on such a memorial—when the President changed his farm advisers from those who guided him during the campaign to those whose advice has resulted in the present change in the farm policy under this administration.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for yielding to me.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for his remarks. I would make one correction in what he said. He stated that the total farm income of 1 million farm families averaged less than \$1,000 a year.

Mr. RUSSELL. A million and a half farm families, Mr. President. We received evidence of the truth of the statement just this morning, in the Appropriations Committee, where a representative of the Department of Agriculture testified.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Let me say that I remember that on the floor of the Senate, 2 years ago, the distinguished Senator quoted from a report of the Census Bureau, according to which at that time the average cash income of one-fourth of the American farm families did not exceed \$1,000 a year. I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia if it is not a known fact that last year the income of American farm families was substantially lower than it was in the year to which that report of the Census Bureau applied.

Mr. RUSSELL. Unquestionably it was lower, and this year it will be much lower.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only will it be lower, but there will be a larger number who will have been brought within the lower bracket.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Georgia is eminently correct, and that development is a direct result of the policy of the present administration.

Mr. President, I wish we could learn when the President changed his farm advisers.

While we are having the benefit of eminent medical counsel in giving the people information about the physical health of the President, I should like to have eminent medical counsel find out, if they could, whether the President was mentally aware of what happened at the time when he changed his farm advisers. I do not know on what date that occurred; but I do know that April 16, 1956, will go down in history as the darkest day American agriculture has known during my lifetime; and when the obituaries of the present administration are written, let the record show that it was on that date that the economic crime of 1956 was committed—and committed by the hand of President Eisenhower himself.

Mr. President, it was in line with the policy of President Eisenhower's administration and his Department of Agriculture, that True D. Morse said, when speaking for Mr. Benson, "The marginal farmer must be eliminated." How successful the administration has been in doing that, Mr. President! The farmers know it, and they also know that this administration has been more successful in creating marginal farmers than it has been in eliminating marginal farmers.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the senior Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from Oklahoma stated that this economic crime was committed by the hand of the President himself. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator this question: While it was done by the hand of the President, are not the words of the veto message the words of his Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. KERR. They are. I say to my good friend, the Senator from North Carolina, that a little later I had intended to say something in that regard. However, I shall say it now: The Bible refers to the hand of Esau but the voice of Jacob. I wish to say that, this time, it was the hand of Jacob, but the voice of Esau. And with reference to the policy of this administration, it was declared on the floor of the Senate by the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], when the farm bill was before the Senate—as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 24, 1956, at page 3319:

The soil-bank proposal as written would permit some small marginal farms to be taken out of production altogether, and the owners of such farms would be enabled to take other jobs which would pay them

enough so that they could make a better living, and at the same time be sure of some income from the marginal lands from which they have been trying to make a livelihood.

Mr. President, the veto is in line with the announced and steadfast policy of this administration to eliminate the marginal farmers, to plow them under, for they have been here long enough.

Mr. President, there are those who say that Mr. Eisenhower has given up any hope of getting any farm votes, and wants to eliminate as many of them as he possibly can between now and the election in November. I wish to say, Mr. President, that he is eliminating them as productive units in our farm economy; but he is going to get the shock of his life when he receives the returns from their voting, next November.

A while ago the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] said he feared the President had vetoed the bill without knowing what was in it. I wish to say that I am convinced that the President vetoed the bill without knowing what was in either the bill or in the veto message. I would challenge him to hold a press conference and let the representatives of the press ask him what was in the bill and what was in his veto message. If that were done, I do not have the slightest fear that he would be able to give a comprehensive answer to either question.

Mr. President, I read these words in the second paragraph of the veto message:

A sound, constructive 9-point program to this end was submitted on January 9, with an urgent request for action.

He was talking about the so-called farm program which he submitted to the Congress.

Then he said:

It was a program that came from the grassroots.

The grassroots of what, Mr. President? The grassroots of what golf course? I wonder if that is where the President's farm message came from. Certainly it did not come from the grassroots of the farm families of the Nation.

I wish to say that that statement in the veto message is an insult to the House and the Senate and to the Agricultural Committees of both bodies and to every Member of the Congress who voted for the conference report on the farm bill. It is an insult to the 15 distinguished Republican Senators who voted for the conference report. I wish to say that any one of them knows more about the grassroots sentiments among the farm families of this country in regard to farm matters than either Mr. Eisenhower or any of the persons in the top echelons of his Department of Agriculture will ever learn. Furthermore, I wish to state that each of the 48 Members of the House who voted for the conference report on the farm bill knows more about the sentiments of the grassroots farmers of this country than the President could ever even conceive of.

Mr. President, I desire to state that the shock which would come to the President, great man that he is, if he were really to receive the information about the grassroots sentiment in this

country in regard to his farm policies, would be so terrific that I would even be uneasy about the health of the senior Republican member of our Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

If the scintillating brilliance of the truth with respect to the sentiment at the grassroots should ever penetrate the insulated walls of the White House, as presently occupied, the shock would be so terrific that the citizenship of this District would think that an atomic bomb had landed there and exploded. The President is allergic to sentiment from the grassroots, unfamiliar with it, and uninterested about it. He says in his veto message:

The problem is price-depressing surpluses.

Undoubtedly there is some degree of fact in that statement.

Excess stocks of certain farm commodities have mounted to market-destroying, price-depressing size as a result of wartime price incentives too long continued.

Yet by his veto of the farm bill he has increased that problem. He did not diminish it. The farm bill as passed had within it provisions whereby that surplus could be curtailed and future production limited. As the distinguished Senator from Louisiana so ably said:

the veto of this bill will not reduce the production of farm products in this country. It will increase it.

The President complains about the price support for feed grains and grain sorghums. The provision of the bill relating to them was the only effective approach ever made by the Government of the United States to bring about an equitable reduction of acreage planted to feed grains and grain sorghums.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Oklahoma that this is the best provision of the entire bill, from three standpoints: first, from the standpoint of bettering the actual cash price of feed grains; second, from the standpoint of reducing surpluses; and third, from the standpoint of making the soil-bank program work. We might add a fourth. This program would do more for the small farmer than any other provision in the bill. In order for a farmer to get the 85-percent supports for small grains he would have to put 15 percent of his small grains acreage under the soil bank. We would get more acreage in the soil bank under this part of the bill than under all the other provisions together.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct. What a tragedy it is that that information would come as such a shock to the President of the United States, if he were ever permitted to learn the truth of what the great Senator from North Dakota has just said.

On the third page of the President's veto message I find this language:

We now have sound and forward-looking legislation in the Agricultural Act of 1954.

Nearly everything else in the message disputes that statement. The action of the Congress disputed that statement.

Every farm family in America knows that that statement is false. The President, by his announcement as to what the Secretary of Agriculture was going to do, conclusively proved that that statement was false.

At the same time he vetoes the act of 1956 he promises to spurn the act of 1954. In the very same message in which he refers to the act of 1954 as "sound and forward-looking legislation," he sets forth in detail the means whereby he expects to ignore it, override it, and spurn it. Thus even a child would know that his statement about the act of 1954 is not sincere.

It has been proved false by experience, and that proof is pointed up and verified by what the President himself says as to what he and the Secretary of Agriculture intend to do in 1956, which does not conform to the act which he himself says is sound.

There is this to be said: The President acted with dispatch. If being on the golf course in Augusta, Ga., enables him to handle big questions as expeditiously as he handled this one, he ought to spend the rest of his term there.

Members of our Committee on Agriculture and Forestry worked for more than a year on the bill. They began intensive hearings last October, which lasted for months. They started extensive sessions when the Congress convened, which sessions lasted for weeks. The Congress debated and worked on the bill for months, and hammered out on the anvil of hearings, through the voice of the people, information from the grassroots, and debate in the committee and in the Senate, not a perfect bill, but a great bill. The President of the United States vetoed it in 15 minutes.

Distinguished Republican Governors from States in the agricultural area called and requested an audience. I understand from the press that they were at the White House this very morning. The President told them to come to the White House and he would talk to them about whether or not he would veto the bill. Yes, it had already been vetoed for days. Benson carried the veto message to Georgia. The press told us that the Secretary went down there to talk about it with the President. He went down there to give the President the veto message.

I see from the press that 15 distinguished Republican Senators petitioned the President to sign the bill. His reaction was about like that of a justice of the peace in Oklahoma in the early days. He had a case before him. The attorney for the plaintiff presented his argument. Then the attorney for the defendant rose and started to make his argument. The judge said, "Go right ahead and make your argument. Speak as long as you like, and say anything you wish to say; document it as you will. When you finish, you will find my decision in this top drawer, but I must leave now to attend to other matters."

The President is too busy recovering from one vacation and getting ready for another to listen to 15 Republican Senators or 4 Republican governors petitioning him with pleas from the grassroots.

No longer can any outraged American say that Eisenhower is not to blame for the farm policy of this administration, for the acts of Secretary Benson, and for the veto of this bill. Mr. Benson has a great many skirts. I shall not assert what shape they are in, but Ike can no longer hide behind them. The mask of hypocrisy has been stripped, and now he must stand forth in the full glitter of the shining truth that he is the implementor and architect of this farm policy. The nails that have been driven into the farmer's hands, the cross upon which he is being crucified, may have been furnished by Benson, but the hammer that drove those nails into the farmer's hands was wielded by the hand of Eisenhower. The hand that placed the crown of thorns upon the farmer's head was the hand of Eisenhower.

It would be tragic indeed, Mr. President, if the action of the President was the result of a conviction that he is against fixed price supports. However, he cannot even have that refuge for his action. In his recommendation for the Dixon-Yates contract, he proved that he was not against fixed price supports, or against 100 percent of parity. By his direction, the Atomic Energy Commission wrote the contract with the Southern Power group by which they were guaranteed 125 percent of parity for 25 years.

The Federal Reserve Bank recently again increased the discount rate on commercial paper, with the result that interest rates will again go up in every financial transaction in the commercial marts of this Nation.

Therefore, President Eisenhower is not against fixed price supports, and he is not against 100 percent of parity, as a general principle. He is against them only as applied to the American farmer.

I believe the most tragic domestic act of this administration was this ill-conceived, unwarranted, unjustified, and penalizing veto by the President of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this is a tragic day. Within a few weeks Republicans from all corners of this country the Republicans will meet in the State so ably represented by the Senator who is the acting minority leader at the moment, the Senator from California [MR. KUCHEL] and draw up a platform. They will send that platform all over the Nation, and appeal for votes for the Republican Party.

Mr. President, only the greatest optimist, I may say to my distinguished friend the acting minority leader, would believe a single plank in that platform. A man who will deceive you once will deceive you again. The Republican Party set up a platform in 1952, and the man it nominated for President of the United States, running on that platform, went to Kasson, Minn., and said, "I am for 90 percent of parity, and it should be 100 percent." Then on October 4, 1952, he came to the Field House of our State college at Fargo, N. Dak., and repeated that he was for 90 percent and that it should be 100 percent, and the farmers there believed him. Then he went to South Dakota and Iowa, and day after day repeated that he was for 90 percent of parity, and that it should be 100 per-

cent. Who will believe the Republican candidate? At the first opportunity the President has to make his word good, he reneges. What does anyone suppose the people will say to him, if a candidate makes such promises and does not keep them?

Why, Mr. President, only a short time ago the Vice President, Mr. Nixon, who had run with Eisenhower on that same platform, and was familiar with the promises made by the President of the United States when he was a candidate, cast the vote that broke the tie in the Senate against a 90 percent of parity provision in the farm bill.

Mr. President, the farmers are not as dumb as the leaders of the Republican Party think they are. Within a few days after Mr. Nixon cast his vote as Vice President, I received word that a big sign had been erected in North Dakota, and on it was printed, "He lied to us."

I do not have the least doubt that in the next campaign the Democrats will have signs erected in the farming States which will enunciate that same doctrine, and which will say, "He lied to us." It is a tragic day when the people of the United States cannot rely upon the word of the President or of the Vice President of this great Nation.

Therefore I say to the distinguished acting minority leader, "I do not care what you put in your platform. You can promise everything from the bottom of the earth to the top of the moon. Those farmers who have been lied to once are going to look askance at future promises made to the farmers of this great Nation."

I am happy in the fact that as the representative of the Abraham Lincoln-Theodore Roosevelt-Bob La Follette-George Norris-Republican Party, I have time and time again enunciated the doctrine of those great men on the floor of the Senate. Can anyone imagine any one of those great men, running on a platform and going all through the farming area and making a definite promise, saying to the voters, "Vote for me if you want 90 percent of parity, because that is what I stand for," and can anyone imagine having the candidate for Vice President of the United States follow in his wake echoing that promise, and then at the first opportunity either one of them had, breaking that promise made to the farmers of this country?

For the third time I want to tell the acting minority leader, the Senator from California [MR. KUCHEL], my distinguished friend, "You can have a committee from now until the day of your convention drawing up platforms and putting in paragraphs that may appeal to certain groups of voters in this country. They will not believe you, no matter what you put in your platform."

I had accepted an invitation to attend tomorrow night the dinner given by the Republican Party, which will be addressed by the Chief Executive of this great Nation. Mr. President, I would be ashamed to go there. The farmers of my State would be ashamed to have their senior Senator attend that banquet.

I wish to compliment the Republican members of the Committee on Agricul-

ture and Forestry, particularly my distinguished colleague from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. He fought very hard to make the Republican Party carry out its promises. Certainly, the veto of the President of the United States cannot be held against my distinguished colleague. He fought on the floor of the Senate and he fought in committee. He fought openly, and he even antagonized the Secretary of Agriculture in his fight for the farmers of the State of North Dakota and for all the farmers of this great Nation.

Mr. President, some of my Republican colleagues who voted for the bill which the President has vetoed kept faith with the promises made by the leader of the Republican Party, temporarily.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I simply wish to state once more that I believe a campaign promise made by a President or a Vice President during their campaign should be kept.

On that note, Mr. President, I close these remarks.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, first of all, I wish personally to welcome to the Senate the present Presiding Officer [Mr. WOFFORD in the chair]. I hope that during the time the present Presiding Officer remains a Member of the Senate he will derive the same enjoyment from his service here that I have experienced in growing degree during the past 3 years.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that the type of utterances heard on the floor to-day, in my judgment, are a little bit lower, a little bit uglier, than those to which I have been accustomed to listen in my days here. We are governed in the Senate by rules, some of which are a little loose, and I suppose some of which are ambiguous. Some, in my view are wrong. But they govern us. There are some regulations with respect to the quality of one's utterances, and, I think, implicit in the rules of the Senate is some injunction that one ought to debate free of rancor or bitterness, and upon a reasonably decent plane.

Of course, Mr. President, there is one precedent which was established a year or so ago when a majority of the Senate saw fit to censure a Member for some utterances he had made off the Senate floor. But, apparently, Mr. President, there are some things a Senator can do with complete impunity in the Senate of the United States. He can, it will be observed, revile the President of this free country, if he wants to, and, apparently, no rule is broken by his doing so. A Senator can obtain the floor and can be smirch and vilify and condemn the President of the United States because he goes to church. A Senator can use the rostrum, as has been done, to assert that the President is physically incapable of discharging the duties of his public office. A Senator can, apparently, under the rules, vent as much spleen as he desires against the Chief Executive of this country.

Mr. President, I thought some of the comments this morning on the presidential veto of the farm bill were almost frenetic, and certainly were fantastic.

I hurriedly wrote down one of the phrases of my good friend, the majority leader. The present national admin-

istration, so says the Senator from Texas, believes that low farm prices are the answer to the farmers' problems. That statement is so patently wrong as hardly to require denial. I think my good friend from Texas was a little bit overly inclined politically when he made that statement.

At any rate, I do not think anyone can question the fact that Dwight Eisenhower vetoed the farm bill because he decided that to do so was in the best interests of the country; and I do not think anyone can accuse him of trying to obtain the farm vote by the action which he took today.

My friend from North Dakota made some comments just a few moments ago, and indicated that the platform which will be written this year by the Republican Party will not be believed by the American farmer or by the American people generally. I do not know how many people read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any more, and I sometimes wonder if Senators are needlessly taking the time of the Senate in making comments in the Senate.

But let the RECORD show that in 1948, the Democratic national platform promised the people of the United States flexible price-support legislation for basic farm commodities. That was a solemn promise to the people of the United States. It so happened that in 1948 the Republican platform made exactly the same compact with the American people. President Truman was re-elected, and, to his everlasting credit, in 1949, he asked the Congress of the United States which was in control of the party to which he belonged to fulfill the commitment which the Democratic Party had made to the people of the Nation. It did not do it. It refused to do it. Four years later, Dwight Eisenhower asked a Republican Congress to adopt flexible price-support legislation, and it did.

Who on the floor is responsible in great measure for the fact that 2 years ago we adopted flexible price-support legislation? Mr. President, he is a great American. He is a member of the Democratic Party, and he was Secretary of Agriculture during the administration of President Truman. I respect CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, Mr. President, for standing up and treating American agricultural legislation as an American and in urging the Congress to do that which he had urged and which his chief had urged when the Senator from New Mexico was a member of the Cabinet. He helped lead the successful bipartisan fight for flexible price-support legislation 2 years ago, and the successful bipartisan fight against rigid price support this year in the Senate.

Mr. President, farm legislation is not going to be too much of a partisan issue in the coming campaign. When the other day we had an opportunity to vote for or against the conference report on the farm bill, most Republicans voted against it and a number of my brethren on the other side of the aisle voted against it. I think some of them will speak on the floor a little later on this afternoon. But let the record show, Mr. President, that it was a bipartisan Sen-

ate majority 2 years ago which adopted flexible price support legislation, and when the attempt was made in all its nakedness in this session to have the Senate approve 90 percent of parity, a bipartisan majority turned that down too.

Mr. President, I become a little tired of hearing some of my brethren call the President of the United States all kinds of terrible names. But, as I say, Mr. President, apparently that can be done in this great and august body. Senators can remain immune from any type of censure or stricture or admonitory taps on the back of the hand so long as they confine their epithets to the President of our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent editorial appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning, entitled "What Kind of Veto?" 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:

WHAT KIND OF VETO?

President Eisenhower's decision on the farm bill is extremely difficult because Congress seems to have left him only a choice of evils. If he should sign the bill, he would again write into law principles which he and a very large portion of the people (farmers, consumers, and economists alike) believe to be unsound. If he should veto the bill, it is said that he would deny the farmer any additional relief this year from what is admittedly a serious economic plight. No wonder the President is deeply perturbed by this dilemma. There is, however, another way of approaching the problem.

We think the country will not be satisfied by acquiescence in either of the two above-mentioned extremes. Despite the sharp division over support prices at 90 percent of parity, the country wants farm legislation. Specifically, it wants the soil bank embodied in the present bill. This is evident from the widespread support given the soil bank in both political parties and the almost complete absence of opposition, although there are many differing views as to its effectiveness in reducing farm production. If the President vetoes the bill, therefore, we do not think he should accept the assumption that no other farm legislation will be passed this year.

This newspaper has already expressed the view that a veto is desirable. But the veto need not be merely negative. The administration has extensive authority to alter price supports within the 75 to 90 percent formula now on the books. The President could raise basic support levels for this year only without upsetting the principle of flexibility, and he could make such action contingent upon the passage of a new soil bank bill by Congress. A simple bill for that purpose could be enacted within a week if Congress made the effort. The result would be constructive relief of the farmer's plight instead of mere political warfare to win votes.

To our way of thinking, such a compromise would be preferable either to the signing of a basically unsound bill or to a veto that would merely toss the problem into the lap of the next Congress. Additional aid to agriculture is urgent now. The President can return this unacceptable bill to Congress along with a powerful plea for enactment of the soil bank to which there is virtually no opposition. If the administration shows its willingness to meet Congress half way, we cannot believe that Congress would turn a cold shoulder to the only farm measure that has a chance of approval.

MR. SCOTT. Mr. President, the President has seen fit to veto a bill with reference to which we have met constantly in committee since last August, hearing farmers and groups representing farmers. Yet the President sees fit to help farmers in foreign lands to the extent of \$4,859,000,975, and denying our American farmers about \$2 billion.

DECLINE OF DRINKING AND DELINQUENCY AMONG NORTH DAKOTA INDIANS AS A RESULT OF A NEW INDUSTRY

MR. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Drinking and Delinquency Decline Among North Dakota Indians as Result of New Industry," published in the Lewistown (Mont.) Daily News of March 21, 1956.

I take great pride in calling attention to the role being played by the Bulova jewel bearing plant at Rolla, N. Dak., in curbing delinquency. Various hearings held throughout the country by the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency have shown the beneficial effects of industry in depressed areas through better living conditions with, consequently, less delinquency. I might point out that Senate bill 2663, on which hearings are being held by the subcommittee headed by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], provides for the relief of depressed areas through industry, and the Senator from Illinois has agreed with the Senators from Montana and North Dakota to include Indian reservations within the purpose of the act. If the results as shown in North Dakota are any indication, then initiating industry in depressed areas throughout the country should cause a great improvement in living conditions, and it necessarily follows that there will be less juvenile delinquency.

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

DRINKING AND DELINQUENCY DECLINE AMONG NORTH DAKOTA INDIANS AS RESULT OF NEW INDUSTRY

Drinking among Indians and delinquency among their children has been a much discussed subject in Montana.

Not that these problems are exclusively Indian—they're not, as everyone knows they also much concern whites, everywhere in the Nation as well as in Montana.

This editorial discusses drinking among Indians, and delinquency among their children, because of the remarkable progress that has been made in lessening these problems at the Turtle Mountain Reservation near Rolla, N. Dak., since the establishment there a few years ago of a jewel bearing plant by Bulova.

The company had been asked to come in to provide employment for idle Indians.

The Lewistown Daily News has taken a great interest in this plant because of the fine precedent it has established.

It has proven that Indians are able and faithful workers once they are given the chance. It has demonstrated that certain types of industry may be established, with much success, on or adjoining Indian reservations. It reveals that this means can be used effectively in enabling Indians to become useful, prosperous, and self-supporting citizens even though living on reservations

where there had previously been little opportunity.

Now there are two new and equally pleasing revelations as a result of the Rolla plant. Drinking among Indians has tapered off considerably, and delinquency among Indian children has decreased about 60 percent.

The authority for this startling statement is Clarence Johnson, sheriff of Rolette County, where the Turtle Mountain Reservation is located.

Since a letter he wrote on the subject is so revealing, and offers so much hope for the Indians if similar developments can be secured on or adjoining Montana reservations, the Daily News reprints the entire letter as follows:

ROLLA, N. DAK., February 3, 1956.

Mrs. STANLEY SAUGSTAD,

Minot, N. Dak.

DEAR MRS. SAUGSTAD: The juvenile delinquency on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation among the Indian people has decreased about 60 percent in the past 2 years. I have figures to this effect. I think the reason for these figures is the employment in the jewel bearing plant, which is located here in Rolla, N. Dak.

When John B. Hart, who is an attorney in Rolla and also executive secretary of the North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission, began working to get a factory of some sort for these people to work in, he had to make several trips to Washington, D. C., in order to get something built for them. After much work on his part, the jewel bearing plant was built in Rolla and it has proven to be the most wonderful thing that has ever happened to the Indian people in this area. The first year there were only about 60 people employed in the plant, but a year later an addition was built. I talked to Mr. Anderson, superintendent of the plant, and he states that they now have 136 employees, nearly all Indians. They expect to employ more soon. The starting salary now is \$1 per hour. It is a busy little factory; everyone comes to work at 8 a. m. Some bring their lunches with them and others eat at the local cafes. They also have some bus service and others drive their own cars to work.

We have about 5,000 Indians living on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation. Before the jewel plant started, we had all sorts of trouble. Things were unorganized and nearly all the Indian families were on some type of welfare help—either through grants from the Indian agency at Belcourt or through the county welfare program. This was all being done to keep them in existence, but the homelife among the people was getting to be a critical situation. There was nothing to keep the family together and because there was no work in the immediate area, the husband or wife could leave the home at any time. No one had any responsibilities in providing necessities for the home. Many homes were broken up this way, therefore it caused hardships to the children and quite naturally, it did not help the juvenile delinquency problem.

I have personally visited the homes of these people, both before and after their employment at the jewel bearing plant. I find that the homes are now more stable because of self-support and hard work. Although the salaries are not large, planning in the home is fairly good. They manage with what they get. For instance, the families take their children to a show once or twice a week and possibly to some other social gathering once or twice weekly as well. A certain amount of security has now come into the homes. I absolutely think there is less drinking among those who are employed, because they have their jobs to think of and they know they have to get up early to get to them. If, as in most cases, the wife works, the husband has to gather wood and take care of the household while his wife is away for the day. This works out fine. Before,

the children were left alone a good deal of the time. Much drinking and dancing was carried on in the homes until all hours of the night. The younger people saw all this and naturally followed the same routine, and as a result they would be constantly missing school.

I have noticed that since the plant was opened, the homes are in better condition and the people have better furnishings in their homes. This all has a lot to do with juvenile delinquency in as far as the parents now have taken back the responsibility of their families, which in my estimation, was their biggest problem to begin with.

The Indian people have received too freely from the different welfare agencies, and for this reason they have lost their sense of responsibility. I fully realize that the welfare agencies are doing a fine job in helping those who are in need of their services. But the point is this, when families are receiving assistance, a case worker is sent to their homes to survey their needs, to arrange for any medical program that might be necessary for different members of their families and in short, to solve all their problems for them. In these cases, they no longer have to think for themselves and that is why I feel that they had lost their sense of responsibility.

After these people become employed in places such as the jewel bearing plant, they have the satisfaction of earning their own money and they learn to manage with what they have. Therefore, they take over the responsibility for their families and create more secure homes. This has proven very helpful in controlling juvenile delinquency in this area.

I have been here over 3 years and have experienced what I am writing. Thank you.

Yours very sincerely,

CLARENCE JOHNSON,

Sheriff of Rolette County, Rolla, N. Dak.

There is reason for real encouragement from Sheriff Johnson's observations.

A better opportunity and life for Indians, a better break for their children.

Bulova deserves credit for its taking a chance and pioneering in bringing industry to the Indians.

The Indians on the Turtle Mountain reservation have proven overwhelmingly what they can and will do when they have the chance.

So here is an achievement—a guide as to what can be done on other reservations.

Carl Beck, of Indian Service, is working hard and efficiently on trying to secure other industries for Indian reservations.

He, and the program, deserve the support of all of us in Montana, and particularly in the communities near Indian reservations.

Indians and whites alike will benefit greatly from continued development along this line.

NOMINATION OF GEORGE COCHRAN DOUB TO BE ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

MR. BUTLER. Mr. President, I am honored to report that the Committee on the Judiciary this morning, by a unanimous vote, recommended the confirmation of the nomination of my good friend and fellow Marylander, George Cochran Doub, to be Assistant Attorney General of the United States in charge of the Civil Division of the Department of Justice.

I have known Mr. Doub for many years. We attended the same law school, from which we were graduated in 1926.

Before his nomination to be an Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Doub

served as United States Attorney for the District of Maryland. His work in that position was of such a nature that he immediately came to the attention of the Attorney General, who asked him to head the Civil Division of the Department of Justice, following the appointment of former Assistant Attorney General Burger as a judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2587. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes; and

S. 2755. An act to designate the reservoir above the Monticello Dam in California as Lake Berryessa.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1287) to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5265) to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOPER, Mr. MILLS, Mr. GREGORY, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. JENKINS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5862) to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FRAZIER, Mr. TUCK, and Mr. HILLINGS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7247) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gain in certain railroad reorganizations; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOPER, Mr. MILLS, Mr. GREGORY, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. JENKINS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10004) making supplemental appropriations for

the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. PRESTON, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. JENSEN, and Mr. CLEVINGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 6712) to amend section 1237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

MORALS AND ETHICS SURROUNDING LEGISLATIVE AND POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF CONGRESS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am reluctant to impose upon the business of the Senate at this time to discuss a matter which may be somewhat disconcerting to some Members of this body, particularly those on the other side of the aisle.

In the present atmosphere of concern over the morals and ethics surrounding both the legislative and political activities of the Congress, however, I believe it is imperative that the American people be told the whole truth about the motives which govern the statements and actions of those individuals in public life who carry the responsibility for providing inspiration and leadership in our governmental affairs.

It was my hope that men of integrity more clearly and closely connected with the incidents which I propose to discuss would come forward willingly to expose and condemn the abominable hoax which was perpetrated upon, and enthusiastically accepted by, the high command of the Democrat National Committee at the expense of the honor and dignity of the United States Senate.

Yet, to this hour, no voice has been raised in either explanation or apology. Not one person even remotely associated with this scurrilous effacement of political integrity has experienced a sufficient stirring of conscience to clear the record before his party and his country.

For this reason, I am presuming upon the time and patience of my colleagues to tell for others more properly qualified a story of deception which they will not tell for themselves.

Mr. President, the Senate is currently pursuing an investigation into improper pressures and influences upon Members of Congress. I am privileged to serve on the special committee which has been established to conduct this study. Perhaps, as a result of our efforts, new legislation will be devised to correct certain inequities in our election laws and to strengthen the safeguards against arrogant pressure tactics employed by those few individuals and groups who would create or defeat legislation according to the pattern of their own self-interest.

Notwithstanding the effects of our investigation, the principal question at issue is one of political courage and, as

I said in a statement at the time of my appointment to the special committee, we cannot legislate courage. So it is particularly appropriate, I think, that we turn our attentions now to this most recent violation of ethical conduct on the part of the Democrat National Committee.

Let me reiterate my reluctance to present the grave charges which are founded upon this episode. I know that many of my colleagues across the aisle—indeed, many Democrats throughout the country—are as repulsed as I am by such shocking evidences of political opportunism.

If we are to maintain the essential vigilance that is required for the strength and security of our political and governmental institutions, however, we cannot permit the ardor of personal loyalties to obscure our higher regard for truth and decency and the rights and freedoms of the citizens of our country.

The Members of the Senate, Mr. President, are disturbed over charges of bribery. They have rightly elected to bare their official souls in order to plug every loophole through which unscrupulous pressures might gain entrance to the legislative councils of America.

It is only reasonable, therefore, that they should be mightily concerned by activities of the National Committee of one of our two great political parties which not only come within the definition of bribery, but also involve an effort to defame the duly-established processes of the Senate.

I refer, of course, to the case of the United States against Paul Hughes, which was described in the opening statement of the prosecuting attorney as "one of the most fantastic schemes to make money in the annals of political intrigue."

The role of the Democrat National Committee in this sordid conspiracy—and specifically the part played by Mr. Clayton Fritchey, deputy chairman of the Committee and editor of the Democratic Digest—is so malicious and unscrupulous as to make even the most hardened and biased Democrat partisan blush with shame. Indeed, the fact that the righteous indignation of sincere and principled Democrats has not compelled them to protect their party's reputation from the vile implications of this offense is, to me, almost as astonishing as the incident itself.

Here was a case, Mr. President, which resulted in the defendant, Paul Hughes, being acquitted on two counts of perjury. The jury deadlocked on four other counts. Mr. Hughes is an admitted liar.

The jury which freed him apparently felt that the testimony given under oath by several witnesses was of such a conflicting nature that they did not know whom to believe. There can be no other conclusion as a result of the trial testimony and the verdict.

The facts of the Hughes case, mysterious and complex though they are, undoubtedly are familiar to most of the Members of this body. A detailed recitation of them is not essential to the present discussion. They are, in truth, only descriptive images which simplify our comprehension of the subtle pattern

of political treachery which engulfed the frenzied opportunism of Mr. Hughes.

Any examination of Deputy Democrat National Chairman Fritchey's clandestine dealings with Hughes must be weighed against the background of the official publication of the Democrat National Committee, which, at Fritchey's command, speaks to the American people in words purported to be Democrat gospel.

It is ironic that such a monumental blunder should be exposed to the light of public scrutiny in an election year during which our citizens will be particularly perceptive of evidences of political integrity. By their actions at the polls in November, as I am sure the Senators well know, they will express their conclusions as to which party they believe is best equipped—intellectually, philosophically, and morally—to provide the best Government for the United States.

They will be interested in the form and direction of persuasions employed by the candidates of both parties. Still more will they be impressed by the words and arguments which carry the force of truth and proof.

I am wondering how they will regard the uninhibited participation of Mr. Fritchey in the Hughes deception. Will this preacher of the new Democrat dogma cast a creditable reflection of character upon the candidates of his party?

I think not, Mr. President, and that is the reason I believe my colleagues across the aisle should heed the warnings of this episode with due alarm and precaution—just as they will undoubtedly be heeded by resentful citizens at the polls on election day.

No layman can properly evaluate the personality of Paul Hughes. Certainly, his unbounded imagination combined conveniently with his pathological addiction to lying to pave a broad highway for the achievement of his monetary aspirations.

The ambivalent routing of his prevarications leaves little doubt that the object of his labors was financial reward, and that he was burdened by no restraints of conscience in the pursuit of this goal. Having been rejected in the self-assumed role of an Air Force investigator desiring to give assistance to a committee of the Senate, he recast himself—with almost casual ease—in the character of a disgruntled employee of that same Senate committee who, for a price, of course, stood ready to tell all about the scandalous operations of that committee.

Naturally, when Hughes offered his services to the spewers of political venom in the Democrat National Committee, he struck the kind of pay dirt for which he had been groping. There was, at the beginning, an understandable skepticism concerning his qualifications; but the fanatic desire of Mr. Clayton Fritchey to realize the potential of this secret informer, this spy from the ranks of a Senate committee whose very purpose and existence he abhorred, quickly overrode any valid objections to Hughes or his "information."

Even when Hughes himself retracted a portion of his earlier biography, Fritchey refused to loosen his grasp on his new-found scheme to blacken the character of a United States Senator, a committee of the Senate and, ultimately, the Republican Party.

Fritchey provided Hughes with every convenience for the unfolding of his fabric of lies. Hughes, caught in the whirlpool of his demented ambitions and suddenly reaping the financial harvest of his mental images, continued to cough up his astounding allegations.

Perhaps the Senators were not taken in by such tales as that of the arsenal buried in the basement of their own office building, awaiting only the signal for an armed uprising in the corridors of the Senate. Perhaps, on the other hand, Mr. Fritchey honestly was. At the very least, the possibility was too real for him to abandon such fiction.

In addition to being paid by Deputy Democrat National Chairman Fritchey, liar Hughes was loaned a typewriter, property of the Democrat National Committee, and a dictating machine on which he recorded his phoney exposés. He was also, through the courtesy of Mr. Fritchey, given free access to the facilities of the Democrat National Committee.

During the time that Fritchey was listening wide-eyed—and believing with cash-backed astonishment—to the lies being peddled by Hughes, he was, in the pages of the Democratic Digest, pleading for truth and purity in political campaigns. He also reprinted, with obvious pride, a letter from Adlai Stevenson, in the June 1954 issue, which praised the publication for its "carefully documented information and its insight into current affairs."

We can be justified, I believe, in assuming that Candidate Stevenson may want to take another look at Editor Fritchey's outpourings as a result of the revelations of the Hughes trial. In fact, I suggest that "Candidate Anybody" on the Democrat ticket would do well, in view of the activities of the Democrat National Committee in this liefest, to view with face-saving apprehension the political contortions of this curiously motivated organization.

In all, Mr. Fritchey handed over \$2,300 to Hughes, and his friend Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., of ADA left-wing fame, tossed an additional \$8,500 in the till to keep Hughes' imagination well oiled so that the supply of scandalous memoranda would not dry up.

That Hughes also came under the sponsorship of the Americans for Democratic Action in the course of his sinister dealings with the Democrat National Committee was apparently a logical consequence of Clayton Fritchey's insatiable yearning to smear, by the foulest devices, the Republican Party. The fact that he pursued this ambition at the expense of the reputation of his own party and the United States Senate was obviously of no concern to him.

The ADA's Mr. Rauh, however, was not entirely satisfied with Fritchey's exploitation of liar Hughes. Rauh sought, in addition, to assist Hughes' recollections to the extent of directing him to produce

"evidence" to accompany his revelations. This "evidence," of course, was created from the same brand of fiction that guided Hughes' whole effort.

One does not need a crystal ball to realize that, while the activities of both Rauh and Fritchey with respect to Hughes were essentially the same, Rauh's ideological compass did not point in the direction of the Democrat National Committee. The goal of Mr. Rauh, and the goal of ADA, is the total revamping of the American system of free enterprise. Fritchey and his fellow apostles at the Democrat National Committee are ostensibly concerned only with the election of Democrats to places of leadership within our existing governmental structure.

Of course, as I have already indicated, Fritchey was so dedicated to his responsibilities in the Hughes affair that he was willing to join forces with Mr. Rauh, no doubt in the delusion that he could have his cake and eat it, too. Such was not the case.

We find, instead, that Deputy Democrat National Chairman Fritchey was not only an enthusiastic dupe as far as Paul Hughes was concerned, but that he also danced with naive grace to the music of the ADA and Joseph L. Rauh, Jr.

I wonder, Mr. President, how my Democrat friends in this body, and Democrat faithful throughout the country, feel about the quality of Mr. Fritchey's efforts in their behalf. I am sure they know that, notwithstanding the "individual" nature of his project with Mr. Hughes, he has placed an albatross around the neck of their party which no amount of hedging or whitewash can remove. The facts are here and they add up to as disgraceful a breach of political morals as this Nation has ever witnessed.

It has been suggested that what Mr. Fritchey and his contemporaries really need is fewer Americans for Democratic Action and many more Democrats for American Action.

In the clamor of this election year, I devoutly hope, for the sake of our country, that Mr. Fritchey and his immediate superior, Mr. Paul Butler, will harken to this advice. It would be a major step toward answering the unshakable challenge created by the Democrat National Committee's guidance of liar Hughes.

In his trial testimony, Fritchey repeatedly described the vigorous activity at the Democrat National Committee which accompanied the Hughes narrations. Stenographers, researchers, and secret messengers supplied from the committee staff, and acting on priority orders, participated in the project. Yet, Fritchey avowed that it was not a committee project, but rather his own "individual" effort.

Fritchey also told the jury that all the Democrat Party had was a deficit. Still, he was able to tap his own till, he tells us, and that of several committee employees, for sums ranging up to \$800, to further his private project.

This arms-length attitude of a stiff-necked virtue in keeping the project en-

tirely unofficial, led the defense attorney at the trial to conclude:

In other words, in effect, Clayton Fritchey, the individual, kept such information from Clayton Fritchey, the deputy chairman of the Democratic Committee, in effect?

To this query, the Government prosecutor appropriately commented:

That is a pretty hard question to answer.

The disgusting moral tone of the project and the corrupt principles which actuated Fritchey to cast his lot with Hughes were revealed in open court.

The defense attorney asked Mr. Fritchey concerning his encounter with Hughes:

When you arranged to meet him, you had information which would lead you to believe that he was closely associated with Senator McCARTHY and that you might be able to have a spy in the Senator's camp, right?

Mr. Fritchey answered:

Yes.

The defense counsel continued:

And that didn't disturb you any, did it, that you should have a spy in the Senator's camp?"

Mr. Fritchey said:

Well, I would say that if this had resulted in his being able to prove the charges that he was making and to demonstrate to the public that a senior official of the Government was corrupting the Government, I would have considered it a signal public service.

Defense counsel asked:

In other words, the means would justify the end?

Mr. Fritchey replied:

Correct.

Now, Mr. President, that answer by Mr. Fritchey points up vividly the whole paradox of this affair. We find the tacitly self-righteous Deputy Democrat National Chairman actively condoning the use of spies, subterfuge, and secret informers which, out of the other side of his mouth, he condemned as a part of the so-called "terrible tactics" of the Senator whom he sought to crucify.

We should remember, too, that the loudest anti-McCarthy criticism by the likes of Mr. Fritchey and Mr. Rauh followed the line: "We approve of his objectives, but we don't like his methods." In other words, the tactics ascribed to Senator McCARTHY by his left-wing antagonists did not justify the patriotic aims of Senator McCARTHY; but, when employed by these shining knights of the Democrat National Committee and the ADA, in a morally deceptive affair of political chicanery, they constituted, in Mr. Fritchey's own words, "a signal public service."

I would remind the Senators, also, of the analogy given by the junior Senator from Wisconsin in answer to the critics of his "methods" in ferreting out Communists. He said—and we all remember it—"You can't go skunk-hunting in a high silk hat."

How much more noble and truthful it would have been for Fritchey and Rauh—second to none among the "Mc-

CARTHY haters"—to have applied a similar admission to the object of their detestable assaults. Surely, being on the opposite side of the political and ideological fence from Senator McCARTHY, they hold no less contempt for him than he evidences for the cause which they—unwittingly, of course—support.

Continuing with the Defense Counsel's cross examination of Deputy Democrat National Chairman Fritchey, we find this question:

Do you recall whether Hughes at any time expressed any opinions which caused you seriously to doubt his ethics or morality?

Mr. Fritchey replied:

No, not one single thing, no.

No comment of mine upon this answer could speak as eloquently or decisively as the following excerpt from a December 1953 memorandum from Hughes to Fritchey which was an exhibit, and part of the evidence, in the trial:

Phone taps can be utilized (against McCARTHY) * * * Don't discount the tremendous value in just bargaining power of recorded phone discussions.

The memorandum continued:

A program of this type, although not nice, can result in harm to no one except (McCARTHY) * * * As mentioned earlier, being nice, too ethical, or squeamish, will accomplish less than nothing, where McCARTHY is concerned. McCARTHY has stated many times, "Ethics went out the window with button shoes." So therefore I don't see the necessity for us to send a boy to do a man's work. If both Federal and civil law-enforcement agencies use the same unethical procedures to bring to justice criminals, are we not justified in using similar methods to expose (McCARTHY) * * *? It is most easy to prove and document (McCARTHY's guilt) by relaxing somewhat on ethics. This is probably what I'm best suited for.

There, Mr. President, in one brief quotation, is revealed the shocking issue in this discussion: Paul Hughes, admittedly a liar and self-professed expert on unethical procedures, received payment from an official of the Democrat National Committee to supply that official with false and defamatory information concerning a duly elected Member of the United States Senate in the performance of his official and patriotic duties.

At another point in the trial the Defense Counsel asked Mr. Fritchey:

Did you ever attempt to check with anybody, Mr. Fritchey, on the authenticity of any of the material that was given you?

To this Fritchey replied:

No; I don't think * * * Not beyond our own scrutiny of it.

At another time during the trial Mr. Fritchey said that he had taken some of the material Hughes gave him to a notary and made an affidavit that he had received it from Hughes "before a certain date."

The defense counsel asked in this regard:

Now, you said that you had taken certain of these transcriptions and those typed things to a notary so as to indicate that you had received them before a certain date, right?

Mr. Fritchey:

Correct.

Defense attorney:

Did you ever suggest taking Hughes along so he could swear that they were true before the same notary?

Mr. Fritchey:

No.

It is, indeed, a sordid tale. Clayton Fritchey is the Deputy Chairman of the Democrat National Committee. He is the editor of the Democratic Digest, which is sold on newsstands and sent through the mails to subscribers. He is the Democrat National Committee's principal "seeker after the truth."

Yet, Mr. President, the facts of the Hughes case prove beyond any reasonable doubt that Clayton Fritchey is either a blind fool or one of the most unscrupulous and unethical political beavers in the history of our country. He may be all of one or all of the other, or he may be a little bit of both. In any case, he is certainly a questionable pace-setter for loyal Democrats of principle and integrity.

In summing up the case to the jury the defense counsel, Mr. Erdmann, had this to say about Mr. Fritchey:

The first man or major witness that I want to discuss, although he was called somewhat late in the proceeding, is Clayton Fritchey because, as the defendant contends and we urge, Clayton Fritchey was in at the beginning.

The Hughes case, then, clearly and unquestionably, involves an attempt to discredit a committee of the United States Senate—not to discredit it legitimately, but, rather, to do it with a mountain of scandalous and fabricated information and with the sponsorship of sworn enemies of congressional efforts to expose the Communist conspiracy.

We have here a secret informer being paid for double-crossing his alleged employer. In this, I see bribery in its most flagrant form.

We have here under-the-table payments in cash for the most absurd batch of lies ever concocted.

We have here a working arrangement between the Democrat National Committee and the leader of the leftwing Americans for Democratic Action.

Are not my Democrat colleagues in the Senate concerned about this deplorable episode? Is Mr. Fritchey really the kind of man my friends on the other side of the aisle wish to have superintending the activities of their national political organization and conducting its public relations? Does the Democrat candidate for President in 1956, whoever he may be, wish to come before the American people and ask their confidence with this monstrous deception hovering above his head?

Perhaps Mr. Paul Butler, the quite vocal chairman of the Democrat National Committee has not had the time to read the trial testimony that is available to him. Certainly, to this hour, he has attempted no explanations or apologies for the actions of Clayton Fritchey, his deputy. Perhaps Mr. Butler has not even availed himself of the opportunity

of reading the press comments on this fiasco. His silence implies either shame or ignorance. If he is not aware of what has been going on in the ranks of his committee staff, or if he is not concerned about the consequences of the Hughes hoax, he is surely laying the political integrity of a great political organization on the block of public censure.

It would seem on the surface to be an unnecessary gesture to call to the attention of the Democrat national chairman this case of the secret informer and his financial mentor and guiding angel, Mr. Fritchey.

It is the job of the Democrat Party to police its own house. It owes that much to the American people and to its faithful partisans throughout the country.

Perhaps, on the other hand, Mr. President, Mr. Butler's silence is of greater shame than we suspect. Perhaps Mr. Fritchey's influence inside the councils of the Democrat Party weighs more heavily upon Democrat policy than has yet been admitted publicly.

After all, Mr. Butler himself has never shown any aversion to the application of highhanded political tactics. This was clearly demonstrated by his brazen suggestion that legislation, however discriminatory, should be pushed in the Congress to aid in the election of Democrat Senators and Representatives in areas where appropriations for the expenditure of Federal funds on public projects would endear the proponents of such measures to the voters of the affected States. In other words, like Mr. Fritchey, Mr. Butler seems to regard the function of Congress as purely a political one. He mentions, for instance, that the Niagara bill is of "tremendous importance to the reelection of Senator LEHMAN," and that the \$500 million Federal plan for Hells Canyon should be passed, since it will be "a vital factor in the reelection of Senator MORSE and Representative EDITH GREEN."

Mr. President, it could be that I have misjudged Chairman Butler, but in view of the proven tendencies of his under-study, Mr. Fritchey, I find this comparative speculation worthy of the closest scrutiny by the American people.

What I should like to leave with the Senate, in concluding this discussion, Mr. President, is this question: Does the "cops and robbers" technique of Deputy Chairman Fritchey constitute the Democrat National Committee's answer to its search for issues in the coming campaign? If it does, then I suggest that the choice before the American voters in this election year will be distinctly one of political courage and integrity. Indeed, Chairman Butler and his committee need look no further for an issue for their campaign. Mr. Fritchey has provided a classic one, and, by his silence, Mr. Butler has endorsed it.

It will be interesting to observe how my Democrat colleagues respond to this challenge, which, though inspired by their own national committee, will be hurled at them by an aroused citizenry during the coming months.

I hope, Mr. President, that the perpetrators of this intrigue will find their punishment in the wrath of men of char-

acter and integrity within the Democrat Party.

It is disturbing, however, even to a Republican, to consider that such punishment might overflow its banks and swamp the service of those Members on the other side of the aisle who are themselves innocent of this blight upon the record of their party.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to take about 30 seconds to thank the very able Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] for the comments he has made today regarding the Hughes case.

I wish he had gone a bit further and had discussed the part the Washington Post took in this case. The Washington Post, which has been criticizing the methods of McCARTHY, took part in this payment and took part in this conspiracy—Wiggins, Friendly, and Murrey Marder. I think Marder was less responsible than were Wiggins and Friendly. Wiggins certainly took a major part in the conspiracy. And up to this time they have not apologized. They have not admitted their part in the conspiracy, even though it has been proven in court that they took a major part in it—one of the most irresponsible acts on the part of a newspaper that I have seen.

I again thank the very able Senator from Arizona for his discussion of this case.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish the Senator from Wisconsin had been in the Chamber when I had the floor and was making my short speech. I wish to tell the Senator from Wisconsin that I have heard—in fact, I have read—something of the implication of the various newspapers in this dastardly plot with Mr. Fritchey and Mr. Rauh. I did not feel I knew enough about it, from the evidence I was able to see, to speak competently on the floor about it. I suggest, therefore, that if the case can be further developed, certainly it would be enlightening to the people of America to have the Senator from Wisconsin discuss the newspaper angle. I wish I had felt competent enough to do it, but I did not desire to explore in that area—an area about which I knew so little.

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope the Attorney General's office will go into that case and procure indictments of those engaged in the conspiracy. If the Senator or I had been guilty of what these men did, we would have been indicted long since. I think there is a very definite duty on the part of the Attorney General to act as I have suggested.

VETO OF THE FARM BILL

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the veto message of the President of the United States on the farm bill, which I strongly approve, presumably brings an end to one of the hardest legislative fights, in which the greatest difference of opinion was manifested, in connection with any issue which has been decided by the Congress in recent years.

In order that the Record may clearly reflect how keen was this difference, both in committee and elsewhere, I wish to recite a few facts at this time.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry consists of 15 members, 8 of us being Democrats and 7 Republicans. On the issue which became perhaps the dominant issue as the bill was considered, the issue of the restoration of the 90 percent rigid price supports, the committee divided 8 to 7. Not only was that division in the committee as close as it could possibly be, but the members of the committee on both sides of the table were as evenly divided as it was possible for them to be and still leave an 8-to-7 vote on this particular issue. As to the Republican members of the committee, sitting on the opposite side of the table from myself, they were divided 4 against the restoration of rigid price supports and 3 in favor of restoration. As to the Democratic members of that committee, we were divided 5 to 3, that is, 5 for the restoration of rigid high level price supports and 3 against that issue.

Not only was that close division found in our committee, but likewise, in the conference committee, the representatives from the Senate were divided on this issue as evenly as they could be, that is, 3 to 2.

I invite attention to these facts at this time preliminary to saying that I was present much of the time at all stages of the debate in the field, in the committee, and in the conference committee, as this measure was heard and determined. I wish to say for the record that I do not believe any member of the committee, or of the conference committee, changed his mind in the slightest upon this particular issue, and upon most other vital farm issues, throughout nearly a year of discussion. Apparently the conviction of the Members was very deep.

So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to accord to Senators who did not feel as I do, the depth of conviction and the soundness of conscience which I hope they will accord to me. The difference of opinion was very real. The depth of conviction was very great. There was not a single change of position in this important field during the course of the hearings, the debate, and the conference.

I have made these statements preliminary to the making of another which it seems to me hardly needs to be made, and that is that I think those members of our committee and those Members of the Senate and House who attributed to the President of the United States a smaller degree of conviction and a lesser degree of courage than they themselves had were wrong from the beginning. They should have known from the beginning, and particularly in these closing weeks, that the attitude of the President would be exactly as he has stated it in his veto message. Any other conclusion than that would leave us in the position of claiming for ourselves some exalted height of conscientious determination and conviction which we were not willing to accord as being present in the mind and heart of the President of the United States. From the very beginning

it has seemed to me, we would necessarily stand on unsound ground if we assumed that the President by reason of the force of pressure, would change what he had long shown to be his very deep conviction and would approve the bill.

The nonpartisan or bipartisan nature of the support of the bill showed up throughout the debates, both in the committee and in the conference, and was reflected by the votes upon the floor of the Senate. I wish the record now to show that upon the final vote on the conference report 10 Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle showed their continuing disapproval of the measure. I have searched in the press in vain for any indication that more than four Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle failed to approve the conference report.

The records of the Senate show very clearly that four Members of the Senate who are Democrats voted against the conference report, namely, the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the senior Senator from Florida, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. But the records show with equal clarity that 4 Members of the Senate who sit on this side of the aisle, and who, I think, are as sound Democrats as any we have, paired in such a way as to show their continuing and unalterable opposition to the conference report, those 4 being the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Unfortunately two Members of the Senate who sit on this side of the aisle could not be present for the final vote. One was recovering from surgery in Bethesda, and the other was absent in the course of his campaign for reelection. Those two Senators, namely, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and my own distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], saw to it that their position of opposition to the conference report was shown on the RECORD of the Senate where all might see it, not only that day, as did those who heard the sound of the yeas and nays, but throughout the history of this Nation.

In addition to those 10 on this side of the aisle who clearly showed their continuing opposition to this measure, there were 3 other Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle who, for reasons sufficient to themselves—and I honor those reasons—felt, when the conference report was submitted, good as it was in part, and bad as it was in part, that they preferred, in weight, the good values, and therefore voted for the conference report. The same three Members of the Senate, who sit on this side of the aisle, by repeated votes during the course of the debate and the development of this measure, had shown their opposition to rigid price supports, and to many of the other objectionable features of the bill. The three Senators to whom I refer are the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the junior Senator from Dela-

ware [Mr. FREAR], and the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I wish that fact to show upon the RECORD because, notwithstanding all the talk of politics which has entered into the consideration of this measure since the conference report reached the floor—and I think there are abundant evidences to justify the charge of politics, at least since that time—I want it to be clear from the RECORD that there were men who, for one reason or another, satisfactory to themselves, felt that it was their duty to vote, in soundness of conscience and in depth of conviction, in favor of the conference report, although they had voted against certain provisions which were contained in it during the debate when those individual issues were presented.

I return to the position I took a while ago, and say again that, with all the depth of conviction and soundness of conscience that were shown during the debate, and with the unwillingness of any member of the committee—divided, as it was, 8 to 7, and divided as evenly as it could be on both sides of the table—to change his position upon these critical issues, I think those who jumped to the conclusion that the President of the United States, when the bill reached him, would display a poorer conscience and a weaker conviction than they themselves had evidenced were bound to be disappointed. I believe that anyone who has thought for weeks that the President of the United States would do anything else than he has done was leaning on the weakest kind of a reed, and based his opinion largely on wishful thinking.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator no doubt has had occasion to recall the statement the President made in Brookings, S. Dak., when he referred expressly to a pledge to maintain 90 percent of parity support for the basic commodities. The Senator from Florida never made such a statement, but I am sure he will agree that any man who makes that kind of pledge should keep his promise.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the first place, I was not present at Brookings. In the second place, I was not following with great interest the statements made by the then candidate of the Republican Party, because I was not supporting him. Furthermore, I have heard from many sources that the statement which the present President of the United States made at that time differed in some detail from the statement which has been mentioned by the Senator from Louisiana. I repeat, I was not present, and what I say is based on hearsay, but my understanding was that the present President and the then candidate of the Republican Party said his party was committed to the temporary 90-percent price support that was then provided in the law on the statute books, and that he wanted to make it clear that he would stand by that commitment until the provision expired.

However, I certainly do not wish to argue the point with the Senator from Louisiana, because neither he nor I was

present on the occasion when the statement was made. Fine lawyer that the Senator from Louisiana is, he realizes that we would be on unsound ground to argue the matter. Besides that, I do not believe that either of us is interested either in besmirching the character of our President or in upholding his every statement, because his statements will have to stand on the record.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to say that the statements the present President of the United States made, when he was campaigning in Kasson, Minn., and also in Columbia, S. C., showed that those statements left no doubt, as I am sure the Senator from Florida will agree, that the candidate would support the 90 percent of parity program. That being the case, some of us were certainly entitled to rely upon a statement made on at least three occasions by the candidate. Perhaps we should not believe what a man says while he is a candidate. However, certainly some of us had reason to hope that he would keep his promise.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would neither defend nor decry the position taken by the President of the United States. I certainly was not present when he made either one of the statements to which the Senator has referred. However, I call the attention of my good friend to the fact that there are areas in this Nation which have not supported rigid price supports and have strongly favored flexible supports, but they nevertheless strongly supported the President. Therefore there could not have been much understanding on their part that that was the candidate's position.

However, I go back to what I said—and I think it will hold up, and that it cannot be broken down—that the men who were claiming for themselves the right to stand by their convictions—and not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry changed his position on this important issue—were standing on unsound ground when they assumed that the President of the United States would follow any different course than he followed today, since repeatedly, in the course of the last year, he had stated his conviction that high rigid price supports had contributed very greatly to the building up of farm surpluses and to the disastrous condition in which agriculture finds itself. Certainly I have not heard anything even remotely indicating that he was sliding from that conviction.

I believe that my friend from Louisiana and other Senators—and I have the highest respect for them—who felt that the President of the United States, despite his conviction and the dictates of his conscience, would do other than what he did today, were standing on shifting sand. I say that because the President had repeatedly stated that he was going to stand up to his conviction, in spite of various efforts in different parts of the Nation, by men who wanted high rigid price supports, who threatened political reprisal if the President failed to support them. One of them, as I recall, the President of the National Farmers Union, went so far as to deliver to the press, before it was received by

the President or the United States, a very insulting and derogatory telegram, which, if anything had been needed to sustain the President of the United States in the firmness of his conviction, would have served to do so.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like first to continue my comments on this point and to yield further to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I wonder whether the Senator believes that some of us stood on unsound ground when we thought the President would sign the natural gas bill, which he vetoed, even though he said it was a good bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not know too much about that, or as much as some of my distinguished friends know about it, particularly those Senators who are lucky enough to have natural gas deposits in their States. I should also like very much to have it appear in the Record that I do not put forth as much gas on the floor of the Senate, but I am afraid that I could not truthfully say that. [Laughter.]

Let me say on that issue that a great diversion came up which created in some minds, though not in mine, the fear that perhaps there was general corruption, so to speak, behind the efforts of some of those who were urging the passage of the natural gas bill. I voted with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for its passage.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum? While I disagree with much he has said, I believe he is making a very important speech, and I believe more Senators should hear it. Therefore, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the willingness of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin to extend that courtesy to me. However, I would rather proceed with my rather brief remarks. Then the Senator from Wisconsin, on his own time, may be heard and I shall be very glad to suggest the absence of a quorum for him after I have concluded my remarks, if he wishes me to do so.

Mr. President, so much for what has happened up to now in this matter. I said on the floor of the Senate, when the conference report was being passed upon by the Senate, that I thought Senators and Members of the House were overlooking a very real point in the whole issue, and that was the position of the general public throughout the Nation.

I remember placing in the RECORD an analysis of the opinions of country editors throughout the United States, taken from the trade journal which serves that group of very fine people. I remember that that analysis showed, even in the areas where the sentiment for rigid price support was high, that, as a rule, the country editors were shaking their heads and saying that there is not any soundness in continuing that provision which creates overproduction and oversupply and the unremitting buildup of agricultural surpluses.

I have said several times on the floor of the Senate that, so far as the press in

my State, the agricultural organizations in my State, and the general public in my State are concerned, I feel that the tremendous majority is strongly against the restoration of rigid price supports, and that there can be no question as to their position in that regard. I have stated in appearances I have made on the floor—and I am afraid I made too many appearances on the floor on this bill—that the Farm Bureau Federation of my State, which is the only organization with a general membership of farmers, throughout the State, the citrus industry organizations, such as the Florida Citrus Exchange and the Florida Citrus Mutual, the vegetable organizations of Florida, particularly the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, and the State Cattlemen's Association had repeatedly gone on record in such a way that no one could question or misunderstand how they stood on this important issue. They do not want high price supports reinstated, and, in fact, many of them are against all price supports.

I have always held that reasonable price supports for storable basics, not calculated to create and maintain surpluses, are necessary at this time when we are moving out of the war period. But, unfortunately, Mr. President, many good people, farmers, throughout the Nation, have learned to rely so heavily upon the weak stick of high price supports that they are unwilling or unable to plan for themselves and to produce in such a way as not to oversupply the market.

Of course, no one in Florida knew until today what the President's decision was going to be, but in order that there may be some showing on the RECORD that the people of that State, which produces \$600 million worth of agricultural products each year, have rather strong convictions on this subject, as represented by newspapers in the centers of agricultural production and as represented, as I have already stated, in farm organizations which I have mentioned. I wish to place in the RECORD some editorials which have come to my attention, which were published the latter part of last week and reflect the attitude of Florida people, I think, correctly.

The first is an editorial from the Tampa Daily Times which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in toto as a part of my remarks.

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

IKE, DON'T HESITATE; VETO THE FARM BILL
President Eisenhower should veto the farm bill.

All of the talk about getting no farm legislation this session unless he allows the monstrosity passed yesterday to become law is far-down, low-grade politics designed to put Mr. Eisenhower on the spot in this election year.

But the truth of the matter is that if he blocks this legislation by a veto and it is not overridden he will have left just what he wants because the present farm law which his administration fought for so bitterly and won two years ago would continue in force.

Congressional action on this new, definitely costly and destructive farm bill has been the worst kind of presidential year

politics. There has been far more evidence of designing the measure for farm votes than for farmers.

The vicious determination to continue rigid price supports if not vetoed by the President will mean the piling up of more farm surpluses instead of bringing relief. It is a complete contradiction of the theory behind the soil bank idea which was approved in the same measure. The purpose of the soil bank obviously is to help restrict production, yet 90 percent of parity guarantees will defeat that objective.

President Eisenhower should take his cue on whether to veto the bill from the results of Tuesday's primary voting in Illinois. The President's evident strength downstate where he outran Stevenson 2 to 1 shows no real revolt among farmers against the administration.

The mock concern of the Democrats and some of the farm State Republican Senators and House members for the plight of the farmers shows they are not being realistic because the farmers themselves have been disproving the assertions that they are against the administration.

The President should not weaken at this last minute in his previous resolve to fight rigid prices. He knows the consequences of rigid supports. His failure to veto would indicate he had yielded to political pressure and would mean he was deserting the public interest hoping to catch a few more votes.

A courageous stand will bring him far more respect.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I quote two small paragraphs of the editorial, and I assure the Members of the Senate that they are representative of the sense and meaning of the editorial. The first is as follows:

Congressional action on this new, definitely costly and destructive farm bill has been the worst kind of presidential year politics. There has been far more evidence of designing the measure for farm votes than for farmers.

Then the closing paragraphs:

The President should not weaken at this last minute in his previous resolve to fight rigid prices. He knows the consequences of rigid supports. His failure to veto would indicate he had yielded to political pressure and would mean he was deserting the public interest hoping to catch a few more votes.

A courageous stand will bring him far more respect.

The next editorial is from the Tampa Morning Tribune, a morning newspaper published in that area of my State which is the greatest citrus producing section, one of the greatest small-vegetable producing sections, and the greatest cattle producing section. It is an editorial entitled "INTEGRITY VERSUS POLITICAL PORK." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, published on April 13, 1956, 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:

INTEGRITY VERSUS POLITICAL PORK

It is hard to figure how Congress could pass a more thoroughly bad piece of legislation, or one loaded with more pure political pork, than the election-year farm bill it has just sent to the White House.

If a measure ever merited a Presidential veto, this one is it.

Those Democrats and the farm State Republicans who approved it may try to say with a straight face that it will provide long-run help for the farmer. Actually it

is clearly fashioned to use him as a political football.

Supporters of the bill realized the President wants the so-called soil-bank plan which is authorized in the legislation. That plan is designed to reduce the present farm surplus. But the congressional majority coupled it with a provision restoring flat 90 percent price supports, the discredited system which brought on more production than the free market could absorb and so accounted for the present surplus. The bill thus is a self-contradiction, an antisurplus measure that would inevitably encourage the production of more price-depressing surplus commodities.

Mr. Eisenhower has frequently spoken out sharply against the rigid parity system. But Democratic strategists consider they have him backed into a corner this time.

If he lets the legislation slide through, they figure to go to the hustings as the party that demonstrated its concern for the welfare of the farmer. If he vetoes the bill on the ground it violates the principles for which he stands, they plan to make the farm bill the main issue of the campaign.

The political dilemma confronting the President is obvious. We may be sure a good deal of pressure will be applied by members of his own party in the farm belt as he mulls over the question the next few days at Augusta. They will argue he must sign the bill if threatened GOP congressional candidates in the farm areas are to be helped and strategic States in the Midwest are to be carried in order to win the Presidency in November.

But the price these fellow Republicans and many Democrats are asking him to pay is far too high. For his signature on the farm bill would mean a bowing to political expediency. It would blemish the integrity of his administration. It would throw into sharp reverse the long-range plan he and Secretary of Agriculture Benson have prepared for reducing farm surplus.

Certainly, Mr. Eisenhower has made it clear that he is a leader capable of rising above political pressure. His recent veto of the natural-gas bill was only one of many such demonstrations.

May he rise above the pressure this time and accompany a veto of the farm bill with a frank and full statement that the upholding of integrity and sound economic principles is far more important than the fate of farm-belt politicians. That course of action may lose the votes of some already disgruntled farmers, but it will kill a bad bill and win the respect, confidence, and support of the country as a whole.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I quote a part of the editorial, as follows:

May he—

Meaning the President—

May he rise above the pressure this time and accompany a veto of the farm bill with a frank and full statement that the upholding of integrity and sound economic principles is far more important than the fate of farm-belt politicians. That course of action may lose the votes of some already disgruntled farmers, but it will kill a bad bill and win the respect, confidence, and support of the country as a whole.

Mr. President, the next editorial is peculiarly interesting, because it was published in the Miami Daily News, a newspaper identified with former Gov. James M. Cox, of Ohio, at one time the Democratic candidate for President. I ask unanimous consent that the 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:

GOP REAL LOSER OVER FARM BILL

The repudiation of the Eisenhower farm policies, not only by the opposition in Congress, but by many Republicans as well, would normally be taken as a political setback for the President.

In the case of President Eisenhower, it seems to be different, however. People generally appear to place him above party politics and the blame for an unworkable farm measure, or none at all if the President vetoes it, will mostly rest with Congress.

This is a political phenomenon which enrages the Democratic politicians, yet it is one of the realities in this election. We don't presume to know what the President will do about the farm bill, but whether he signs or vetoes it the congressional candidates will be the ones mostly affected.

If the President vetoes the new farm legislation on the ground it restores rigid high price supports for basic crops, Republican candidates in the farm belt will feel the effects of his action. If he signs it on the theory it is better than a return to the present price support law under which farm income has declined a billion dollars in a year, then Democratic candidates will claim credit for reversing administration policy.

In any case, the Democrats who framed the hodge-podge measure passed by both Houses of Congress yesterday, and the Republicans who voted for it, have little reason for pride. As passed, the 1956 farm bill is an undisguised political measure hopefully designed to garner votes, with little regard for the welfare of the Nation as a whole. In the parlance of the day it's strictly for the birds.

Mr. HOLLAND. I read from the editorial two excerpts which I think may cause some searching of souls here, Mr. President, since they come from the source I have mentioned.

As passed, the 1956 farm bill is an undisguised political measure hopefully designed to garner votes, with little regard for the welfare of the Nation as a whole. In the parlance of the day, it's strictly for the birds.

Earlier in the editorial there are these words:

The blame for an unworkable farm measure, or none at all if the President vetoes it, will mostly rest with Congress.

Mr. President, I hope Senators will re-read that part of the editorial very carefully, because I so firmly believe it to be true, particularly when we have a veto message which invites Congress speedily to consider and report a bill setting up the soil bank and perhaps other commendable features, so that it may be promptly passed. I think the general public, if Congress fails to follow that course, will come indisputably to the conclusion that most of the Members of the Congress were interested in votes rather than in farm support.

I again quote the portion of the editorial which I just read:

The blame for an unworkable farm measure, or none at all if the President vetoes it, will mostly rest with Congress.

Mr. President, the next editorial is from the Miami Herald of April 13, 1956, which I ask unanimous consent to have 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:

FARM BILL CONFOUNDS FARM CONFUSION

The political analysts are hard at it interpreting the farm bill which Congress passed over expressed Executive displeasure.

The President most likely will veto the measure, although Democrats and Farm Belt Republicans say that there is no way open to him—electionwise—but to sign it.

If the President vetoes the measure the session will probably end without any farm-relief legislation.

That would not be all to the bad. Congress enacts a lot of bills that would better serve the country if tossed into the waste-basket before they got to the discussion stage.

The farm bill is an amorphous creation. It seethes with confusion.

Actually, it does nothing to stabilize the agricultural industry.

Rather, it has incorporated some provisions previously tried, which in themselves are largely responsible for the problems which this new bill purports to solve.

The President said before Congress passed the measure it was not a good bill. It isn't.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I read a few paragraphs from the editorial:

The farm bill is an amorphous creation. It seethes with confusion.

Mr. President, I hope Senators will look up the meaning of the word "amorphous." I looked it up and was delighted to find what it means.

I read further from the editorial:

Actually, it does nothing to stabilize the agricultural industry.

Rather it has incorporated some provisions, previously tried, which in themselves are largely responsible for the problems which this new bill purports to solve.

The President said before Congress passed the measure it was not a good bill. It isn't.

Mr. President, the last of the editorials which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD is from the Orlando Sentinel of April 11, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that the short editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PARAGRAPHS

Secretary Benson will have no truck with the thing called a farm bill which the politically minded House and Senate have passed. And we're glad to see that Senator HOLLAND would not sign the conference committee report either. It would only add to the farmers' problems.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there cannot be the slightest doubt that Congress has it within its power now to have submitted to it quickly from committee and to pass a bill which will create a soil bank. Is there need for a soil bank? I think there is very great need for it. I heard a statement made on this floor within the hour to the effect that all the planting had been accomplished in connection with all the basic commodities. I think that statement was thoughtlessly made, because everyone knows it is not completely correct as to the wheat industry. Anyone can plant up to 15 acres of wheat anywhere that wheat can be produced in this Nation and not be under the provisions of the present allotment program. So there

will be an unbridled invitation for the planting of wheat, and there would have been if the bill had been passed as it was. It seems to me there is a need for soil bank diversion of wheat, and there would be if the soil bank provision were separately considered and passed by the Congress.

Likewise, in the case of corn there is plenty of its acreage and mostly in the commercial areas that has not yet been planted. There is plenty of time to make good use of the soil bank in the case of corn if Congress has the will to do so.

Congress again is challenged. Shall we not live up to our opportunity to create a soil bank?

Mr. President, I have been reading in newspapers within the past few days about the terrific destruction accomplished in the Wheat Belt, in six States, Colorado, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, and Nebraska, by the recent dust storms. The amount of wheat which has been blown out of the ground is stupendous. I do not suppose anyone knows the exact amount. It certainly must total many hundreds of thousands of acres, and, probably, from what I have read, 2 or 3 million acres. There is a need, right now, for the soil bank.

There are other situations, none, I am glad to say, so acute as that which I have just mentioned, which likewise call for the use of the soil bank to reduce production and to give useful employment for many acres in such a way as will enable farmers to get their land out of production and claim the beneficial effects of the soil bank.

Mr. President, we are about to conclude, so far as Congress is concerned, unless someone should be so unwise as to call up the Presidential veto and to attempt to override it in either House of Congress. I think there is no advocate of this monstrous bill in its present form who would be so unwise as to do that. If so, I think the result would be eye-opening, because I believe it would show a majority of both Houses clearly holding up the hands of those who now realize, and who have realized for a long while, that the provisions of the bill simply are not sound, and would not stabilize the agricultural industry of the Nation, but instead would create greater surpluses and greater difficulties, and would add to the dependency of our people upon the Government.

Mr. President, I cannot too strongly urge that in the whole field of agricultural legislation one of the points we must always keep in mind is that the farm areas where there have been high rigid price supports, first in the war years, then in the year that followed, are the areas in which too many farmers have shown continuing inability to plan for themselves, continuing unwillingness to work out their own problems, and continuing failure to cut their production to fit consumption needs.

Throughout the Nation, many other agricultural industries which are being called upon to plan for themselves and to produce wisely, are prosperous and are doing well. Not only do they not want help, but they have seen the bane-ful effects of the too-great assistance

which has been given in other places, and they do not want to subject themselves to the effects of the overuse of high support prices, as they see those effects developing, and unfortunately as such effects have already been greatly over-developed in some parts of our Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONFUSION SURROUNDING THE ADMINISTRATION'S SO-CALLED PARTNERSHIP POWER PROGRAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, so much confusion and misinformation circulates around the present administration's so-called partnership power program that citizens directly affected are hard put to understand the full meaning of its implications. In my home State of Oregon, the efforts on behalf of partnership have been directed toward needed multiple-purpose projects which are already authorized by Congress for construction as units in the Federal system.

I have attempted to clarify this aspect of the drive for partnership in a recent letter replying to an editorial published in the Eugene Register-Guard of April 8, 1956. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my reply to the editorial which appeared April 8, 1956, and the text of the editorial at issue.

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

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of April 8, 1956]

SENATORS BLOCK EUGENE WATER AND ELECTRIC BOARD FROM COUGAR

There have been many people who have asked in recent weeks about the chances of the Eugene Water and Electric Board gaining approval for partnership participation in Cougar Dam on the South Fork of the McKenzie.

It is a good question. Ray Boals, superintendent for Eugene Water and Electric Board, says that work currently being done on the project by the Army engineers will not prevent the local utility from participating in the project later on. But the chances of partnership authorization getting through this session of Congress are indeed slim. A bill for partnership by Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH was approved in subcommittee but has been held from the full committee by the subcommittee chairman, JAMES DAVIS, Democrat of Georgia. Even if the bill reached the floor of the House and passed it would never pass the Senate because it would be blocked by Oregon's Senators, as it was once before by Senator MORSE after passing the House.

They believe it will wreck Federal power development in the Northwest and cut off the region from cheap hydroelectric power which they say is vital to attract industry.

In the case of aluminum and a few other industries this might be the case. But to contend that it would stop industrial development generally is pure poppycock. (To belabor this point, it hasn't stopped industrial development in California where private steam generation handles most of the power load.)

Our Senators want all-Federal development within the Bonneville system. But with the needs that are foreseen in the next 10 to 15 years, it is not realistic to believe that Congress will appropriate all the funds necessary to do the job.

Private capital, and capital from municipal utilities such as Eugene Water and Electric Board, is needed to take up the slack. Vital

flood control dams are traditionally a Federal cost and it takes some doing to get appropriations for these.

So again, we must ask, what's wrong with the idea of partnership development of some of these projects? Is it an unfair use of a natural resource? We don't see how. Falling water is used to generate electricity to meet the needs of the population. If Eugene Water and Electric Board developed the power facilities at Cougar it would provide power for this area that would not have to be taken from the Bonneville system. Either way we get the power for the Northwest region. But with partnership development we get it now or in the near future when we will need it. In fact, it is our opinion that if we wait for all-Federal development we shall never meet our requirements, whether there is a Democratic or Republican administration. In the past 20 years the Federal Government has put about \$2 billion into the Bonneville system. Can we logically expect about \$8 billion in the next 10 to 15 years? That is the estimated need to meet our requirements.

Opponents of partnership argue that private and municipal firms desiring to develop electric power would be taking all the profit from multi-purpose projects. This is a flimsy argument. When the Government builds the power features of a dam, the sale of the power over 50 years pays back the cost of the power part of the structure. It does not pay back the cost of the flood control features.

Under partnership, at Cougar for instance, Eugene Water and Electric Board would pay the costs of the project allocated to power. It would be constructed under specifications acceptable to the Government and the Government would own all of the project except the powerhouse and the generators. Eugene Water and Electric Board would have the right to use the power for 50 years under a Federal Power Commission license. The Government would pay for the costs allocated to flood control and construct the project with Eugene Water and Electric Board and Federal funds.

At Cougar and at Green Peter-White Bridge on the Santiam the Government would be saved the expenditure of an estimated \$40 million on power allocations, a sum that could well be applied to Libby or a number of other Federal projects so urgently needed.

If our Senators desire to aid development of the Northwest, they should get off their all-Federal power high-horse and take the lead on partnership development, particularly on some of the smaller multi-purpose projects. Their argument for all-Federal development is a political pipe dream and they know it.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,

April 11, 1956.

To the EDITOR OF THE EUGENE REGISTER-GUARD:

Your recent editorial asked why Senator MORSE and I are blocking partnership construction of Cougar Dam. For your information, Cougar Dam is presently authorized and construction is underway as a Federal project. The law must be changed for it to become a partnership proposition. Why, I ask, are McKay, Ellsworth, Coon, and Norblad blocking Federal construction of Cougar which has already started? Why are the Republicans generally opposed to continuing the Federal program that has been so successful?

When Cougar Dam's powerplant is integrated into the Bonneville Power System, the Eugene Water and Electric Board will share—along with other public and private utilities of the region—in the new power supply. Contrast this with what happens under a partnership in which the Eugene

Water and Electric Board would own all the power. How would the power consumers of the Springfield Utility Board, Lane County Electric Co-op, Biachly-Lane County Co-op, and Pacific Power & Light Co. fare under a partnership which gave all the power to Eugene?

The Eugene customers, like those elsewhere, should receive a fair share of the Cougar power, and that's what they will get when Cougar is completed as a Federal project. I do not agree with your belief that customers of the Eugene Water and Electric Board have a greater right to Cougar power than those who reside outside the city limits. I think the power should be shared equitably, and this can best be accomplished with Cougar Dam as a Federal project.

Your editorial headline: "Senators Block Eugene Water and Electric Board from Cougar," can only have been motivated by political partisanship. Let's look at the record. The President's budget for 1956 requested \$100,000 for Cougar Dam planning. The House, of which Mr. ELLSWORTH is a Member, approved the \$100,000. Following this less-than-desirable action, Senator MORSE and I urgently requested the Senate Appropriations Committee to increase the funds so construction on Cougar could be started, and the day advanced when Eugene and other Bonneville customers could share in the Cougar power supply. The Senate approved an increase to \$500,000 and work on Cougar has begun. Perhaps it is only during election years that words can be twisted so that work toward starting a project can mean that it is being blocked.

With great political fanfare, President Eisenhower recently signed the bill authorizing \$785 million worth of Federal power projects in the upper Colorado Basin. The same Oregon Republicans, who plead so fervently for partnership in our region, were quite enthusiastic about Federal projects in the upper Colorado. Why are they blocking Federal projects in Oregon? Is the answer to be found in the fact that no private utilities would have the poor Colorado power sites, whereas the fine hydroelectric sites in Oregon's Columbia Basin are desired by so-called local interests?

The Federal-power program has brought the Northwest the cheapest electricity in the United States, as well as irrigation, navigation, and flood-control benefits. It is remarkable that every partnership proposal represents a retreat from these comprehensive values. Why do our Republican Congressmen lament that they cannot secure more funds for Federal development in the Northwest, when they themselves have helped push through \$785 million worth of development for the upper Colorado?

It is true that Senator MORSE and I voted for the upper Colorado program, but we also are fighting hard for Federal projects in our own region. We would never be so hypocritical as to favor \$785 million worth of upper Colorado Federal construction, while lamenting lugubriously that Congress would refuse further Federal funds in our own area. That, however, is the record of the Oregon Republicans—a record which some Oregon daily newspapers, ironically, find quite commendable.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

CONSTRUCTION BY IDAHO POWER CO. OF DAM IN HELLS CANYON STRETCH OF SNAKE RIVER

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, only a few months ago the supporters of the Idaho Power Co., seeking to block construction of a high Federal dam in Hells Canyon, claimed that the water rights of irrigators which were established by State law would be impaired if

a Federal project spanned the canyons of the Snake. These spokesmen for the company represented the Federal Government as some kind of a predator, crouched to override the water laws of the upstream States.

How quickly the leopard can change its spots.

The Idaho Power Co. has proceeded with the construction of a dam in the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake River in defiance of the laws of the State of Oregon. It now contends that its license received from the Federal Power Commission places it above the jurisdiction of the State, that permission of the State of Oregon is not necessary when the company appropriates a water resource of the State after receiving a Federal license.

What has happened to those staunch defenders of States rights who, before the Federal licenses were granted to the Idaho Power Co. for the dams in Hells Canyon, pictured the high Federal dam as a form of piracy threatening the farmers' water rights? Their silence is proof of the falsehood of their claims.

The legislation to authorize the construction of a Federal dam at Hells Canyon specifically subordinated the operation of its power facilities to the water rights of upstream irrigators. The laws of the States were to govern in this respect.

The contrast between the respect for State law which would have been provided under the Federal construction of a dam in Hells Canyon and the defiance of State law which has resulted from licensing of Idaho Power Co. projects is pointedly discussed in an editorial from an outstanding Oregon newspaper.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial entitled "Is This Case Different?" published in the East Oregonian, of Pendleton, Oreg., of April 6, 1956.

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

[From the East Oregonian of April 6, 1956]

IS THIS CASE DIFFERENT?

When Douglas McKay was governor of Oregon he said to a luncheon meeting in Walla Walla, "You know, I find that I have to remind Len Jordan that the State of Oregon has quite an interest, too, in the Snake River." It was at a meeting of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee at which Idaho's Governor Jordan was present. Mr. McKay was speaking, of course, of Mr. Jordan's oft repeated statement that the State of Idaho must protect its rights to Snake River water by opposing Hells Canyon Dam. Mr. Jordan did not concede that Oregon might have some interest in Snake River waters that flowed between the borders of Idaho and Oregon.

In recent days the attorney general of the State of Oregon has decided that the Idaho Power Co. should have asked permission of the State of Oregon to construct Brownlee Dam on the Snake River. He has started proceedings to force the company to seek that permission. Idaho Power Co. has said that the only permission it considers necessary is that granted by the Federal Power Commission. The company so thoroughly believes it that it undertook construction of a bridge over the Snake without asking permission of the Corps of Engineers.

When Idaho's Governor Jordan was doing everything possible to prevent the construction of Hells Canyon Dam he and his followers warned that the high dam would encroach upon State rights. Now that Idaho Power Co. flaunts the rights of the State of Oregon, those same people in the State of Idaho are strangely silent.

In the State of Oregon some of the stoutest defenders of State rights see in the attorney general's action a political motivation. The same citizens see in a different light the move of Portland General Electric Co. to build a dam on the Deschutes River that has been opposed by the State hydroelectric commission.

Apparently, it is all a matter of whose ox is being gored.

Our hope is that we never shall see the day that Oregon's attorney general will not guard the rights of the State in the use of any and all waters in which the State has an interest.

The Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune has some interesting comments on the State of Oregon versus Idaho Power Co. case:

"The supporters of the 3 dams the Idaho Power Co. hopes to build as a substitute for a high Hells Canyon Dam have devoted several million words in recent years to the threat of Federal encroachment upon State rights. The theme had infinite variations. Every effort to reassure the public, particularly in southern Idaho, that a Federal high dam would operate in compliance with State law was drowned in the flood of 'man your floodgates' oratory. The Federal Government was pictured as the fearsome ogre which would crush all State rights in its sweep toward domination of the region. The Idaho Power Co., by contrast, was pictured as a local interest under full supervision and control by State agencies and dedicated unwaveringly to preservation of State rights.

"The question arises, of course, as to why the Idaho Power Co. currently is paying such devoted attention to the weirdly reasoned decision of a Federal agency, the FPC, and so little attention to the protests of the Oregon attorney general. The answer, of course, is that the FPC opinion is favorable to Idaho Power's objectives, and the Oregon attorney general's protests are unfavorable to those objectives.

"The rest is campaign oratory, as most of it has been throughout the Hells Canyon battle. The crusade for State's rights does not happen to have much bearing at the moment upon Idaho Power's plans. Therefore, it can be ignored for the time being while construction of Brownlee goes ahead at full speed.

"There is nothing particularly alarming about this situation. Idaho Power's approach seems to be realistic and logical. Its objectives have been clear enough to anyone who cared to see them. It is proceeding toward those objectives according to plan.

"The disturbing thing has always been the uncritical acceptance by thousands of people of the image of Idaho Power as the stalwart champion of State's rights and protector of the people from their own Federal Government.

"The slight disagreement between the Oregon attorney general and Idaho Power would be mainly useful if it persuaded some of these people to make a belated reexamination of some of the campaign oratory."

DUPPLICITY OF ADMINISTRATION'S ACTIVITIES IN FIELD OF WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the duplicity of the present administration's activities in the field of water-resource development is reflected in many recent developments. The claims of the administration spokesman that there is not sufficient money in the Treasury for

Hells Canyon Dam is contradicted by approval of the \$750 million Upper Colorado storage project. The administration contends that the magnificent Columbia River basin dam sites can be developed only by private power company partners, but at the same time gives its full backing to wholly Federal construction on the Colorado. What is the reason for this Jekyll-and-Hyde philosophy in a field of vital concern to our national welfare? Are powerful pressures at work which require one pattern for development of one river system, and a completely different approach to another?

The method by which word and action often differ in the present administration's power policy is discussed in a recent column by the distinguished journalist, Thomas L. Stokes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article written by Mr. Stokes, which was published in the Washington Evening Star of April 12, 1956.

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

WORD AND ACTION SOMETIMES DIFFER—EISENHOWER O. K. OF COLORADO RIVER BILL VIEWED AS RUNNING COUNTER TO POLICY

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

It's easy to understand how our people can be fooled about what goes on here. Often there's a difference in what is said about policy and what is actually done.

An example is what President Eisenhower said at Augusta, Ga., when he signed into law the bill recently passed by Congress for the mammoth upper Colorado River storage project to be developed by the Federal Government.

"This," he said, "represents something I believe in." It follows his idea, he explained, of "treating river valleys as a whole thing—it goes from top to bottom—it recognizes that one thing is certainly true—water is getting to be one of our most valuable resources."

Such an aim first was expressed half a century ago by President Theodore Roosevelt. He told Congress in his first message of the need for great storage works to equalize the flow of streams which, he said, were too big to be undertaken by private interests, as is the case with the Colorado River project. In a later message to Congress, Theodore Roosevelt advocated integrated public development of our river systems for navigation, flood control, reclamation, and production of electric power.

It was not until many years later that his vision began to come true in great public projects—Boulder Canyon Dam in Nevada during the Hoover administration, later renamed Hoover Dam, and, in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, a whole bevy of giant projects—TVA in the South, Bonneville in Oregon, Grand Coulee in Washington, Shasta in California, Hungry Horse in Montana, and so on.

But, if President Eisenhower believes in treating river valleys as a whole thing, he either has not told the responsible officials in his administration or they have not followed his instructions. For, until the upper Colorado, in which special factors are involved, the administration's policy had been contrary to treating river valleys as a whole thing. That's why conservationists have so bitterly attacked the administration policy.

In letter or spirit the principle now espoused by the President has been violated in numerous instances. Perhaps the most graphic illustration is in the case of another great river system like the Colorado—the Co-

lumbia, which spans our Pacific Northwest. Both Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams are on it. When built in the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration they were envisaged as part of a series to develop the Columbia system from top to bottom. A grand plan for unified and integrated development of the Columbia Basin was completed by the Army Engineer Corps in 1950 after Bonneville and Grand Coulee were built.

But the Eisenhower administration has scrapped this in the so-called "partnership" of Federal Government with private utilities proclaimed by President Eisenhower in his 1952 campaign speech at Seattle and faithfully executed by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

This violation of "treating river valleys as a whole thing began at Hells Canyon on the Snake River, a Columbia tributary, along the Oregon-Idaho border. The Army engineers had recommended a high dam there to be built by the Federal Government to utilize the full potential of the river and fit Hells Canyon most effectively into the Columbia River plan. But Secretary McKay stopped this. He withdrew an application for a license for Federal development submitted by the Interior Department in the Truman administration to the Federal Power Commission to carry out the Army engineer plan. That opened the way for a private power company, Idaho Power, to put in its bid to build, instead, three small dams, which subsequently was granted by the FPC. This would mean piecemeal development that would throw the whole Army engineer plan askew.

Though this was represented as "partnership" with a local power company, that came to be a joke around here. For Idaho Power stock is owned mostly in the East, and stockholders were, in fact, holding their annual meeting at Augusta, Maine, the day that Secretary McKay opened the way for them to cut in on Hells Canyon by withdrawing the application for a license to carry out the Army engineer plan. In turn, this discarding of the Army engineer plan at Hells Canyon led to other private utility companies coming forward with plans for small "partnership" dams at other points in the Columbia system. That, if carried through, would prevent the building of larger dams called for by the Army engineers. It can only be stopped through a suit now pending in the courts brought by the Hells Canyon Association to invalidate the license of the Idaho Power Co. or by Congress acting on bills which have been bottled up.

Thus far the utilities have been successful in fighting the public development of the Columbia as projected by the Army engineers and are making a mockery out of the Eisenhower theory of "treating river valleys as a whole thing." In the case of the upper Colorado, the utilities were not interested, as this is not to be utilized for power on the same scope and does not offer the rich profits of the Columbia and so they were content to let the Government develop it.

THE VETO OF THE FARM BILL

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, for the reasons so well outlined in the President's message, a veto was the only course open to him on the farm bill. Enactment of the bill would have resulted in further piling up of surpluses, restricting markets, and bringing about more restrictive controls.

In 1957 the cotton industry will be faced with further acreage reductions to the overall tune of 8.9 percent, as the reductions would affect each State, according to a table which I ask unan-

imous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks.

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

States	1956 allotment	1957 allotment	Acreage reduction for 1957	Percentage reduction from 1956 to 1957
Alabama	1,025,141	905,503	119,633	11.7
Arizona	343,640	328,995	14,645	4.3
Arkansas	1,424,511	1,271,412	153,099	10.7
California	782,405	737,294	44,111	5.8
Florida	36,974	34,111	2,863	7.7
Georgia	903,221	805,369	97,852	10.8
Illinois	3,110	3,110	0	0
Kansas	29	29	0	0
Kentucky	7,799	6,841	958	12.3
Louisiana	610,891	543,435	67,456	11.0
Maryland	25	25	0	0
Mississippi	1,646,562	1,458,671	187,891	11.4
Missouri	378,055	341,192	36,863	9.8
Nevada	2,324	2,324	0	0
New Mexico	179,375	167,373	12,005	6.7
North Carolina	483,932	428,152	55,780	11.5
Oklahoma	845,616	755,307	90,219	10.7
South Carolina	726,193	649,484	76,709	10.6
Tennessee	563,491	510,836	52,605	9.3
Texas	7,410,893	6,877,025	533,868	7.2
Virginia	17,114	14,956	2,158	12.6
Total	17,391,304	15,841,584	1,549,720	8.9

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as for cotton, the most depressing problem facing cotton farmers and the cotton industry was the need for regaining and maintaining our traditional and historic export markets.

This could be done only by meeting the price competition of foreign-produced cotton and foreign synthetics in the foreign markets. Cotton producer organizations from one end of the Cotton Belt to the other clearly recognized that fact last fall, and agreed that if the Secretary of Agriculture would exercise the authority vested in him by Congress to make United States cotton competitive, pricewise, in the export market, the cotton producers would make their contribution toward the solution of the overall problem by accepting a moderately lower support price, thereby improving cotton's competitive position with synthetics in the domestic market.

The cotton growers' organizations agreed to accept price reductions of from 3 to $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound in order to make cotton competitive with rayon. Under the $82\frac{1}{2}$ percent of parity, which was announced today in the President's veto message, cotton prices will be reduced only about $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound. That is a rough estimate, which is very close to being correct.

So far as cotton is concerned, the main thing wrong with H. R. 12 was that it would have provided a return to a rigid system of price supports, thereby holding a price umbrella over domestic synthetic fiber production, which would have made impossible an improvement in the position of cotton in competition with rayon in the domestic market, and would have seriously impaired our chances for obtaining the kind of export program for cotton which would have been really adequate in effectively meeting foreign price competition from foreign-produced cotton and synthetics.

It was for this reason, which dealt with the very heart of cotton's most serious problem, that I felt compelled to vote against the conference report. That is not to say that there were not a number of provisions in H. R. 12 which were constructive and urgently needed, so far as cotton is concerned.

Mr. President, what is necessary is to establish a minimum acreage allotment for cotton for the years 1957 and 1958. Otherwise, there will be an additional reduction in the acreage allotment for 1957 of 8.9 percent, as I have said, and a further acreage reduction in 1958 of, roughly, 6 percent. Mississippi would take an acreage reduction of, roughly, 8 percent. Acreage reductions are destructive of the industry, tend to pull down farm income, and, if continued, there will be no way whereby a cotton farm can be operated at a profit.

Furthermore, in the South there are millions of small farmers who plant 4 acres of cotton or less. They must be provided for by appropriate legislation.

Third, H. R. 12 contained a provision which would clear up the question as to whether the President had the authority to deal with the problem of textile imports by negotiation with the individual countries from which such imports emanate.

Fourth, the bill contained a provision to rectify a very serious injustice which is being worked upon the producers of extra long staple cotton.

Fifth, the bill contained provisions for the soil bank, which would have made possible further voluntary reductions in production, without the loss of net income to farmers.

Mr. President, I therefore feel that the most constructive course we could now pursue would be to delete from H. R. 12 the specific provisions to which the President has objected so seriously, and return to him the remainder of the bill without further delay.

It would be a simple matter for the Congress to follow this course, and place upon the President's desk a farm bill which he could sign before the end of this week.

I urge my colleagues to take such action as is necessary to bring this about.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY— DOCUMENTS FURNISHED BY SENATOR McCARTHY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to give the Senate some information.

A few days ago when the Senate was considering the CIA joint resolution I stated that if the resolution were passed I would turn over to the proposed new joint committee some 50 or more documents having to do with everything from incompetence to communism in the CIA. The resolution failed, and the joint committee was not established.

The question arose as to whether the information should go to the Armed Services Committee, headed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], to the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Op-

erations, headed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], or to the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. I felt that the Internal Security Subcommittee had the most complete jurisdiction of the subject, so I have turned over the documents, as of today, to the subcommittee of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], not because I preferred that subcommittee to the other committee but because I thought that it had unquestionable jurisdiction on the subject.

I know they will have difficulty getting the witnesses from the CIA. They refused to appear before our committee. However, I hope that we will test on the Senate floor the right of the Internal Security Subcommittee to get the necessary information. For that reason I have turned over all the pertinent material to the Eastland committee.

PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization and authorizing appropriations therefor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the unfinished business, which is Senate Joint Resolution 97. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment heretofore proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, this joint resolution authorizes an increase in the ceiling on the authorized United States contribution to the Food and Agriculture Organization from \$2 million a year to \$3 million a year. It also authorizes an increase in the ceiling on the authorized contribution to the International Labor Organization from \$1,750,000 a year to \$3 million a year.

The joint resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Relations on July 27 of last year. It was considered briefly in the Senate July 30, but no action was taken in the adjournment rush.

When Congress reconvened in January, the Committee on Foreign Relations again considered the matter in the light of developments in the intervening months. After discussion with Assistant Secretary of State Francis O. Wilcox and Assistant Secretary of Labor J. Ernest Wilkins, and after further consideration, the committee saw no reason to change the position which it had taken last July—namely, that the resolution is a meritorious one and should be passed.

Indeed, Mr. President, passage of the resolution is daily becoming more urgent, particularly so far as the ILO is concerned. Let me review the situation briefly for the Senate.

At a meeting in March of this year, the ILO governing body adopted a budget for the calendar year 1957 amounting to a net of \$7.6 million. The vote, by the way, was 28 to 10, with the United States voting "No." This budget will be presented to the ILO Conference in June for final approval; but in view of the almost three to one vote in the governing body, there is little reason to anticipate contrary action by the Conference.

On the basis of 25 percent, which is the current rate of assessment of the United States in the ILO this budget will call for a United States contribution of \$1.9 million. The net contribution can be reduced to \$1.8 million by taking advantage of an expected credit accruing from earlier years; but, even so, our assessment will be \$50,000 above the existing statutory ceiling.

Thus, it is clear that the United States will be confronted with an assessment which it cannot pay unless Congress raises the ceiling. Although this budget is for 1957, and we would not actually be in default until that time, our influence at the June conference would obviously be at a low ebb if we went there with the whole world knowing that we would be unable to meet our obligations. An organization does not pay much attention to the thoughts of a member who is avowedly about to refuse to pay his dues.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, our delinquency might turn out to be even greater than the figure of \$50,000 which I mentioned. That figure was based on a calculation of our assessment at the rate of 25 percent. That rate has been in effect since 1951, and there has been growing pressure within the ILO to revise all assessments to bring them more into line with the United Nations scale, under which the United States pays 33.3 percent. I do not think that the ILO would undertake such a drastic revision in one step, but I do think we have to anticipate some increase in the percentage of our assessment.

The question has been raised as to whether we should continue to participate at all in the ILO; or, if we do continue to participate, whether we should increase our contributions. To state the question another way, we have three possible courses of action:

First. We can withdraw entirely from the ILO. For reasons which I shall elaborate on a little later, this would not be a wise course for us to take, but it would

at least have the merits of being forthright and unequivocal.

Second. We can defeat this bill and continue in the ILO under our present legislation. This, I think, is probably the worst thing we could do. We would be half in, half out, delinquent in our assessments, utterly without influence, and in general offering an altogether sorry spectacle for a Nation which is supposed to be in a position of world leadership.

Third. We can pass this measure and continue to participate in the ILO on a vigorous, wholehearted, full-membership basis. This seems to me to be clearly the wisest course for us to take. If we are going to belong to an organization as important as the ILO, we ought to belong to it all the way—we ought to work in it and try to get our ideas adopted by it. We ought to take a seat up in front, and not one by the door, where we can walk out every time something does not go to suit us or where the other members can throw us out for nonpayment of dues.

The ILO is unique among international organizations in that its delegates represent private groups, as well as governments. Each member of the ILO has two government delegates, plus one delegate representing employers, and one representing workers. The organization was established in 1919 to promote the voluntary cooperation of nations in improving working and living conditions. The United States has been a member since 1934.

The principal impetus for United States withdrawal from the ILO at this time comes from Mr. William McGrath, who was the American employer delegate in 1954 and 1955. In his public statements, Mr. McGrath has voiced numerous complaints about the ILO; but so far as I can determine, all of them come under three main headings:

First, a great many foolish proposals are advanced in the ILO. While Mr. McGrath evidently differs with a good many persons, even in his own country, as to what is foolish and what is not, I think we can all agree that there are some foolish proposals advanced in the ILO. Well, Mr. President, there are some foolish proposals advanced in every organization—even in the Congress of the United States; but I never heard of an individual's refusing to serve in Congress because of that fact. The truth is that most of the foolish proposals in the ILO meet the same fate as those in Congress: They are buried, and never are adopted.

The few which may be adopted can be harmful to the United States only to the extent that we ourselves are foolish enough to put them into effect. This fact destroys the validity of Mr. McGrath's second major complaint, which is that the ILO is an international law-making body bent upon legislating socialism into existence throughout the world. This can only be described as plain nonsense. The ILO has no power whatsoever over any sovereign country on the face of the world. The ILO can only act through recommendations,

which do not have to be followed, or through conventions, which do not have to be ratified, and which, of course, are not binding unless they are ratified.

Finally, Mr. McGrath complains that the employer and worker delegates from the Soviet Union and other Communist countries are, in fact, merely additional government delegates, and do not represent free employers and free workers. This is a valid point, and I disagree with Mr. McGrath only as to the conclusion to be drawn from it. He thinks we ought to get out of the ILO. I think we ought to stay in it, and fight harder than ever to show up this Communist fiction for what it is.

Incidentally, Mr. President, I may say that at the present time there is within the International Labor Organization a subcommittee looking into the matter of so-called employer representation on the part of the Communist states which happen to be members of the Organization.

I am not alone in believing that we should remain in the ILO. The executive council of the AFL-CIO thinks so. It recently said:

We regard the ILO as a vital forum through which to promote the cause of freedom and democracy in the world. We take this opportunity to officially reiterate our full and unqualified support of the ILO and of United States membership and active participation therein.

We urge the Congress of the United States to enact Senate Joint Resolution 97.

The Catholic Church thinks so. I quote from an editorial of March 16, 1956, issue of the *New World*, official Catholic paper of the archdiocese of Chicago and the diocese of Joliet:

The Holy See has been one of the ILO's strongest supporters from the very beginning of the Organization. In November 1954, the Holy Father enthusiastically welcomed the members of the ILO governing body in a special audience at the Vatican and, echoing the sentiments of his predecessor, vigorously endorsed the important work that they are doing for the cause of social justice. ***

Moreover, as recently as January of this year, a French Jesuit, Father Joblin, was appointed to the staff of the ILO with the advice and consent of the Holy See. *** The fact that Father Joblin's appointment was made long after the problem of Communist representation in the ILO became a public issue is an obvious indication that the Holy See is not in favor of scuttling the Organization merely because of the fact that Russia and some of her satellites are included in its membership.

Further, Mr. President, as recently as April 4, less than 2 weeks ago, the economic subcommittee of the Catholic Association for International Peace found that American withdrawal from the ILO "would play directly into the hands of the Communists."

Finally, Mr. President, the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers—the two groups who nominate our employer delegate—have decided to continue their participation this year. Although they are not without some misgivings about the matter, they have rejected Mr. McGrath's proposal for immediate withdrawal from the ILO.

Mr. President, let me say just a word about the paragraph of the joint resolution relating to the Food and Agriculture Organization. I think there would be general agreement that this agency has done one of the best jobs of any of the UN specialized agencies. It certainly has one of the most important jobs—namely, that of keeping food production up with population increases in underdeveloped countries.

The FAO Conference last fall voted a budget of \$6.6 million for 1956 and of \$6.8 million for 1957. The vote, incidentally, was 24 to 23, with the United States voting "No." After taking account of small miscellaneous income, the amount of these budgets which will have to be met by assessments is \$6.5 million in 1956 and \$6.7 million in 1957. The United States assessment for each of these years is 31.5 percent. These assessments can be met within the existing ceiling by taking advantage of a credit which has accrued to the United States in the FAO Working Capital Fund.

It is apparent, however, that the United States is operating on a very thin margin, that our 1958 assessment will breach our ceiling, that the ceiling would therefore have to be raised next year in any event, and that in the meantime our whole position in the FAO will be strengthened by timely action to raise the ceiling now.

Mr. President, the amounts of money involved here are not large. The total increase provided for by this resolution to be spread over a period of years is less than half of one one-thousandth of the unexpended balances of appropriations for military assistance. The amounts involved here appear even more trifling when considered in relation to the damage our international position would suffer if we were to fail to play our full part in both the ILO and FAO.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee unanimously reported the joint resolution. I know I express the hope of the chairman and of other members of the committee when I urge the Senate to pass the joint resolution.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say to the Senator that I intend to support the joint resolution, either with or without some of the amendments which have been suggested, depending upon the discussion which may follow.

However, I think it is only fair to say that in the Committee on Foreign Relations there was the feeling that both the FOA and the ILO had a part to play, despite the objections, and perhaps some of the legitimate criticisms which have been raised. The viewpoint of the American Federation of Labor and the CIO as to their usefulness was pointed out. While the representatives of the United States Chamber of Commerce had some questions, they felt, as I understood, that perhaps the ILO should be continued for another year or so, and

that perhaps further studies should be made by the Congress as to its value.

While the representatives of the National Association of Manufacturers were perhaps not so enthusiastic, I think it may be said that many of them felt that the organization should not be terminated without further investigation, and that perhaps it was too early to terminate it. For that reason I do not believe it should be terminated at this time.

However, I think it is only fair to say that there was considerable discussion in the Foreign Relations Committee apropos of the question of the percentages which the United States might properly contribute to these agencies and to the overall situation.

At one time we were contributing considerably more than 33 1/3 percent for the total United Nations operation until, at the instigation of the late Senator Vandenberg and other members of the Committee on Foreign Relations at the time, and also members of the Appropriations Committee, a limitation of 33 1/3 percent, as I recall, was established.

In the discussions before the Committee on Foreign Relations—I know it has been true in the Appropriations Committee—it has been pointed out that this figure was not necessarily intended to be a permanent level, and that it might properly be 30 percent or 25 percent. I do not know just what the amount might properly be. However, it seems to me that there are other nations which are not carrying their fair share of the load, and there are some which, for various reasons, have not been able to pay their assessments. At least we have been doing that, within the limitations established.

I hope the Department of State will bear in mind that there may very well

arise—and properly so—in the Congress a feeling that 33 1/3 percent for support of the independent agencies and the United Nations itself is too much, and that the figure should perhaps move toward 25 percent, rather than upward, or rather than necessarily remaining stationary.

I thought that the discussion today should at least point out the fact that that particular topic was the subject of considerable discussion in our committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what the distinguished minority leader has just said is true. He has given us a very good, though very brief, résumé of the discussions which took place in the committee relative to this particular subject. I can corroborate every statement he has made.

Of course, we are all in accord with his idea that at the first favorable opportunity we should do what we can to reduce our contributions, if we can do so legitimately and within reason, and not be wedded to a figure of 33 1/3 percent, or a higher figure.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from Louisiana that an amendment offered by him is already pending before the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the amendment I have just sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Possibly it is the same amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is the same amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the amendment has been pending since July of last year. Without objection, the clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the ratio of (a) the contributions made hereafter by the United States in any year to defray the expenses of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, or of the International Labor Organization, to (b) the total contributions made by all nations in such year for such purpose shall not exceed the ratio of (1) the contributions made by the United States for such purpose in the year in which this section is enacted to (2) the total contributions made by all nations for such purpose in that year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that for the past few years the Committee on Appropriations has been carefully examining these contributions in an effort to make them uniform, if possible, and to not further increase the amounts percentagewise. That is now being done with respect to the various international organizations.

It will be recalled that when the United Nations was first organized, the contribution made by the United States amounted to almost 40 percent of the entire amount required to operate that organization. Over the years the amount has been decreased percentagewise, to where it is now 33 1/3 percent of the total.

Great Britain is, as of now, contributing 8.55 percent. The U. S. S. R. is contributing 15.28 percent. France is contributing 6.23 percent.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point tables showing the contributions being made by all members of the United Nations.

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

TABLE 2.—United Nations: Scale of assessments

Member countries	Calendar year 1954		Calendar year 1955		Calendar year 1956		Member countries	Calendar year 1954		Calendar year 1955		Calendar year 1956	
	Percent	Assessment	Percent	Assessment	Percent	Assessment		Percent	Assessment	Percent	Assessment	Percent	Assessment
Afghanistan	0.08	33,040	0.08	31,712	0.06	28,998	Lebanon	.05	20,650	.05	19,820	.05	24,165
Argentina	1.40	578,200	1.32	523,248	1.28	618,624	Liberia	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332
Australia	1.75	722,750	1.80	713,520	1.80	869,940	Luxembourg	.06	24,780	.06	23,784	.06	28,998
Belgium	1.38	569,940	1.38	547,032	1.38	666,954	Mexico	.75	309,750	.80	317,120	.77	372,141
Bolivia	.06	24,780	.05	19,820	.05	24,165	Netherlands	1.25	516,250	1.25	495,500	1.25	604,125
Brazil	1.40	578,200	1.32	523,248	1.20	579,960	New Zealand	.48	198,240	.48	190,272	.48	231,984
Burma	.13	53,690	.13	51,532	.11	53,163	Nicaragua	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332
Byelorussian S. S. R.	.50	206,500	.53	210,092	.53	256,149	Norway	.50	206,500	.50	198,200	.54	260,982
Canada	3.30	1,362,900	3.63	1,438,932	3.63	1,754,379	Pakistan	.75	309,750	.67	265,588	.60	289,980
Chile	.33	136,290	.30	118,920	.33	159,489	Panama	.05	20,650	.05	19,820	.05	24,165
China	5.62	2,321,060	5.62	2,227,768	5.62	2,716,146	Paraguay	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332
Colombia	.41	169,330	.41	162,524	.41	198,153	Peru	.18	74,340	.18	71,352	.16	77,328
Costa Rica	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332	Philippines	0.45	185,850	0.45	178,380	0.45	217,485
Cuba	.34	140,420	.30	118,920	.30	144,990	Poland	1.73	714,490	1.73	685,772	1.70	821,610
Czechoslovakia	1.05	433,650	.94	372,616	.92	444,636	Saudi Arabia	.07	28,910	.07	27,748	.07	33,331
Denmark	.78	322,140	.74	293,336	.72	347,976	Sweden	1.65	681,450	1.59	630,276	1.59	768,447
Dominican Republic	.05	20,650	.05	19,820	.05	24,165	Syria	.08	33,040	.08	31,712	.08	38,664
Ecuador	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.05	24,165	Thailand	.18	74,340	.18	71,352	.18	86,994
Egypt	.47	194,110	.40	158,560	.40	193,320	Turkey	.65	268,450	.65	257,660	.69	333,477
El Salvador	.06	24,780	.06	23,784	.06	28,998	Ukrainian S. S. R.	1.88	776,440	2.00	792,800	2.02	976,266
Ethiopia	.10	41,300	.12	47,568	.12	57,996	Union of South Africa	.78	322,140	.78	309,192	.78	376,974
France	5.75	2,374,750	5.90	2,338,760	6.23	3,010,959	United Kingdom	9.80	4,047,400	8.85	3,508,140	8.55	4,132,215
Greece	0.21	86,730	0.21	83,244	0.22	106,326	United States	33.33	13,765,290	33.33	13,212,012	33.33	16,108,389
Guatemala	.07	28,910	.07	27,748	.07	33,831	Uruguay	.18	74,340	.18	71,352	.18	86,994
Haiti	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332	U. S. S. R.	14.15	5,843,950	15.08	5,977,712	15.28	7,384,824
Honduras	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332	Venezuela	.39	161,070	.44	174,416	.47	227,151
Iceland	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332	Yemen	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332
India	3.40	1,404,200	3.30	1,308,120	3.25	1,570,725	Yugoslavia	.44	181,720	.44	174,416	.40	193,330
Indonesia	.60	247,800	.56	221,984	.56	270,648	Total	100.00	141,300,000	100.00	139,640,000	100.00	148,330,000
Iran	.28	115,640	.25	99,100	.30	144,990							
Iraq	.12	49,560	.11	43,604	.13	62,829							
Israel	.17	70,210	.17	67,388	.17	82,161							

¹ 60 members.

² 76 members. New members admitted in December 1955; assessments not yet

determined: Austria, Albania, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Ceylon, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Laos, Libya, Nepal, Portugal, Rumania, Spain.

TABLE 3.—Food and Agriculture Organization: Scale of assessments

Member countries	Calendar year 1954		Calendar year 1955		Calendar year 1956		Member countries	Calendar year 1954		Calendar year 1955		Calendar year 1956	
	Percent	Assessment	Percent	Assessment	Percent	Assessment		Percent	Assessment	Percent	Assessment	Percent	Assessment
Afghanistan	0.16	\$9,481	0.12	\$7,068	0.08	\$5,168	Korea	0.09	\$5,333	0.16	\$9,424	0.11	\$7,106
Argentina	1.83	108,437	1.60	94,240	1.63	105,298	Laos	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Australia	2.00	118,510	2.06	121,334	2.29	147,934	Lebanon	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.06	3,876
Austria	.38	22,517	.55	32,395	.49	31,654	Liberia	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Belgium	1.78	105,474	1.76	103,664	1.75	113,050	Libya			.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Bolivia	.06	3,555	.08	4,712	.06	3,876	Luxembourg	.06	3,555	.07	4,123	.08	5,168
Brazil	1.52	90,067	1.71	100,719	1.52	98,192	Mexico	.81	47,996	1.14	67,146	.98	63,308
Burma	.16	9,481	.15	8,835	.14	9,044	Nepal	.10	5,925	.08	4,712	.04	2,584
Cambodia	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,884	Netherlands	1.70	100,733	1.26	74,214	1.59	102,714
Canada	4.76	282,054	5.69	335,141	4.61	297,806	New Zealand	.65	38,516	.58	34,162	.61	39,406
Ceylon	.13	7,703	.20	11,780	.15	9,690	Nicaragua	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Chile	.31	18,369	.41	24,149	.42	27,132	Norway	.66	39,103	.65	38,285	.69	44,574
Colombia	.40	23,702	.65	38,285	.52	33,592	Pakistan	.98	58,070	1.15	67,735	.76	49,096
Costa Rica	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,884	Panama	.05	2,963	.06	3,534	.06	3,876
Cuba	.46	27,257	.50	29,450	.38	24,548	Paraguay	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Denmark	1.08	63,995	.91	53,599	.91	58,786	Peru			.21	12,369	.20	12,920
Dominican Republic	.05	2,963	.07	4,123	.06	3,876	Philippines	.22	13,036	.74	43,586	.57	36,822
Ecuador	.05	2,963	.06	3,534	.06	3,876	Portugal	.65	38,516	.37	21,793	.34	21,964
Egypt	.55	32,590	.60	35,340	.51	32,946	Saudi Arabia	.06	3,555	.09	5,301	.09	5,814
El Salvador	.05	2,963	.08	4,712	.08	5,168	Spain	1.37	81,179	1.62	95,418	1.59	102,714
Ethiopia	.15	8,888	.13	7,657	.15	9,690	Sweden	2.11	125,028	1.97	116,033	2.02	130,492
Finland	.43	25,480	.56	32,984	.52	33,592	Switzerland	1.56	92,438	1.54	90,706	1.60	103,360
France	6.70	397,008	7.49	441,161	7.91	510,986	Syria	.10	5,925	.10	5,890	.10	6,460
Germany	4.73	280,276	5.66	333,374	5.85	377,910	Thailand	.17	10,073	.30	17,670	.23	14,858
Greece	.27	15,999	.38	22,382	.28	18,088	Tunisia					.06	3,876
Guatemala	.08	4,740	.10	5,890	.09	5,814	Turkey	.66	39,108	.79	46,531	.88	56,848
Haiti	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,884	Union of South Africa	.95	56,292	.77	45,353	.99	63,954
Honduras	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,884	United Kingdom	15.03	890,603	10.49	617,861	10.87	702,202
Iceland	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,884	United States of America	30.00	1,777,650	30.00	1,767,000	31.50	2,034,900
India	5.18	306,941	4.55	267,995	4.13	266,798	Uruguay	.25	14,814	.23	13,547	.23	14,858
Indonesia	.52	30,813	.83	48,887	.71	45,866	Venezuela	.45	26,665	.57	33,573	.60	38,760
Iran			.34	20,026	.38	24,548	Vietnam	.23	13,629	.21	12,369	.22	14,212
Iraq	.12	7,111	.12	7,068	.16	10,336	Yemen			.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Ireland	.40	23,702	.27	15,903	.27	17,442	Yugoslavia	.66	39,108	.60	35,340	.51	32,946
Israel	.13	7,703	.19	11,191	.22	14,212	Total	100.00	1 5,925,500	100.00	2 5,890,000	100.00	3 6,460,000
Italy	3.19	189,023	2.99	176,111	2.88	186,048							
Japan	2.25	133,324	2.79	164,331	2.73	176,358							
Jordan	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584							

¹ 67 members.² 71 members.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the joint resolution we are now considering is passed, we will automatically have abandoned the proposition that many of us have advanced in the past, to decrease the amounts of our contributions percentagewise, or at least, to hold them at present levels. The total amount of the contribution that is now assessed against the United States for the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations is \$2 million. Percentagewise we are now furnishing 31.5 percent. If we increase the amount to \$3 million, as is being asked in the joint resolution, it is entirely possible that the amount of the contribution percentagewise will be much greater than the overall limitation on contributions of 33 1/3 percent, the goal toward which we have been aiming for several years.

If with our contribution of \$2 million, we have now reached the percentagewise level of 31 1/2 percent, then with \$3 million, the percentage may well climb to 37 or 38 percent of the total.

Therefore the suggestion I would make is that instead of fixing the amount at so many millions of dollars for the Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Labor Organization, we limit, percentagewise, the amounts to be contributed. The amount, as I have indicated, that we are contributing to the Food and Agriculture Organization is 31 1/2 percent. With respect to ILO, we are now contributing 25 percent. The limitation that is now on the statute books is \$1,750,000. If we raise the amount to \$3 million, it is entirely possible that our contribution will be in excess of the overall limitation on U. N. contributions of 33 1/3 percent which is certainly an ample burden for us to bear.

I do not wish to withdraw from any of these organizations. However, I do believe that our contributions should be within reason, and that if increased expenditures are necessary, that other nations should contribute a pro rata share of those increases.

With respect to all these organizations, our contribution is far in excess of that of any other country in the world.

For example, the contribution we are making to the Organization of American States is in the neighborhood of 66 percent of the total budget. In the United Nations, in connection with the technical aid program, we have been contributing as much as 65 percent for that program. That is entirely aside from any amount that we contribute directly to the various nations of the world through our own technical aid and mutual assistance programs.

As was stated by my distinguished friend, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], instead of increasing the amounts percentagewise, it strikes me that we should let them stand where they are or fix a ceiling of, at the maximum, 33 1/3 percent.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana has made what I believe to be a very meritorious and worthwhile suggestion. I have discussed the matter with the distinguished minority leader and with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], both of whom are members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and they have proposed the possibility of offering an

amendment from the committee which would read as follows:

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of this act, the payments by the United States to the Food and Agriculture Organization and to the International Labor Organization shall not exceed 33 1/3 percent of the total assessed budgets of those organizations.

That does not mean that that percentage should be reached automatically, but it does set a ceiling. Of course, it would be the intent of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and especially of the Committee on Appropriations, of which the Senator from Louisiana is a member, as well as of Congress as a whole, to make certain that our requirements be held down to the most reasonable minimum.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator concedes that if we should put a limitation of \$3 million instead of the \$2 million in the joint resolution, it would be entirely possible that the amount we might contribute to the Food and Agriculture Organization would be in excess of 33 1/3 percent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The same would be true with respect to the International Labor Organization.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. As a matter of fact it is probable that such would be the situation if we raised the contribution from \$1,750,000 to \$3 million.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the Senator's point is a good one. If we had a dollar limitation alone, it might

have—depending on what the size of the budget was—the tendency to do what the Senator suggests. I think the amendment which the Senator from Montana has suggested would at least keep the figures from getting out of line with the other percentages.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator—I do not know whether he was in the Chamber when I spoke on this subject earlier today—that we must make a close study of the situation to determine if we cannot get the percentages to move downward, instead of upward. At least the amendment would tend to keep them in conformity with the efforts which Congress has heretofore made, to keep the top limitation at 33½ percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. The purpose of the amendment I offered is to fix the percentagewise contribution at its present level. However, I realize that it may be a little difficult to do that. Instead of using dollar figures, the Senator would limit the amount percentagewise to make the amount not over 33½ percent, the ceiling which we have been trying to apply with respect to other organizations. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say that that would be correct. However, I am inclined to believe—and I would also wish to check the matter with our staff—that unless we add a dollar amount, the problem would not be solved, because there is already a dollar restriction in effect. Therefore, it seems to me that the suggestion of the Senator from Montana, to let the dollar figure stand but to provide also that in no event shall the amount exceed 33½ percent, would take care of the situation at both ends.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I stated earlier, the Senate should not abandon the idea of not increasing the amounts, percentagewise, of our contributions to these agencies; on the contrary, we should adopt those limitations. In the past 4 or 5 years the Senate Appropriations Committee has been able to considerably reduce the amounts we have been contributing to various international organizations, and particularly with reference to the specialized agencies of United Nations. If the amendment which I have proposed should be adopted, it would mean that the amount could be increased—that is, if the agency budget were increased—but, percentagewise, our contributions would remain fixed at the present levels. With respect to the International Labor Organization, it would remain at 25 percent, and with respect to the Food and Agriculture Organization, it would remain at 31½ percent, if my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. President, I hesitate to take a backward step, but rather than passing a bill under which it may be possible to go above the 33½ percent which has been our goal, I would much prefer that the measure be amended as suggested by the distinguished Senator from Montana, to limit the amount percentagewise, so that in no event can either of those organizations obtain a larger contribution for this Nation than 33½ percent of the total agency budget.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me for the purpose of submitting an amendment and asking that it be read?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana is pending, it might be well if the Senator would temporarily withdraw his amendment. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana, which would be placed at the end of the joint resolution, would fix the maximum at 33½ percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, I am a fair compromiser. I should like to see my amendment adopted, of course, but, with so many apparently against it, I shall withdraw it with the understanding that a limitation will be imposed, as was suggested by the distinguished Senator from Montana, so that the amounts to be contributed cannot exceed 33½ percent of the budgets.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the language is very clear, because it is proposed to add section 2, reading as follows:

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of this act, the payments by the United States to the Food and Agricultural Organization and to the International Labor Organization will not exceed 33½ percent of the total assessed budgets of those organizations.

Mr. ELLENDER. With the understanding that the amendment will be offered and adopted, I shall withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana is withdrawn. The Senator from Montana has an amendment at the desk, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution, it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of this act, the payments by the United States to the Food and Agricultural Organization and to the International Labor Organization shall not exceed 33½ percent of the total assessed budgets of those organizations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the amendment is a wise one, but I wish to be certain as to what is proposed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We are now proposing to fix a percentage ceiling, a question which has been discussed among the members of the committee. We think it is quite agreeable and is probably the best compromise which can be reached at this time.

It means, of course, that, if necessary, in the case of the ILO the amount could be raised from approximately 25 percent to as much as 33½ percent. As I recall, the amount contributed for FAO is now approximately 31.5 percent. I think it should be satisfactory to all concerned.

Mr. LEHMAN. As I understand, if in the event of the allocation to this country

of its share the expenditure for ILO were raised to 33½ percent, which is provided for by the amendment of the Senator from Montana, there would be sufficient money—

Mr. MANSFIELD. There would be more than sufficient money so far as the dollar amount is concerned, but that would be a matter for the Committee on Appropriations to decide, based on the facts made available to them as to how much would or would not be appropriated to these subsidiary organizations.

Mr. LEHMAN. The reason why I press the question is because in the statement submitted by the Department of State, explaining the reasons for the proposed legislation in great detail, I find the last paragraph reads as follows:

If the present ceiling of \$1,750,000 remains, the United States will have little or no flexibility for negotiation, particularly as regards the assessment scale when this issue is considered by the governing body in November. The Department of State and the Department of Labor believe that the United States would be in a better position to obtain a reasonable solution on this issue, and on other financial and substantive issues, if this Government were not forced to take a completely negative stand on these matters. The proposed increase in the statutory ceiling to \$3 million would provide the flexibility which is required.

I have never been a delegate to the meetings of the ILO or the FAO, but I have been a delegate to the World Health Organization. The same question arose in 1951 or 1952. We wanted it to have a certain amount of flexibility and the arrangement which was made was in the interest of this country. But there was no limitation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The proposal has been discussed, has been agreed on, and has been considered as containing much in the way of merit.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to call up my amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 2, line 5, to change the period to a comma, and insert the following: 'and by inserting before the semicolon at the end of such subsection a colon and the following: 'Provided, however, That no sums in excess of \$1,750,000 shall be appropriated to defray the expenses of the International Labor Organization for any calendar year after the calendar year 1956, if during the preceding calendar year delegates allegedly representing employers and employees in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or in any nation dominated by the foreign government controlling the world Communist movement were permitted to vote in the International Labor Conference or in other meetings held under the auspices of the International Labor Organization'."

MR. BRICKER. Mr. President, in support of the amendment, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks an article entitled "How Useful Is the ILO?" written by George Sokolsky, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 5, 1956. The article points out the need for the amendment.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

MR. BRICKER. Mr. President, I am fearful of the amendment which has just been offered by the Senator from Montana, because it is an open invitation to increase our contribution to the amount set forth as the maximum. I feel quite assured that that is what ultimately would happen. Furthermore, I am supported in this position by the American delegations to both the FAO and ILO. They voted against the increases which are here provided for.

Senate Joint Resolution 97 would:

First. Increase the ceiling on United States annual contributions to the Food and Agriculture Organization from \$2 million to \$3 million; and

Second. Increase the ceiling on United States annual contributions to the International Labor Organization from \$1,750,000 to \$3,000,000.

I do not oppose the recommended increase in the statutory ceiling on contributions to the FAO. To the best of my knowledge and belief, FAO has done a good job. Our participation in that U. N. agency is relatively noncontroversial. FAO assessments on the United States for the calendar year 1956 may exceed the existing ceiling figure.

I may say, in connection with the Food and Agricultural Organization, that much has been done by private organizations throughout the country, by voluntary contribution, to promote the building up of productivity in the various countries of the world where there is great need for food and agricultural production.

Entirely different considerations arise with respect to the ceiling on contributions to the International Labor Organization. First, continued participation by the United States in ILO is a highly controversial issue. And, secondly, the committee report indicates that the ILO ceiling will not be pierced until the calendar year 1957. Accordingly, I believe that the Senate should amend Senate Joint Resolution 97 by striking out subsection (b) concerned with United States contributions to the ILO.

I am advised that no public hearings were held by the committee in regard to the increased appropriations. There are very important organizations in the country which are entitled to have and ought to have a voice. They should be heard, and a record ought to be made. It is my understanding that conferences were held in executive session between the committee and representatives of the State Department and, perhaps, of the Department of Labor, in regard to the increased contribution, all of which will be paid by the taxpayers of the United States.

If the pending resolution is limited to the Food and Agriculture Organization,

the Senate Foreign Relations Committee can then make a full investigation of the International Labor Organization. No hearings have been held on Senate Joint Resolution 97. It is an original joint resolution reported favorably from the committee at the request of the State, Agriculture, and Labor Departments.

Why should we authorize the spending of more money for the International Labor Organization when public hearings on the question have not been held, when the need for increased funds will not arise before the calendar year 1957, and when United States participation in the ILO is a matter of growing public concern? The Senate should amend Senate Joint Resolution 97 by striking therefrom subsection (b), page 2, lines 1 through 5.

If Senate Joint Resolution 97 is not so amended, the Senate must face this question: Why should the International Labor Organization be rewarded for an intolerable act of Communist appeasement? I refer to the action of the ILO Conference in 1955 which seated employer and employee representatives from Communist countries and granted them voting privileges. If the ceiling on United States contributions to the ILO is raised, the following condition should be imposed:

Provided, however, That no sums in excess of \$1,750,000 shall be appropriated to defray the expenses of the International Labor Organization for any calendar year after the calendar year 1956, if during the preceding calendar year delegates allegedly representing employers and employees in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or in any nation dominated by the foreign government controlling the world Communist movement were permitted to vote in the International Labor Conference or in other meetings held under the auspices of the International Labor Organization.

Each member of ILO is represented by four delegates. Under the ILO constitution, 2 delegates represent government; 1 delegate represents employees; and 1 delegate represents the employers of his country. Under this tripartite arrangement the nongovernment delegates must be free of government dictation; that is, they must be truly representative of free, voluntary associations of employers and employees.

The United States employer delegate is nominated by the National Association of Manufacturers and by the United States Chamber of Commerce. The United States employee delegate is nominated by the AFL-CIO. The two Government delegates are nominated by the Secretary of Labor.

At the ILO Conference in Geneva in 1955, so-called employer and employee representatives from Communist countries were seated and granted voting privileges. The United States Government and employee delegates protested this action but bowed to the will of the majority. In contrast to this rather feeble protest, the United States employer delegate, Mr. W. L. McGrath, of Cincinnati, Ohio, refused to sit with so-called employer representatives from Communist Russia and its satellites. Had he done so, he would have declared,

in effect, that employer associations in Communist countries are free and voluntary associations; that their representatives have just as much right to participate in ILO deliberations as employer delegates from the free nations of the world. In other words, Mr. McGrath stood on principle. He refused to act out a lie. The question now is: Will Congress support his stand? I hope so.

Why should the Senate reward the ILO by raising the statutory ceiling on United States contributions from \$1,750,000 a year to \$3 million a year? I shall not vote for this increase unless its effectiveness is conditioned on the ILO unseating so-called employer and employee representatives from Communist countries. In addition, I hope Congress will take a new look at the ILO technical assistance program and at all other U. N. technical assistance programs in which Communist "experts" are financed—directly or indirectly, in whole or in part—with the dollars of American taxpayers.

It is perfectly proper for President Eisenhower to sit at the conference table with Bulganin or for Secretary Dulles to meet with Molotov. No matter how much we despise the fact, the fact is that Bulganin and Molotov represent the Government of Communist Russia. Moreover, except for the slim hope of revolution in Russia, the only alternative to war is patient negotiation with the rulers of the Kremlin. I believe that both President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles should be commended for their efforts along this line.

Although heads of government must maintain diplomatic intercourse, this does not mean that the great organizations of American business and labor must stultify themselves by having their representatives treat so-called employer and employee representatives from Communist Russia as coequals. These phony delegates from Communist Russia do not resemble free employers or free employees any more than Outer Mongolia resembles a sovereign nation.

We have been told that the United States must continue to be a member of the ILO no matter how that Organization handles the Communist issue. We have been told that this must be done in the interest of universality. So far as I can tell, universality in internationalist lingo usually means that honorable men and free nations should abandon their principles for the privilege of associating in the same club with Communists, atheists, and barbarians. That is what the argument for universality in the International Labor Organization really means.

The National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce have voted for employer participation in the International Labor Organization for 1 more year. According to my information, the United States employer delegate will not sit in committees in Geneva with Communist agents masquerading as representatives of free employers. Both the NAM and the chamber have asked the President to appoint a commission to study the question of further participation by the United States in ILO. The concern of

American business organizations is reflected in the following resolution adopted by the United States Chamber of Commerce on January 28, 1956:

Whereas the Chamber of Commerce of the United States reaffirms its belief in the fundamental objectives of the original constitution of the International Labor Organization which were:

"Universal and lasting peace can be established only if it is based upon social justice.

"Conditions of labor exist involving such injustice, hardship and privation to large numbers of people as to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperiled."

Whereas since 1934 we have cooperated and participated in the efforts of the International Labor Organization to effectuate these principles;

Whereas our participation has convinced us that the International Labor Organization is not accomplishing these objectives, but instead has shown that—

1. The activities of the International Labor Organization have gone far afield from the original concept of the achievement of social justice within the field of labor-management relations;

2. There has been undue interference with the internal affairs of nations, beyond the proper scope of international agreement;

3. The International Labor Organization is being used as a propaganda forum for statism and socialism;

4. The technical-assistance program has been subverted to the distribution of statist and Socialist ideologies and propaganda;

5. The tripartite system of representation by Government, employer and worker delegates is a failure;

6. The entry of the Soviet Union and its satellites into the International Labor Organization has made a mockery of free and independent employer and worker representation;

7. By and large the staff of the International Labor Organization is nonobjective and dangerously devoted to the accomplishment of statist and Socialist ideologies;

8. The proper functions of the International Labor Organization are now or could be performed by various other agencies now in existence;

Therefore, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States is convinced that continued support of the International Labor Organization by the taxpayers and by the Government of the United States should be questioned seriously at this time, and recommends—

1. That the executive department should reexamine the activities of the International Labor Organization;

2. That there should be an immediate and thorough congressional investigation of the activities and structure of the International Labor Organization, to determine whether the United States should continue its support of and participation in this organization;

3. That, pending such investigation and subsequent decision, the United States should not increase its financial support or participation; and

4. Pending this investigation and decision at the request of representatives of the United States Government, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States will again participate in the nomination of employer delegations to the International Labor Organization for the year 1956.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Scott in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator is making a very important and very powerful argument. I wish to explore with him precisely the meaning of his amendment. As I understand the viewpoint of the Senator and of the organizations to which he has referred, it is that presumably the ILO was to consist of certain delegates representing governments as governments, certain delegates representing employers as employers, entirely independent of governments, and certain delegates representing labor movements which were free labor movements, independent of either employers or governments. Is that the concept the Senator has of what ILO should be and what he believes was the original intent?

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from California, the distinguished minority leader, is exactly right. That was the original concept of the International Labor Organization when we joined it and in its early days. Much could be accomplished if it were actually organized in that way; but last year, over the protest of the American delegation, and I think the delegation as a whole, the representatives of labor, of industry, and of government in Russia were seated, with four votes, just as the United States had. That means Soviet Russia has four times as many votes on one side as we have, because they all vote as a unit. They do not represent free employers, because there is no such thing in Russia as free employers.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Or free labor.

Mr. BRICKER. And they do not represent free labor, because there is no such thing in Russia as freedom of labor, as we understand it, and as the original concept of the International Labor Organization contemplated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is what I understand the Senator's point to be. Now I am trying to find out for the Record the meaning of the Senator's amendment, if the Senator does not object to this interruption.

Mr. BRICKER. No.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The amendment reads as follows:

Provided, however, That no sums in excess of \$1,750,000—

I may say parenthetically that is the limit now in effect.

Mr. BRICKER. That is right.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The amendment continues:

shall be appropriated to defray the expenses of the International Labor Organization for any calendar year after the calendar year 1956—

So this would not apply until the subsequent year.

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct, and it is not needed in 1956, anyway.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I continue to read from the amendment:

, if during the preceding calendar year delegates allegedly representing employers and employees in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or in any nation dominated by the foreign government controlling the world Communist movement were permitted to vote in the International Labor Conference or in other meetings held under the auspices of the International Labor Organization.

What I am trying to do is get the Senator's intent. It would still be possible for the representatives of Government to be seated, but only so long as they were not masquerading as delegates purporting to represent free employees, free labor, or free employers, neither one of which exists in the Soviet Union or under the Communist union. Am I correct?

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator is correct in that interpretation. In other words, the amendment would hold the appropriations for the years ahead to what they are at the present time, without increasing them—the vote now being completely unbalanced in favor of the Soviet philosophy—until the things asked for could be accomplished, and until there could be a hearing by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate in regard to this very important field, so that there might be a reappraisal of our position, and representatives from industry and labor might be questioned by the committee. That could be done in the next year, and no harm would be caused, because the ceiling would not be pierced until 1957.

Furthermore, I suggest that the executive department completely reexamine its position, so that the United States delegates and free employees and free employers may know exactly where it stands with regard to the International Labor Organization. At the present time it is working on treaties and executive agreements to be entered into, many of which are opposed to our concept of free employers and free employees and the private enterprise system of our people and Government; and many of which tend toward the socialization of the country, which many of us fear at this time, under the leadership of the radicals, Socialists, Communists, and the totalitarians who now dominate, in voting power, the philosophy and the actions of the International Labor Organization.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In effect, the message which might go out behind the Iron Curtain might very well be that what we were doing was looking after the interests of a real free labor movement behind the Iron Curtain, and whenever they had that opportunity they would be able to be represented in the International Labor Organization. Is that the Senator's point?

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator is exactly correct. If we were to increase the amount, it would be a source of encouragement to Soviet Russia, because it would dominate the activities. It would have a single voice in four votes, and we would be at a disadvantage.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield again at this point?

Mr. BRICKER. I am happy to yield. Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator from Ohio has the answer to the question I have in mind, I shall be glad to have him state it. Let us consider one of the countries—there are several of them—in which, although there is not a totalitarian dictatorship, in the sense that such a dictatorship exists in the Soviet Union, nevertheless, any semblance of a free labor movement or of free employers, for that matter, has been

completely eliminated, although the government is freely elected by the people, even though they may be under a Socialist system, as we understand it, under which there is a large degree of government ownership. In such a case, of course, there would still be a free labor movement, presumably.

Mr. BRICKER. Yes; to a degree, although not to the degree in which it exists in the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course. Nevertheless, to that extent they would be independent.

Mr. BRICKER. Yes; and they could objectively approach their responsibilities.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. I presume that in such instances the railroads, the mines, and so forth, would be government owned and government operated, but certain businesses would be privately owned. In the case of such a country, what has been the custom in the ILO? Does such a country have in the ILO one representative from the state-owned industries and another representative from the privately owned industries?

Mr. BRICKER. I do not know. It may be that that information is in the possession of the Foreign Relations Committee. I judge that the staff of the committee would have the information.

In my opinion such a country's two delegates would represent its government, and there would not be an additional delegate to represent the free employers, for in case there were a delegate representing the free employers, the country would have in the ILO three representatives, instead of two. At least, if the original plan of the ILO were followed in that case, that would be the situation.

Mr. President, American labor leaders seem to favor continued participation in ILO, notwithstanding ILO recognition of Communist agents as representatives of free associations of employees behind the Iron Curtain. I do not understand such a position. Consistently, and to their great credit, leaders of American labor unions have fought the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions—WFTU—and have joined with free trade unionists abroad to create the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

For American labor, the question of continued United States' participation in the ILO presents this issue: Shall representatives of free American labor deal on a basis of equality with phony employee representatives from Communist Russia and her satellites? When a Member of Congress suggested to Mr. George Meany that he get all maritime unions, including Harry Bridges' longshoremen's union, together on industry problems, Meany declared that the AFL-CIO have no intention of sitting down "with Commies and gangsters"—Seafarers' Log, February 17, 1956.

That is the issue in connection with the International Labor Organization at this very moment, Mr. President.

Delegates representing the Government of the United States also protested the seating of so-called employer and employee representatives from Commun-

ist countries. For example, Mr. Warren Burger, then Assistant Attorney General of the United States, said at the 1954 ILO Conference:

Every step which the majority report asks you to take toward accepting employer's or worker's delegates who are completely controlled by a government is a step towards changing the essential nature of the ILO. It is precisely because the United States Government does not want this to happen that we raise our voice today in warning.

Gov. Arthur B. Langlie, of Washington, said:

We are confronted with a bloc of 7 Iron Curtain countries, 7 countries who do not know the meaning of freedom—7 countries whose 28 ILO representatives function as 1. There is ample evidence to show that the delegates sent to this peaceful forum from these countries do not conform with the spirit of this organization.

It is plainly ridiculous to speak of "worker's" representatives or "employer's" representatives from these countries.

In other words, the official position of representatives of the United States Government at the 1954 conference was that Communist "employer" and "worker" delegates are mere mouthpieces of government, and are, therefore, ineligible under the ILO constitution to vote in ILO meetings. The ILO has not finally ruled on the eligibility of Communist "employer" and "worker" delegates to participate in the work of the Organization. That is one more reason why the Senate of the United States should not now raise the ceiling on appropriations to the ILO.

If United States labor, business, and Government delegates to the ILO do not stand firm on this Communist issue, they will approve by their deeds the following statement from *Trud*, published by the Central Headquarters of the Soviet Trade Union Organization:

In the course of recent years, hundreds of workers' delegations and people of different political or religious convictions have visited the Soviet Union. All are agreed in finding that there is full freedom of association in the U. S. S. R. The Soviet unions are the center of organization for millions of workers and employees, constituted on a basis of freely acquired consent. They reflect the inflexible will of the workers of our country to build up the splendid organization of Communist society. They protect the interests of the workers and the employees and seek to improve their living and working conditions. The administration of social insurance, to which the Soviet Government subscribes millions of rubles, is in their hands. In the Socialist countries, where the power lies in the hands of the people, there are and could be no breaches of trade union rights or liberties; antilabor or antidemocratic laws, such as the infamous Taft-Hartley Act, laid down by the reactionary bosses of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, cannot exist.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I strongly urge the Senate to take one of the following courses of action:

First. Keep the statutory ceiling for the ILO at its present figure, pending hearings on the advisability of raising the ceiling and on the desirability of continued United States participation; or

Second. Make any increase in the statutory ceiling contingent on ILO re-

jection of Communist agents as bona fide employer and worker delegates. This is the effect of the amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 97 which I proposed on January 12, 1956.

Mr. President, I think my amendment should be willingly accepted by the Foreign Relations Committee. The committee members know as well as I do that we are completely out of sympathy with the position taken by the Communist governments of the world in regard to employer-employee relationships. As a matter of fact, in the Communist countries there are no such relationships; all such relationships are completely eliminated, and all employee groups are dictated to by the governments controlling those countries at the time. So it would stultify the position of free business and free labor in the United States, as well as the position of our Government itself, if our representatives to the ILO were to sit around the conference table with representatives of the Communist countries, for the consideration of the very important matters connected with employer-labor relationships. At such a conference our delegates would be greatly out-numbered and out-voted by the delegates representing the Communist governments, just as our representatives to the ILO now are out-numbered and out-voted in connection with the positions the Soviet and Communist governments take, whereas we should be able to oppose them effectively.

Mr. President, the way for the United States to take affirmative steps in the best interests of free labor and free business is for us to say that we are not going to increase by 1 cent the United States' contribution to the International Labor Organization, for which we are now paying more than our share, until the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate hold a public hearing on this subject, so that, first, the American people will be able to know what the issues are; and, second, until the representatives of those tyrannical governments are excluded from the consideration of the rights and relationships of free workers and free business in the world.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 5, 1956]

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

HOW USEFUL IS THE ILO?

The United States has become a member of a large number of international organizations in addition to the United Nations. Most of these organizations come quite expensive because the United States quota usually runs to about one-third of the budget. It is difficult to assess the value of all these international efforts; some are useful, others are only continuous.

The International Labor Organization is one of the least useful and effective. Because of the increase of government-owned enterprises throughout the world, the nature of employment has changed in many countries to such a degree that slavery has been restored. The ILO was established during a capitalistic era; much of the world is now socialistic.

As the American employer representative, W. L. McGrath, of Cincinnati, says in his report:

"At annual ILO conferences Communist orators, outnumbering ours in the ratio of 32 to 4, will tell the representatives of 69

nations about the decadence of the free-enterprise system, the superiority of the Communist system, the exploitation of the workingman by the American capitalists, and our greed and desire for war. These speeches will be reprinted by the ILO and circulated all over the world. One cannot imagine a better ready-made vehicle for the promotion of Communist indoctrination. Do we want to continue to finance this Communist operation?"

To many careless readers throughout the world, such publication by an international body will give the impression that the material is not Russian propaganda, but is the conclusion reached and assented to by the body.

McGrath objected to seating the Russian employer delegates. As all industry in Soviet Russia is owned by the Government, who are these employers? How, in a country which forbids private ownership of an industry, can there be an employer?

This may not be an exciting argument, except that the reason for the existence of the ILO is to have government, employers, and labor-union heads meet together to lay down certain policies concerning labor and working conditions on a universal basis. That this cannot be accomplished with the varieties of standards of living in the various countries is obvious from the small accomplishments of the ILO, but the excuse that is being given for its continued existence is that it is useful to have such a cooperative body.

In fact, the Marxian aim of Soviet Russia is to abolish the private ownership of enterprise throughout the world so that employers will not be permitted anywhere. Why then does such a country hold membership in an international organization which recognizes the right of an employer to exist, to hire labor and to bargain with a free labor union?

McGrath says:

"If we are simply to accept the present situation in the ILO, the end result is, to my mind, inevitable. The Communists, with 8 nations to our 1, and 32 votes to our 4, will remain firmly entrenched and will progressively dominate the ILO. It will become merely an international forum for the dissemination of Communist propaganda, financed to at least 25 percent by the taxpayers of the United States. In fact, at its next session, our Congress will be asked to raise the ceiling for the United States contribution to the ILO from \$1,750,000 a year to \$3 million a year."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I dislike very much to disagree with my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Ohio; and I dislike it the more because there is a good deal of truth and merit in what he says. However, I invite his attention to the fact that financially the ILO is operated on a calendar-year basis. Its appropriations are effective on the first of January each year.

It is true, as the distinguished Senator from Ohio has said, that there have been no public hearings on the pending joint resolution; but, as I recall—and I should like to be corrected if I am mistaken—the reason why there were no public hearings is that there were no requests on the part of anyone to come before the committee at that time.

I point out to the senior Senator from Ohio that the administration sent to the committee representatives of the State and Labor Departments, and that those representatives were quite urgent in their request to us that we report the joint resolution favorably. It was reported unanimously from the Foreign Relations Committee.

The Senator from Ohio has mentioned something about our being outvoted. I do not believe that is exactly true, because while there are eight Communist countries in the ILO, they have, as I understand, 32 votes out of a total of 284 votes. I think we ought to recognize the fact that we are in a pretty tough scrap with communism and with the Soviet Union.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. How many votes has the United States?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Four, as I understand.

It is my feeling that we should remain in an organization of this sort and not get out, because if we were to show our pique, if we were to refuse the necessary funds, and refuse to cooperate with other freedom-minded members of the organization, I feel that the end result would be the creation of a vacuum into which the Soviet Union and its satellites would move. I think we ought to recognize the fact that, while it is true that so-called employee and employer delegates are fictions so far as the Soviet Union is concerned, nevertheless, at the present time the ILO does have a committee looking into this particular subject and trying to find out what can be done to bring about a clear declaration regarding the Soviet Union and its captive states, so that this myth or fiction of so-called employer and employee delegates can be done away with.

I think the Senator from Ohio made a sound suggestion when he said that the President should create a commission to study the question of further participation by the United States in the ILO, based upon the arguments advanced. It is my hope that the joint resolution will be passed without the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, that the President will appoint a commission, and that we can go along, in the interest of harmony in this country between labor, management, and Government, because I understand that the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce have nominated their delegate for this year. It seems to me that what we should do is to fight out the issue in this particular Organization, and not back out and allow the Soviet Union and its captive states to come in. So I sincerely hope that, even though there is a great deal of merit in what the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio has said in offering his amendment, the joint resolution will be approved as it is, and that we shall proceed to work out some of the details later.

Inasmuch as the Government is in the process of appointing its delegates; inasmuch as the AFL-CIO is participating; and inasmuch as employers have appointed their delegate, let us go ahead and give this program a chance. Let us try to do what we can by fighting within the Organization, instead of trying to withdraw and allowing the Soviet Union and its satellites to take over.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Ohio—and I must say that during the course of the discussion today I have somewhat changed my views with respect to it, in the light of the statement of the Senator from Ohio—he is not proposing that the United States withdraw from the organization. So I do not believe that point is at issue. Certainly he is not proposing that we withdraw at this time. While some people on the outside had suggested that possibility at one time, and while it may still be suggested by our former representatives in the ILO, that is not the issue before the Senate today.

We have adopted an amendment which increases the amounts for the Food and Agricultural Organization up to the maximum of 33 1/3 percent. By that amendment, as I view the legislative picture, we have contingently increased the ILO amount up to 33 1/3 percent.

The contingency or proviso in the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio is that that not be done until two things have happened—first, until the Senate and the executive branch of the Government shall have had an opportunity to review the situation growing out of the action by the ILO in obviously going counter to what had been the original intent, of having representatives of free labor, free employers, and the Government, rather than to have the Government unilaterally voting for all three when, in fact, free labor and free employers are nonexistent.

Secondly, after the executive branch and the Congress shall have had an opportunity to study the problem, our representatives will still be on hand, as the Senator from Montana points out, to carry on the battle, to see if the problem cannot be solved within the ILO itself.

If that can be done, the Congress of the United States will certainly be in a position next January to act. The contingency will be removed, because if the ILO solves the problem, the amendment of the Senator from Ohio will not apply. If, on the other hand, despite non-action by the ILO, hearings bring out the desirability of continuing in the Organization on the basis of a contribution of 33 1/3 percent, at that point the Senate and the House could, in effect, strike out the proviso.

I must say, in all fairness both to the Senate and to the distinguished Senator from Montana, that I do not purport, as minority leader, to speak for the administration in this connection. I agree with the Senator that the administration made it very clear before the committee that it thought the amount should be increased; and the Senator is quite properly carrying out the mandate of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

However, on my own responsibility, let me say that I think the arguments which have been made by the Senator from Ohio are very persuasive. I believe that a question of moral principle is involved. I believe that at some point we shall have to draw the line and say that we cannot continue to have the Soviet

Government, in effect, making a dead letter of what has been the intent and the normal practice, of having free labor and free industry represented.

As a result of the discussion today, I have personally come to the conclusion that I will support the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the pending joint resolution.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to answer the distinguished minority leader first before I yield to the Senator from New York. I can well understand the reasons for the consideration given by the Senator from California to the suggestions of the Senator from Ohio. It is true, of course, that the so-called employee and employer delegates representing the Soviet Union in the ILO are phonies and myths, and that it is all a fiction, and does not stand up. However, I would like to point out to the Senate that the issue of the Soviet Union employer and worker representation in the ILO became acute at the ILO Conference in 1954. At that time, the United States Government, employer, and worker delegates all supported challenges that had been filed to the Soviet employer and worker delegates on the grounds that they were in fact representatives of the Soviet Government and not of free employers and free workers. Nonetheless, the Soviet were seated.

Subsequently, in March 1955, the ILO governing body appointed a committee, headed by Lord Arnold D. McNair, former president of the International Court of Justice, to study the question of the freedom of employer and worker organizations in each of the ILO member countries. That committee made a voluminous report shortly before the March 1956 meeting of the governing body. Because of the shortness of time, the governing body decided to postpone full discussion of the problem until its November 1956 meeting. In the meantime, however, the governing body is proposing that the ILO Conference in June discuss the question, not with the purpose of taking formal decisions, but in order to give the governing body the benefit of the delegates' views.

The problem is by no means so simple as it might appear. There is reason to hope that in time it can be worked out to our satisfaction, but the approach embodied in this amendment will certainly not contribute to such a solution.

I should like respectfully to suggest to the Senate that at this time the amendment be rejected, and that the joint resolution be passed as it is. In the meantime, we should follow the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio that the Committee on Foreign Relation consider the matter and hold public hearings—which I must insist again have not been requested up to this time—and that the ILO itself, through a subcommittee, keep looking into this question, so that there may be demolished the myth of Soviet employer and employee representation. Of course, there are other things to be considered also.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the Senator from Montana that his arguments would be quite persuasive if the Senator from Ohio or any other Senator had suggested that either the United States withdraw at this time under those circumstances, or indeed if an amendment had been offered which would cut the amounts which the United States is now contributing to ILO. But that is not the situation which confronts us. In either case the Senator's arguments would be persuasive under the present circumstances, and such an amendment could properly be rejected by the Senate.

However, the situation confronting us—and what I say now is in addition to the statement made earlier—is that for the first time the Senate is being asked affirmatively to put what may be termed its stamp of endorsement upon the changed condition in the ILO, and to indicate what might be considered to be full approval of the action which has been taken.

It seems to me that there is an entirely different situation confronting us in view of the event which took place a year or so ago. As the Senator has pointed out, a committee has been appointed, which is to make its report in March of this year, and the matter is to be considered presumably in June and perhaps in November, or whenever the organization next meets. Therefore it seems to me that under those circumstances—and I admit this is true in the present situation, as it is in the case of many other issues which come before the Senate—there is ample room for an honest difference of opinion on this subject. No one can speak dogmatically on it and insist that his solution is the proper one. However, it seems to me, in view of the facts which have been presented—the outline by the Senator from Ohio, and the fact that it is not being proposed that we withdraw from the organization, or that we so much as cut a single penny from our contribution—that there is certainly great concern felt, not only among the employers of our country but also among our labor organizations as well. Although our labor organizations feel very strongly that we should not withdraw from ILO, I do not believe any inference should be left that the American Federation of Labor—if I know that organization and Mr. Meany, or even the CIO organization, or any other labor organization—believes that the method of letting the Soviet Government or any other Communist government represent both its employers and its employees is the right approach to the situation. On the contrary, they would be very adamant in opposing such an approach.

Therefore, it seems to me that, under the circumstances, the Senate would be justified in accepting the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. It is for those reasons—and I must say that it has been brought out by discussion here today, and I am not speaking as a party leader, but only on my own responsibility—that I feel there are strong reasons to sup-

port the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As the Senator from California has said, there are two sides to every question, and there is room for an honest difference of opinion.

However, I feel that if we pass the joint resolution as is, what we will be doing will be to back up the employer and employee delegates representing our country. Certainly there is no reason why the situation should be regarded as being as dangerous as some people think it is. If the commission the Senator from Ohio has suggested is appointed, if the committee appointed by ILO itself looks into the matter, and if perhaps also the Committee on Foreign Relations looks into it—especially if the committee were to hold public hearings and look into the matter—plus the constant watchdog attitude of the Committee on Appropriations, I think we would probably be in a better position next year to find out how this matter is coming out and what would be the best way to fight against some things we do not like at this time.

However, as I say, and as the minority leader says, it is purely a matter of opinion.

Mr. LEHMAN. I rise to support the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. It seems to me we ought to pass the joint resolution as it reads in its amended form, although I sympathize with the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio that the matter be studied and investigated by the administration, by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and by the ILO itself. Certainly no harm would come from passing the joint resolution as it reads in amended form. There will be ample opportunity to take action next year if it is considered desirable, as necessary to do so.

I wish to point out that nothing dangerous has developed in connection with this entire situation. I wish to read from a statement submitted by the Department of State, which explains the joint resolution and states the reason for the support of the joint resolution by the Department of State. It reads as follows:

Since 1950, there have been significant developments in the ILO program which have increased the costs of the Organization. Four ILO operational field offices have been established on a regional basis to permit more effective assistance to governments in meeting problems in such fields as manpower utilization, industrial safety, administration of labor standards, social security, etc. In addition, the ILO has been instrumental in exposing violations of basic rights of labor, particularly in Iron Curtain countries, and in promoting and strengthening democratic institutions among workers. Jointly with the United Nations, the ILO has carried on a worldwide investigation of the use of forced labor for purposes of political coercion or for the fulfillment of the economic plans of a State. This investigation has done much to dispel the Soviet fiction of the "workers' paradise" in the minds of those whom the Soviets are most anxious to influence. In regard to freedom of association, the ILO has brought to public attention specific, documented cases of governmental control or domination of worker organizations in a number of countries for political purposes. At the same time, careful screening procedures are employed to

weed out allegations which are propagandistic, malicious and unsubstantiated.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that what the ILO has accomplished along the lines of breaking down and refuting false statements and false propaganda is highly important. I think we would be making a serious mistake if we should undertake to give the impression that we are seeking to take unilateral action. The voting strength of the Soviet bloc in ILO, I believe, represents numerically one-seventh or one-eighth of the voting strength of the non-Communist countries having membership in the ILO. I consider the ILO highly important and effective. This organization has done much to break down the myths and the false propaganda employed by the Communists regarding the position of labor in Communist countries and in refuting the claim that they represent democratic principles. We all know that such a claim is completely untrue. I think the work of ILO is tremendously important and we must not handicap it.

I do not believe the resolution as it now stands, with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana, would in any way jeopardize the rights of this country which are already recognized by the representatives who have been selected to sit as members of the United States delegation in the ILO. I hope the resolution as amended by the Senator from Montana will be agreed to.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I should like to say, further, that if there has been anything accomplished in breaking down, as the Senator from New York has said, the myth of Soviet imperialism and the lack of freedom of labor and business in communistic countries, it has been done without their participation, because up to this time they have not been members at all of the Organization. So that any work that has been done has been done on the part of the other nations before the Soviet Republic was represented.

The Senator from New York says that the Organization has only one-eighth of the voting power of the other nations represented; but when we add to that the fact that there are totalitarian countries which do not agree with us with respect to the right of labor and business to be free and to bargain collectively, and the like, I might point out the fact that the Soviet countries have eight times as many votes in this Organization as has the United States. Furthermore, if we increase the appropriation, what the Senate will be doing is saying to representatives who have voted against us that we are going to increase the amount, willy-nilly, and, in fact, it will weaken our position when we come to confer with employer and employee delegations. It will weaken the hands of the United States representatives in carrying out the plan and purpose of maybe getting rid of the captive representatives who will vote against us on every possible occasion. It will further nullify the effectiveness of the ILO in calling to the attention of the world the default in the Soviet system of imperialistic control and domination of the rights of labor in those countries and the complete servility of their people.

CII—399

Mr. President, I have searched the records to find out what justification there is for the increase. There was no testimony, so far as I know, concerning it. There is certainly nothing in the report to justify it except the vote of the ILO Council itself asking that the United States increase its appropriation. It may be that since Soviet Russia and her satellites are in the Organization, they want their share of clerks and stenographers, their share of propagandists in the ILO, so that they may multiply their influence and say to the United States and other countries and to the Organization itself, "We are in now, and we are entitled to an appropriation proportionate to the number of employees of the Organization who are sympathetic to our philosophy and who will agree with us when our representatives vote."

I do not know what the justification is, except that they voted for it against the vote of the representatives of the United States Government, United States business, and United States labor.

So, Mr. President, I think my amendment should be agreed to. There should be a full record of what justification there may be for it, and then let our representatives try to work out, with the strength of the position of the Senate behind them, the proper place for Russian labor and Russian business in the councils of the ILO.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the distinguished acting majority leader permit me to ask a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The hour is getting late, and I think the Senator may have given some consideration to a recess, under the previous order. I have understood, from previous conversation with the Senator, that he did not intend to ask for a vote this evening on the question, and that, according to the earlier announcement by the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], when the Senate concluded its labors today, it would go over until Wednesday. So I was wondering, in order that Senators may be on notice, whether we might have a yeas-and-nays vote ordered, the vote to be taken when the Senate assembles on Wednesday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays may be ordered on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it has been my purpose to make a statement supporting the position of the Senator from Montana on the joint resolution. When the Senate agreed to the amendment which was stimulated by the suggestion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], most of the argument I had intended to make has been taken care of.

The matter which the Senator from Ohio brings up is of great interest to me, and I sympathize with the sentiments he has so ably expressed, but I wish to make the RECORD clear on this point.

In my judgment, the ILO has done one of the most important international jobs

since we began work of this kind. It antedates the United Nations, as the Senator from Ohio knows. I have discussed it with the Labor Department representatives, including the Secretary of Labor, and it is perfectly clear that if we take any steps which may sabotage this work entirely, we may destroy one of the best instruments we have for international understanding.

Although one can understand the natural reaction of many people who say that we should refuse to participate with Soviet bloc countries in organizations such as the ILO, I feel strongly that it would be a mistake for us to act on such an impulse. At this time, with the Russians shifting the emphasis in their tactics in the cold war, it is particularly important that we do not quit the field and give them the battle by default.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I may suggest to the Senator that that was not the import of my amendment at all.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I understand. However, I want to make it clear that I do not believe we should do anything which would in any way jeopardize the position of the ILO.

I wish also to make this point: It has been said that we are outvoted in the ILO by the Communists. Eight Soviet bloc countries are members of the ILO, and they have 4 votes apiece, or a total of 32 votes. The United States also has 4 votes—2 for our Government delegates and 1 each for our employer and worker delegates. But besides the Soviet bloc and the United States, there are 62 other members of the ILO, also with 4 votes each. Of the 284 votes in the ILO, the Soviet bloc has 32, and the free world has 252.

I have had the responsibility of being a delegate to the United Nations. The very question which the Senator from Ohio has raised today comes up all the time with regard to United Nations votes. We are in a very difficult position there, with our limited vote in the Assembly. The United States has only one vote in the Assembly. But the vast majority of the members have been loyal to the United States leadership in opposing the attempts made by the Soviet bloc to outvote us. Therefore, I have such faith in the justice of our cause as to be confident that by strong and vigorous leadership we can continue to win an overwhelming majority of the 252 non-Communist votes in the ILO.

It has also been said that the ILO is a forum for the propagation of communism. Every single day I was in attendance at the U. N. Assembly the Communists had propaganda efforts under way. Of course, the Communists attempt to use the ILO as a propaganda sounding board, just as they attempt to use every other international organization. But so far, in the ILO, they have had little success. The fact is that far from being a forum for the propagation of communism, the ILO is a forum for the exposure of communism.

Through its careful, meticulously factual studies of forced labor, the ILO has

shown up the Soviet bloc as one big concentration camp, instead of as the workers' paradise that Moscow propagandists try to picture.

At the moment, we are on top of the situation. Through its participation in the United Nations Expanded Technical Assistance Program, and through its regular activities, as well, the ILO has made a real contribution to increasing worker productivity and improving managerial skill not only in Western Europe but also in the underdeveloped countries.

This, it seems to me, is one of the most valuable services which the ILO performs, and one which redounds markedly to the interest of the United States. It is the kind of positive approach which can be extremely effective over a period of years and will help the labor situation in the United States. It is one of the reasons why our big labor organizations have been so strongly in support of the continuation of the ILO.

I regret that I was unable personally to attend as a delegate, when the Secretary of Labor asked me some time ago.

The senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] attended last year. I regret that he is not present today to relate his experience, but he has said that he was convinced of the value of the Organization and that nothing should be done to undermine its effectiveness. I am not certain that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio would result in undermining the effectiveness of the Organization, but we should think the matter through very carefully to see whether we should not give a vote of confidence to our colleagues in the ILO, and the nations supporting our point of view, and not try to tie them down by some mandate from Congress at a time when we have heretofore, in a general way, accepted our share of what the whole group decided would be the budget for the year.

I am simply suggesting this because it seems to me that if there is any implication that we do not trust our colleagues, we may lose some of the support we have had so effectively right up to this time. I believe, as the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has said—and I support his position—that it would be wise for us this year to create a new ceiling.

The resolution will not increase the amount in one big jump; it will simply place a new ceiling on the amount and will give our representatives in the ILO, and our representatives in the United Nations, who are supporting the ILO representatives, the flexibility and ability to negotiate for the kind of budget which will be decided upon for the coming years.

All the proposal really amounts to is the giving of our representatives the freedom to work with those who have worked with us before, without saying to them, "We are imposing this mandate upon you because you are not behaving yourselves. This is all you can do."

Thus, I feel it would be wise to support the proposal which has been made, by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], especially since the ceilings have been set percentagewise. A maximum of 33 1/3 percent is all that we can possibly contribute; but at the same time

we will be saying to our representatives, "We shall trust you to handle the matter."

So I shall support the position of the Senator from Montana in his able presentation of the case for the committee. I say at the same time to the Senator from Ohio that I think I agree with the criticisms he has made about what is going on. Nevertheless, I think we are on top of the situation; and when we are on top of it, I do not believe we should tell our partners that we do not trust them to play the game as they have played it heretofore.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROVED EFFICACY OF SALK VACCINE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I know that the entire Congress and all the people of the United States are very much interested in the degree to which we may be achieving success in wiping out poliomyelitis in this country.

Last week marked the first anniversary of the announcement of the proved efficacy of the Salk vaccine. On this anniversary Mr. Basil O'Connor, president of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, to whose valiant and successful work in this field all of us owe so much, issued a report addressed to all physicians in the United States.

That report sums up the gratifying opinion of the Foundation that paralytic polio in the United States can be cut in half in 1956 and practically eliminated in 1957. It carefully analyzes the situation with respect to our current knowledge of the production and utilization of Salk vaccine and concludes that the problem of preventing paralytic polio is no longer a problem of medical science but simply one of logistics. This being so, Mr. Basil O'Connor explains in his brief but careful and analytic report how and when we can achieve the goal of wiping out paralytic polio if all concerned with achieving this objective put forth carefully coordinated efforts in the remaining months of this year.

I believe Mr. Basil O'Connor's report is of tremendous importance to all of us, and I ask unanimous consent that it be set forth at this point in the RECORD.

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

REPORT TO PHYSICIANS—CAN PARALYTIC POLIO BE PREVENTED IN 1957?
(Statement by Basil O'Connor, president, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis)

Paralytic polio in the United States can be cut in half in the epidemic period in 1956 and can be reduced to a negligible amount in 1957 if there is a coordinated effort during the remaining months of 1956 by all concerned: the public, the public health services, the doctors, and the manufacturers. It may be properly assumed that such coordination can be had.

The primary interest of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis is to wipe out paralytic polio. Everyone joins in that wish. If it is possible to accomplish that result, all people would unquestionably be willing to do their part to bring it about. Any suggestion or plan as to how that end may be

reached ought to be carefully examined and receive full consideration.

The program needed to accomplish the desired result can be divided into two time periods—from now through July 10, 1956, called the first period—and from July 10, 1956 through December 31, 1956, called the second period.

The manufacturers of Salk vaccine estimate that between March 1, 1956 and December 31, 1956, they will produce 203 million cubic centimeters of vaccine. It is estimated that 92 million of these 203 million cubic centimeters will be produced between March 1, 1956 and July 10, 1956, and 111 million cubic centimeters between July 10, 1956 and December 31, 1956.

The manufacturers have had 1 year's experience in producing vaccine. One has a right to use their estimates of production for purposes of calculation. Using their estimates, the problem of preventing paralytic polio becomes one of logistics and not one of medical science.

To reduce paralytic polio in 1957 to a negligible amount, an effort should first be made to immunize those groups which have the highest incidence rate of paralytic polio. Eighty percent of our paralytic polio is in the 0 to 19 age group and pregnant women. The first period of the plan should be devoted to immunizing these groups.

In the age group 0 to 19 inclusive there are 61 million individuals.

In the pregnant women group there are 4 million women.

These two groups make a total of 65 million individuals.

In these two groups we have 80 percent of our paralytic polio.

Assuming an 80-percent acceptance of the vaccine this would mean that 52 million of the 65 million in these 2 groups would receive the vaccine. On a 90 percent effective basis this would likewise mean preventing at least 50 percent of all paralytic polio that might otherwise occur in the epidemic season of 1956. Immunizing such a large number in the groups having the highest incidence rate of paralytic polio should have the effect of reducing paralytic polio in the nonvaccinated.

The present estimates of the manufacturers making Salk vaccine indicate that between now and July 10, 1956, there will be enough vaccine to give 2 shots to the 52 million available individuals in these 2 groups. This would require a total of 104 million cubic centimeters of vaccine.

Between April 12, 1955, and March 1, 1956, 42 million cubic centimeters of vaccine were released for use. This vaccine has either been used or is available for use within these two groups.

The manufacturers estimate that between March 1, 1956, and June 25, 1956, they will produce 92 million cubic centimeters of vaccine. The estimated monthly rate of this production is as follows:

	Cubic centimeters
March	12,811,272
April	19,242,626
May	18,930,790
June	40,821,240
Total	91,805,928

The 42 million cubic centimeters of vaccine actually released between April 12, 1955, and March 1, 1956, and the estimated production of 92 million cubic centimeters between March 1, 1956, and June 25, 1956, total 134 million cubic centimeters of vaccine available between April 12, 1955, and July 10, 1956, or enough to give 67 million people 2 shots of vaccine. This is 15 million more people than those considered available for vaccine in the 0 to 19 group and pregnant women group, which total 52 million. This indicates a safety margin of 30 million cubic centimeters, over and above the number of

cubic centimeters required for 2 shots for the available in 0 to 19 and pregnant women groups.

It seems proper to conclude that by July 10, 1956, there will have been manufactured and released for use adequate vaccine to give 2 shots to all available in the 2 groups referred to and thus reduce by at least one-half the incidence of paralytic polio in the epidemic period of 1956.

Of the 42 million cubic centimeters of vaccine already released, probably 20 million have been used to give 10 million individuals in these 2 groups 2 shots each, leaving 22 million cubic centimeters which have been used or are available for use to give 1 shot to 22 million of the 52 million in these 2 groups, leaving 20 million in this group who have not received any shots. These 20 million could be given 1 shot from the March and April production totaling 32 million cubic centimeters, leaving 12 million cubic centimeters which could be used as second shots for those in the 22 million group who had received 1 shot. This would leave 30 million yet to receive a second shot and these could be taken care of by the May production of 19 million cubic centimeters and the production of the first 2 weeks in June which totals 18 million cubic centimeters. There would still remain an excess of 30 million cubic centimeters from the production to June 25 after giving the 52 million available in both groups 2 shots of vaccine.

With reference to the second period, July 10, 1956 to December 31, 1956, the manufacturers estimate they will produce 111 million cubic centimeters of vaccine. The estimated monthly rate of this production is as follows:

	Cubic centimeters
July	17,500,000
August	18,040,000
September	18,220,000
October	19,000,000
November	19,000,000
December	19,000,000
Total	110,760,000

If we add to the total estimated production for the last 6 months of 1956, namely 111 million cubic centimeters, the 30 million cubic centimeters not used in the period ending July 10, 1956, there is an estimated 141 million cubic centimeters available for use during the period July 10, 1956, and December 31, 1956. This would be adequate to give the third shot to the 52 million in the two groups referred to herein and two shots to approximately 45 million additional persons—or a total of at least 2 shots to 97 million individuals out of a total of 167 million in this country—or 80 percent of the population aged 0-45. Less than 2 percent of all paralytic polio is in the age groups over 45.

The job is a big one logically, but it can be done if all those interested cooperate fully. In an effort of such public health significance we can assume—

1. That the manufacturers will make every effort to live up to their production estimates;

2. That the United States Public Health Service through the National Institutes of Health will be ready to release promptly for public use all properly manufactured vaccine presented to it;

3. That parents of children in the 0 to 19 group will have the vaccine given to their children when and as it becomes available and not wait until June when its administration to such a large group will present insuperable practical difficulties;

4. That local public health officials and doctors will let the public know promptly when vaccine is available; and

5. That doctors will not hold in reserve vaccine for second shots, but will give one shot to as many individuals as possible in

the two groups referred to, relying on the second shot to be available before June 30, 1956.

There is every reason to expect that such cooperation will be gladly given in view of the importance of the result to be obtained.

To give 97 million people at least 2 shots of Salk vaccine before December 31, 1956, is not an impossibility but the logistics of such an operation must be worked out by the Public Health officials and the medical society in each State on the basis of an emergency health program.

The intelligent use in 1956 of the vaccine estimated to be available during that year would indicate that cases of paralytic polio in the United States in the year 1957 should be very few.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS FOR INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT-ELECT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce the appointment by him of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] as members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Arrangements for the Inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on January 21, 1957, authorized by Senate Concurrent Resolution 64 of the 84th Congress.

RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until Wednesday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Wednesday, April 18, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 16 (legislative day of April 9, 1956):

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Clarence G. Morse, of California, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for a term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1960. (Re-appointment.)

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Harry L. Bolen, of Illinois, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, vice Egbert Alfred Smith, deceased.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be captains in the United States Coast Guard:

William L. Maloney	William D. Shields
Ralph R. Curry	Chester L. Harding
Arthur L. Dickert	Richard E. Morell
Clifford R. Maclean	Aden C. Unger
Henry F. Stolfi	Victor F. Tydacka
George P. Kenney	George I. Holt
Leonard T. Jones	Simon R. Sands, Jr.
Searcy J. Lowrey	Donald M. Morrison
Samuel L. Denty	Philip A. Ovenden
George W. Dick	Christopher C. Knapp
Charles B. Arrington	Joseph E. Madacev
Charles E. Brush	James B. Rucker
Robert T. Alexander	Henry U. Scholl
Edward A. Eve, Jr.	Rufus E. Mroczkowski
Eric A. Anderson	Oscar C. B. Wev
Marion Amos	Harold B. Roberts

Ned W. Sprow
William I. Swanston
William E. Creedon
Henry A. Meyer

Preston B. Mavor
Quentin M. Greeley
Charles P. Murphy
Richard C. Foutter

The following named persons to be commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

Edwin B. Ing	Louis B. Kendall
Donald V. Reardon	John A. Fagan
Torval A. Berg	Harold O. Rasmussen
Winslow H. Buxton	Jesse E. Eastman
Lewis L. Whittemore	Gorman W. Larsen
Arthur R. Hoglund	Sylvius Pellegrini
Harry C. Gifford	Robert B. Scott
Edmund Redington	Charles P. McFaull
Robert W. Goehring	Ralph M. West
Wesley W. Wood	Clifford A. Anderson
Felix S. DeSoboll	Robert Murdoch
John H. Phinney	Arthur E. Wilcox
William A. McFaull	Curtis A. Alexander
William E. Pratt	Charles E. Sharp
Harry L. Morgan	Gilbert Hinchcliffe
George S. Beck	George A. Butler
Lee O. Moyer	William C. Mahoney
Vitus G. Niebergall	John D. Hill
John H. Cleary	Julius Schuler
Alfred W. Medcalf	Lynn Parker
John D. McCubbin	Louis A. Grundler
Earl C. Young	Julian J. Shingler
Elmer J. Bodenlos	Ellie D. Baker
John H. Holm	Byron I. Reynolds
Joseph E. Mallett	Francis B. Ford
Lawrence D. Connor	Robert J. Ernst
Ross P. Bullard	Robert Flockhart
Isaac R. Boothby	Edwin J. Lautermilch
Archibald H. McComb, Jr.	Bertrand J. Henesey
	Claude G. Winstead
James B. McCarty, Jr.	Thomas G. Byrne
Leonard E. Penso	Leslie G. Haverland
Orvan R. Smeder	George W. Nantau
Thomas P. McMaster	Robert H. Burt
Paul E. Savonis	Peter Snyder
George C. Steinman	Gustav E. Johansen
John W. Anderson	Theodore LeBlanc
Ernest S. Rasmussen	Elvin C. Hawley
Victor Pfeiffer	Emery H. Joyce
Arthur M. Vrooman	Casimer J. Bernas
Bertram J. Tuckey	William Barkalow
Leonard C. Walen	Douglas R. Shambeau
William L. Morrison	William D. Brimmer
George J. Monteverdi	James L. Thompson
James M. Caulk	Paul H. Browne
George M. Russell	Daniel C. Dickert
William T. Coyle	John H. Wildhack
Edwin W. Wickham	Frank McLaughlin
David W. Sinclair	Donald G. Elliott
Adam A. Klein	Lloyd R. Morrison
Edward E. Dickey	Cyril L. Heylinger
Robert R. Russell	Frank F. Elliott
John P. Fox	Paul Olson
Edward W. Kirkpatrick	Charles H. Freericks
Carl A. Anderson	Newton W. Winberg
Ellery H. Capen	Kenneth H. Hellweg
Vincent H. Casey	Herbert J. Kelly
Charles E. Masters, Jr.	William S. Vaughn
Emilio G. Oliotti	George W. Stedman, Jr.
Karl A. Bergman	Joseph Mazzotta
James C. Campbell	Jonas T. Hagglove
William J. Willman	Lionel H. DeSanty
James N. Schrader	Ashton H. Barnes
Harry F. Frazer	Thomas N. Kelley
Benjamin Malloch	Arthur M. Davison
William J. Tracy	William R. Sayer
Viggo A. Madsen	Joseph J. McClelland
Lester W. Raynes	Raymond G. Miller
Glenn W. Ellis	John P. Latimer
Charles C. Phillips	Robert E. Hammond
Francis J. Swan	Clyde R. Burton
George E. Ross	Ottis T. Estes, Jr.
Martin Spain	James F. Bills
George E. Holland	Edwin C. Crosby
Warner K. Thompson, Jr.	Ira H. McMullan
	William C. Foster
Thomas McCusker	James W. Paine
Maurice D. Melanphy	James A. Cornish
Martin J. Dean	William K. Earle
William R. Riedel	Edward H. Houghtaling
Mark L. Hocking	William D. Strauch, Jr.
Clement B. Cozad	Robert F. Barber
James H. McDowell	
Fred M. Cronan	
John R. Silliman	

The following-named persons to be lieutenants commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

George H. Lawrence Emerson Hayes, Jr.
 Robert E. Emerson John Wilfred McCurdy
 Hersey C. Forehand, Jr. William Kesler, Jr.
 Sherman K. Frick William P. Williams
 Marcus H. McGarity Edward A. Richardson
 John E. Day Warren F. Stevenson
 Fletcher W. Brown, Jr. Peter E. Gibney
 Charles W. Scharff Lewis R. Lavalley
 Charles M. Shepard III Joseph R. Steele
 Francis D. Heyward Edward M. F. Kirchner
 Arthur C. Hoene, Jr. Mitchell A. Perry
 Edward F. Cotter Garth H. Read
 Paul F. Foye William E. Dennis
 Raymond J. Perry Robert J. Loforte
 Ephraim P. Rivard Owen W. Siler
 James V. DeBergh Arthur Hancock
 Thomas F. Dunham, Jr. Richard A. Pasciuti
 Francis J. Malloy William S. Allan, Jr.
 James W. Booze Robert B. Moore
 Ernest R. Challenader Wallace C. Dahlgren
 James W. Conway Harry H. Carter
 Claude W. Bailey Bernard E. Kolkhorst
 Andrew P. Hopewell Donald M. Reed
 George W. McClure George W. Sohn
 Charles L. Turner Carl L. Parrott
 Stewart R. Graham Frederick J. Hancox
 James F. Phair Robert A. Adams
 Robert A. Copeland, Jr. William M. Benkert
 Walter C. Bolton Robert A. Schulz
 Kenneth M. Bilderbäck Warren E. Rast
 Clinton J. Maguire Curtis J. Kelly
 Roger B. Clark Austin F. Hubbard
 George W. Walker Ward R. Emigh
 Bruce W. Clark William J. Zinck
 Sidney K. Broussard Richard E. Hoover
 Louis J. Glatz William N. Banks
 Frank D. Hilditch Keith Low
 Arthur M. Watson Daniel J. Scalabrini
 Arthur H. Sheppard Edward R. Tharp
 Raymond W. Siegel Wilfred N. Derby, Jr.
 Harry A. Solberg Alden E. Lewis
 Robert O. Bracken John J. Doherty
 John W. Hume John D. Davies, Jr.
 Herbert Krause Donald A. Caswell
 Errol H. Seegers Forrest H. Willoughby Donald J. P. Evans
 Robert D. Burkheimer Lewis F. Lovell
 Jack E. Forrester David C. Kierbow
 Lewis R. Davison Lloyd M. Logan
 John H. Hawley Albert S. Frevola
 Carol L. Mason Edwin J. Brummeler
 Franklin A. Colburn Nathan L. Fendig
 Robert S. Wilson Edwin S. Radford
 Charles E. MacDowell Andrew J. Grogard
 Elmer P. Mathison Clyde J. Miller
 Warren C. Mitchell Alfred J. Unger
 Henry A. Campbell, Jr. John M. Nagy
 Armand J. Bush Jason S. Kobler
 Lester A. Levine William H. E. Schroeber
 John J. Omeara
 Glenn O. Thompson Robert E. Foley
 Arthur F. Heffelfinger James D. Doyle
 Eugene F. Walsh James E. Fleming
 Lloyd E. Franke David R. Permar
 Samuel E. Taylor Harry G. Kosky
 Richard C. Wilkie Neale O. Westfall
 George A. Philbrick Edward P. Sawyer
 George J. Bodie Henry E. Steel
 Henry W. Stinson, Jr. Francis J. Mann
 Earl E. Broussard Norman L. Miley
 John F. Fitzgerald

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard:

Orville C. Hinnen Leo J. A. King
 Byron M. Wineke Henry J. Pfeiffer
 Adam Stanzak Thomas C. Pennock
 Paul A. Berg Hugh E. McCullough
 Olaf T. Sturdy Alvin J. Boxwell
 Thomas B. Prather Francis Twarog
 James G. Cowart Willard E. Carlson
 Ronald S. Krueger Hugh J. LeBlanc
 Harry S. Raleigh Thurston L. Willis

Bernard B. Wood Robert L. Davis, Jr.
 David T. Haislip Glenn R. Taylor
 Stanley L. Waltzfelder Walter F. Guy
 Harold D. Muth Warren S. Pettersen
 Samuel W. Branin Harold E. DeLong
 Jack E. Stewart William C. Wallace
 James C. Boteler Henry G. Cassel
 Richard L. Huxtable Raymond M. Miller
 John Vukic Hardy M. Willis
 Norman P. Weinert Fred E. Wilson
 James A. Emery Clarence G. Porter
 Owen B. Smith Leroy Flatt
 Paul L. Anderson Charles R. Howell
 William C. Carber Robert E. Bracken
 Rubin E. Young, Jr. William A. Mayberry
 Fred J. Michalson Rollin T. Young
 Richard C. Green Cornelius G. Farley
 James B. Reynolds Francis L. Brittan
 Wesley J. Quanmme William C. Akers
 William C. Akers Philip A. Hogue
 Eugene Carlson, Jr. Paul Richard Happel
 Philip S. Bell Edric S. Bates
 Donald D. Davison John William Yager
 Ivan C. McLean Thomas W. Wolfe
 Edward G. Taylor Gerard J. Perron
 Franklin F. Bohlik Louis E. Price
 Louis E. Price Elliot S. Shafer
 Jerry Komorech Robert E. Ogin
 John W. Cherry Samuel R. Early
 Vincent J. Wernig Nelson W. Allen
 James C. Norman Roger J. Dahlby
 Franklin J. Miller Charles A. Haley
 Russell W. Lentner Everett B. Kopp
 Harold A. French Edward P. Boyle
 William H. Yates William M. Barney
 Sam Pisicchio Walter C. Behan
 Robert D. Parkhurst Edward F. Oliver
 Otto F. Unsinn Edwin Lee Knowles
 Walter O. Henry Robert E. Wolfard
 Verne D. Finks Michael J. Holland
 William L. Aitkenhead Charles F. Baker
 Charles F. Baker James P. Stewart
 James H. Swint James H. Swint
 Shirl J. Stephany Shirl J. Stephany
 George F. Rodgers George F. Rodgers
 Leslie D. High Leslie D. High
 George H. P. Bursley Frank E. Parker
 Frank E. Parker Leiland C. Batdorf
 Leiland C. Batdorf William F. Tighe, Jr.
 William F. Tighe, Jr. Bruce H. Edwards
 Bruce H. Edwards Roy K. Angell
 Robert C. Krulish Robert C. Krulish
 William J. Kirkley William J. Kirkley
 Edward E. Chambers Edward E. Chambers
 Robert W. Johnson Robert W. Johnson
 Charles Scot Marple Charles Scot Marple
 Wilfred F. Raes Wilfred F. Raes
 Albert H. Clough Albert H. Clough
 Randolph Ross, Jr. Randolph Ross, Jr.
 Robert W. Smith Robert W. Smith
 David E. Perkins David E. Perkins
 Robertson P. O. Dinsmore Robertson P. O. Dinsmore
 Alfred J. Tatman Alfred J. Tatman
 Malcolm E. Clark Malcolm E. Clark
 Richard M. Underwood, Jr. Richard M. Underwood, Jr.
 Charles M. Mayes Charles M. Mayes
 Dan Rayacich Dan Rayacich
 David P. Bates, Jr. David P. Bates, Jr.
 Rudolph E. Lenczyk Rudolph E. Lenczyk
 William L. Faulkenberry William L. Faulkenberry
 Donald C. Davis Donald C. Davis
 John H. Bruce John H. Bruce
 James H. MacDonald James H. MacDonald
 Donald R. Vaughn Donald R. Vaughn
 Thomas W. Powers Thomas W. Powers
 Archibald B. How Archibald B. How
 Herbert H. Sharpe, Jr. Herbert H. Sharpe, Jr.
 Michael B. Lemly Michael B. Lemly
 Glenn M. Loboudger Glenn M. Loboudger
 John E. V. Murray John E. V. Murray
 Vincent A. Bogucki Vincent A. Bogucki
 Robert A. Lee Robert A. Lee
 Lloyd W. Goddu, Jr. Lloyd W. Goddu, Jr.
 Donald J. McCann Donald J. McCann
 Edward D. Cassidy Edward D. Cassidy
 John B. Hayes John B. Hayes

Alfred Prunski Clarence R. Hallberg
 James B. Brook Darrel W. Starr
 William H. Fitzgerald, Jr. John K. Byerlein
 James R. Hope Joseph C. Dorsky
 Herbert E. Lindemann Thomas T. Wetmore
 Philippe C. Gaucher Norman P. Ensrud
 George Schmidt James T. Clune
 Stuart S. Beckwith Charles B. Hathaway
 Carl S. Mathews Donald M. Chapman
 Wayne E. Caldwell Leroy Reinburg, Jr.
 Samuel M. Moore III Walter C. Ochman
 Stuart T. Scharfenstein Maxwell S. Charleston
 Bernie E. Thompson Paul W. Tift, Jr.
 Harry F. Gregg William R. Weadon
 Howard W. Pagel Raymond C. Hertica
 Robert E. Walsh

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

Anthony A. Allegio William L. King
 Paul T. Anderson Walter W. Kohl, Jr.
 Warren D. Andrews William E. Lehr, Jr.
 Darrell L. Babcock Charles W. Linn
 Kenneth E. Barrett Herbert G. Lipsett
 Laurence O. Bates Richard V. Littlefield
 Murray W. Boggs, Jr. Roger L. Madison
 Paul H. Breed Max S. Maire
 Dan H. Briganti Graeme Mann
 Roger A. Britt William D. Markle, Jr.
 William B. Clark Charles W. Matherly
 Dan A. Colussey, Jr. Charles E. Mathieu
 James H. Conrad Charles F. Merritt
 Edmund L. Cope Roger W. Mowell
 Charles L. Crane, Jr. Edward Nelson, Jr.
 Calvin E. Crouch Harry J. Oldford, Jr.
 Richard P. Cueroni Hal F. Olson
 Edwin H. Daniels Walter E. Paulsen
 Ted O. DeYoung Harris A. Pledger, Jr.
 Richard A. Donnelly, Jr. William P. Reilly
 Vaughan W. Driggers Dean A. Ridyard
 James R. Erwin Arthur P. Roberts
 George Everett Ernest E. Rowland, Jr.
 Edward C. Farmer, Jr. William Russell
 Rolland A. Faucher Keith B. Schumacher
 Henry C. Fisher Thomas M. Sing
 Jerome V. Flanagan Donald W. Smith
 Thomas J. Flood William E. Smith
 Galloway B. Foster Arthur Solvang
 Walter D. Fox Nathaniel C. Spadaforn
 Frank A. Frauenfelder Frederic C. Sponholz, Jr.
 Donald D. Garnett Charles G. Stadlander
 Gregory C. Gaski Raymond L. Stevens
 James E. Grabb Donald Grim
 George K. Greiner, Jr. Ralph C. Hill
 Nathaniel F. Main Donald C. Hintze
 Vincent J. Mitchell Roger A. Holmes
 Richard T. Houlette David G. Howland
 Andrew S. Skucus Bernard A. Hoyland
 Thomas C. Duncan, Jr. Robert E. L. West
 Adam S. Zabinski Robert E. Iden
 William J. Brasier James C. Irwin
 Edwin Allen Schmidt Joseph A. Kearney
 Arthur G. Taylor James M. Kelly
 Richard S. Wohlgemuth Marinus F. Keyzer

The following-named persons to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard:

Michael Abaranell Richard Andrew Blackford
 Ernest Charles Allen Lawrence Francis Bond
 Gilbert Lawrence Aumon Robert Loring Bristol
 John Donat Basque William Jasper Brogdon, Jr.
 Don Stewart Bellis Gilbert Edward Brown, Jr.
 Neal Hugh Bernard Benjamin John Lavelle Callahan
 Robert Allan Biller Donald Thompson Campbell
 Richard Andrew Blackford Joseph Canzoneri
 Lawrence Francis Bond Norman Edgar Cutts
 Robert Loring Bristol John Edward DeCarteret
 William Manlove Devlin Alan Charles Dempsey

John Richard Ehrmann
Charles Wesley Faircloth
William Murray Flanders
Donald Lee Frantz
Bruce Stephen Gathy
Robert Gillespie
Wesley Goodwin
James Arthur Granger
Basil Davis Harrington
Roger Putnam Hartgen
Lynn Neal Hein
Paul Dana Henneberry
William Gardner Hicks
Arthur Klaus Hounselea
Floyd Dore Hunter
Vernon Costen Jones
Kirk Robert Kellogg
Robert Joseph Ketchel
Bruce James Kichline
Laurence Crawford Kirkbride
Thomas Wightman Kirkpatrick
Ronald Charles Kollmeyer
Richard Jay Kyte
Norman Burleigh Lynch
John Neil MacDonald
Ernest George Marsh
Robert Emmett McKew
James Irving McLeahis
Robert Garland McMahan
LeRoy Clifford Melberg, Jr.
William Firman Merlin
William Bryan Mohin
Charles Edward Moorhead, Jr.
Parker Dennis Morris
George Robert Oberholtzer
Richard Duane Olsen
Lawrence Joseph O'Pezio
Kennard Miller Palfrey, Jr.
David Clyatt Pendergrass, Jr.
Robert Ira Plattus
Donald LeRoy Prince
Edward Joseph Quinn
George Leith Rettie
James Edward Rivard, Jr.
Barry Christie Roberts
William Fitch Roland
James Joseph Rooney III
Richard Ignatius Rybacki
Richard Eugene Sardeson
Thomas Patrick Schaefer
Benjamin Keith Schaeffer
Brinton Roger Shannon
Clifton Raymond Smith
Joseph Francis Smith
Bruce Lee Solomon
John Gerard Stanley
Earl Lorraine Sullivan, Jr.
David Arthur Sumi
Arnold Swagerty
Donald Melvin Taub
Paul Thomas Thevenin
Robert Richard Tutt
George Francis Viveiros, Jr.
Arthur Henry Wagner
James Weiskittel
Walter William White
Raymond Earl Womack
Joseph Henry Wubbolt III

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 16 (legislative day of April 9), 1956:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Maurice E. Stans, of Illinois, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Ignatious E. Self, Decatur.
Lee J. Ledbetter, Troy.

ARKANSAS

Teddy E. Miller, McCrory.

CALIFORNIA

Raymond E. Balch, Angwin.
Alan H. Miller, Belmont.

Elmo Nicoli, Ben Lomond.
Esther M. Dauer, Biola.
William B. Evans, Bridgeport.
Jule M. Ashworth, Calistoga.
Chester G. Umberham, El Modeno.
Walter J. Wiegert, Grass Valley.
Etta A. Y. Wilbanks, Lebec.
Olsen O. Wheeler, Loma Linda.
Doris L. Johnson, Madison.
James W. Bristow, Mentone.
Thelma E. Jacobs, Parker Dam.
Dick A. Willey, Pollock Pines.
Juanita A. Lombardi, Rockaway Beach.
Russell K. Bates, San Bernardino.
Lowell B. Chapman, San Pedro.
Charles E. Louk, Sierra Madre.
Alfred H. Willhoit, Templeton.
Mary Eleanor Lennie, Thousand Palms.
Axel A. Granstrom, Weed.
Robert L. Reifel, Willows.

COLORADO

Foster A. Rose, Elizabeth.
William L. Robbins, Grover.
Earl K. Downing, Littleton.
Robert A. Clark, Mead.
Ira G. Cook, Milliken.

CONNECTICUT

Leroy M. Beaujouan, Canaan.
Milford L. Carson, Enfield.
Frank A. Lattanzi, New Haven.
Wesley J. Gilbert, New Preston.
Joseph P. LeVasseur, Rocky Hill.
George A. Lamb, Sharon.
Norma K. Schaefer, Weatogue.

FLORIDA

Alfred R. Dickey, Auburndale.
Ray L. Mercer, Bunnell.
Sidney Pennington Smith, Everglades.
James R. Harris, Plant City.

GEORGIA

Scott Walters, Sr., East Point.
James Harold Carlyle, Jr., Norcross.

ILLINOIS

Samuel W. Goers, Altamont.
James Haney, Arthur.
Clyde C. Norton, Cordova.
Robert W. Miller, Du Quoin.
Merle L. Miller, Fairview.
Patricia Ann Higar, German Valley.
Harvey Ellet Calame, Godfrey.
Karl Max Hoover, Lovington.
Paul O. Davis, Mason.
John R. Simpson, Park Ridge.
Milo L. Pearson, Pleasant Hill.
George Harlin Sloan, Rankin.
Paul J. Michael, Somonauk.
Frank P. Campbell, Techy.
Delbert R. Britt, Ullin.

INDIANA

Marcus O. Lane, English.

IOWA

Robert E. Shultz, Allison.
Louis E. Pfaff, Aurelia.
George L. Beeler, Bellevue.
George E. Jenison, Belmond.
Herbert G. Martin, Clermont.
Maurice M. Neal, Dexter.
Hollis E. Scott, Elkhart.
Charles E. Powers, Exira.
Charles H. Worsley, Farnhamville.
Alexander W. Mihm, Fort Atkinson.
Russell H. Oviatt, Goldfield.
Emory A. Smith, Lakota.
Donald Lyle Youngers, Le Claire.
John N. Moore, Leon.
Clark M. Sexton, Oakville.
Joseph A. Nowatzke, Panama.
Clifton Lee Schmidt, Rockford.
Doris N. Hatheway, Sabula.
Eugene M. Clark, Stockport.

KANSAS

Charles E. Brown, Glasco.
Helen G. Lacy, Humboldt.
Henry Michel, Lakin.

Elery N. Stevens, Lane.
Mabelle E. Mettling, Lewis.
Arlene D. Wright, Maple Hill.
Lowell E. Sohm, Otis.
John M. Hampton, Parker.
Harold B. Vernon, Simpson.
Glen G. Shook, Virgil.

LOUISIANA

Laurence M. Carmadelle, Barataria.
Effie E. Bickham, Blanchard.
John N. F. Martin, Kenner.
Michael J. Byrne, Marrero.
Homer M. Delacroix, Jr., Plaquemine.
Carey O. Fairbanks, Sicily Island.
Homer B. Roark, West Monroe.

MAINE

Wilbur F. Moulton, Limerick.
Richmond S. Hooper, York.

MARYLAND

Gertrude E. Grabis, Byrns Road.
James F. Wallace, Jr., Easton.
Edgar Marine Belt, Hampstead.
William C. Coakley, Havre de Grace.
Samuel Ahmuy, Jr., Odenton.

MASSACHUSETTS

Norma G. Scothorne, Accord.
Beatrice M. O'Brien, Ballard, Vale.
Albert Foster, East Freetown.
Merle L. Hunt, Hudson.
Jean T. Nelson, Ocean Bluff.
John Wesley Warren, Sheffield.

MICHIGAN

Earl M. Halsey, Almont.
Jeannette J. Reider, Big Bay.
Harold W. Bobb, Genesee.
Clarence L. Meredith, Hudson.
Russell J. Strazzulla, Newport.
George P. Donner, Jr., Spring Lake.
Earl L. Gray, Williamsburg.

MISSISSIPPI

James A. Fellows, McComb.
Ethelyn B. Weldy, McLain.
Herman Alexander Smith, Ripley.

MISSOURI

Linne O. Stemon, Avilla.
Winston H. Watt, Bosworth.
Lessie H. Bray, Clarksdale.
Harry F. Rickhoff, New Florence.
Delvan M. Mahurin, Novinger.

NEBRASKA

Wayne A. Shaneyfelt, Aurora.
Jack K. Pugh, Bradshaw.
Lloyd E. Scheer, Cook.
Eugene L. Tarr, Gothenburg.
Wilmer R. McConnell, Imperial.
Lawrence L. Valentine, McCool Junction.
Elmer E. Kasper, Prague.

NEVADA

Frank M. Compston, Jr., Yerington.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Lauretta L. Sumner, Grasmere.
Carrie S. McDonald, Harrisville.

NEW JERSEY

Elmer Stanton Holmes, Jr., Avalon.
Moses N. Strader, Newton.
Elizabeth K. Simpson, Saddle River.
Holloway W. Case, Sussex.

NEW MEXICO

Edward M. Berardine, Santa Fe.

NEW YORK

Howard E. Guinnip, Angelica.
Viola M. Comstock, Sodus Point.

OHIO

Helen E. Smith, Adelphi.
Richard J. Gamble, Alliance.
Earl A. Smith, Berlin Center.
John Clifton Richards, Delaware.
Robert E. Trout, Edison.
Nicholas W. Smith, Elyria.
Mary E. Ayres, Goshen.

Roland M. Dorr, Kensington.
 Oliver Wolcott, Kent.
 Robert J. House, Killbuck.
 Ernest L. McConnell, Kirksville.
 John W. Meadows, Lucasville.
 Arthur R. Miller, Madison.
 Bernard W. Ihland, Metamora.
 Glenn W. Duffy, Morristown.
 Samuel H. Wolf, New Paris.
 Albert F. Warnecke, Ottoville.
 Murry N. Johnson, Pataskala.
 Margaret L. Hess, Petersburg.
 John F. Crawford, Sardinia.
 Virgil O. Hutchison, Smithville.
 William O. Ochsner, Strongsville.
 Richard A. Campbell, Sylvania.
 William Paul Wilcoxon, Uhrichsville.
 Edward J. Oswald, Unionport.
 Seth W. Huntley, Vinton.
 Harold D. Brenneman, Warsaw.
 Clark Wickensimer, Washington Court House.
 Everett J. Pearson, West Milton.

OREGON

Clarence A. Christiansen, Cornelius.
 Lyle B. Dannen, Halsey.
 Myrtle E. Gibbs, Long Creek.
 Ruth E. McLeod, Maupin.
 Wayne E. Dexter, Scappoose.

PENNSYLVANIA

Francis E. Redding, McSherrystown.
 Wilbur M. Hall, Montgomery.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Nellie E. Hodge, Alcolu.
 John W. Stevenson, Carlisle.
 Sara M. Campbell, Clio.
 John M. Harrelson, Drayton.
 Joseph W. Milling, Jr., Ridgeway.
 B. George Price III, Walterboro.

TENNESSEE

Cordie L. Majors, Ramer.

VERMONT

Perley C. Brainerd, Bradford.
 Roy H. Jarvis, Grafton.
 Ralph S. Nealy, Jericho.
 Kenneth H. Neill, Johnson.
 Ballou L. Towne, Morrisville.
 Alice P. Waterman, North Thetford.

VIRGINIA

Merrel M. Nash, Jr., Bayside.
 Mary G. Arnold, Bishop.
 Emerson N. Lamb, Blue Ridge.
 Radford C. Montgomery, Buchanan.
 Ivan L. Potts, Colonial Heights.
 Daniel Jackson Kilby, Culpeper.
 Ray W. Redd, Draper.
 Thomas E. Caldwell, Fincastle.
 Allen S. Trevett, Glenallen.
 Harry H. Kimberly, Jr., Hampton.
 John H. Norris, Jr., Kinsale.
 Robert H. Sipe, McGaheysville.
 Elina T. Gooding, Oakton.
 Fred M. Mullins, Pound.
 Irving L. Wood, Ridgeway.
 Nancy E. Wood, Rock Castle.
 Francis A. Holdren, Vinton.

WISCONSIN

Jean E. Herschleb, Arlington.
 Helen G. Klus, Armstrong Creek.
 Glenn W. Meyer, Birnamwood.
 Martin N. Ross, Cambria.
 John A. Wimme, Nelsonville.
 George W. Gessert, Plymouth.

WYOMING

Emilene A. Weisenberger, Baird.
 Virginia C. Bennion, Cokeville.
 Priscilla Butwell, Frontier.
 Dale E. Howery, LaGrange.
 Harry L. Estes, Thermopolis.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 16, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Myron C. Cole, D. D., First Christian Church, Portland, Oreg., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whom we live and move and have our being, grant Thy divine benediction upon us. As the builders of a great nation, we have inherited that which is truth, beauty, and goodness; therefore, impel us ever forward with the motives upon which our Nation was founded and that which will make America great.

Our Heavenly Father, forgive us where we err. Let us not indulge in pious phrases, but let us be ever bound together in the search for the truth which makes men free and we will give Thee the honor and the glory.

We pray for the leaders of our Nation. Bestow upon them honor, integrity, and all that which is of Thy nature and will bring Thy will upon the earth.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 12, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On April 6, 1956:

H. R. 374. An act to authorize the adjustment and clarification of ownership to certain lands within the Stanislaus National Forest, Tuolumne County, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 1082. An act for the relief of Golda I. Stegner;

H. R. 1855. An act to amend the act approved April 24, 1950, entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes";

H. R. 2946. An act for the relief of Eugene Dus;

H. R. 3233. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to make it a criminal offense to move or travel in interstate commerce with intent to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for arson;

H. R. 5889. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the town of Savannah Beach, Tybee Island, Ga.;

H. R. 6461. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 6463. An act to ratify and confirm section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, section 1 (b), Act 12, Sessions Laws of Hawaii, 1951, and the sales of public lands consummated pursuant to the terms of said statutes;

H. R. 6574. An act to amend section 2 of title IV of the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 680), as amended;

H. R. 6625. An act to provide for the transfer of title to certain land and the improvements thereon to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo

(Pueblo of Picuris), in New Mexico, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6807. An act to authorize the amendment of certain patents of Government lands containing restrictions as to use of such lands in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 6808. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 6824. An act to authorize the amendment of the restrictive covenant on land patent No. 10,410, issued to Keoshi Matsunaga, his heirs or assigns, on July 20, 1936, and covering lot 48 of Ponahawai house lots, situated in the county of Hawaii, T. H.;

H. R. 7236. An act to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to water conservation practices;

H. R. 8100. An act to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of Brazil; and

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to release reversionary right to improvements on a 3-acre tract in Orangeburg County, S. C.

On April 9, 1956:

H. R. 1892. An act for the relief of Dr. Lu Ho Tung and his wife, Ching-hsi (nee Tsao) Tung.

On April 10, 1956:

H. R. 1005. An act for the relief of Alice Duckett;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Porter;

H. R. 1667. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Boehme; and

H. R. 4039. An act for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Roldan, and Julian, Jr., Lizardo.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carroll, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3481. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution requiring conference reports to be accompanied by statements signed by a majority of the managers of each House.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4009. An act relative to the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation, organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the membership corporations law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the membership corporations law of the State of New York.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10004. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.